Great North Road Solar and Biodiversity Park

Section 47 Applicant Response Table

Document reference - EN010162/APP/5.1.10

Revision number 1

June 2025

Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009, APFP Regulation 5(2)(q)

Contents

1 Section 47 Applicant Response Table.....

2 Section 47 Feedback From Notable Organisations .....

3 Section 47 Targeted Consultation Applicant Response Table .....

1 SECTION 47 APPLICANT RESPONSE TABLE

Table 1: Section 47 Applicant Response Table

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Topic Area: Agricultural Land			
GNR2_EF_006, GNR2_EF_013, GNR2_EF_001, GNR2_EF_021, GNR2_L_003, GNR2_L_005, GNR2_L_008, GNR2_L_009, GNR2_L_010, GNR2_L_011, GNR2_L_012, GNR2_L_016, GNR2_L_017, GNR2_L_020, GNR2_L_022, GNR2_EF_020, GNR2_FF_0011, GNR2_FF_0018, GNR2_FF_0021, GNR2_FF_0027, GNR2_FF_0035, GNR2_FF_0036, GNR2_FF_0037, GNR2_FF_0041, GNR2_FF_0042, GNR2_EF_041, GNR2_EF_045, GNR2_EF_049, GNR2_OFF_001, GNR2_OFF_004, GNR2_OFF_009, GNR2_OFF_010, GNR2_OFF_013, GNR2_OFF_025, GNR2_OFF_029, GNR2_OFF_035,	Respondents expressed concern about the use of agricultural land. Some respondents expressed land is prime BMV designated land.	Yes	The Applicant assures there will be no permanent loss of agricultural land, only temporary use for the duration of the Development. The Order Limits have decreased since PEIR, taking into account public concerns around use of agricultural land. Additionally, the Applicant approached site selection to avoid higher value land, as set out in the ES Chapter 4, Site Selection and Design **[EN010162/APP/6.2.4]**.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_OFF_037, GNR2_OFF_042, GNR2_FF_0043, GNR2_OFF_045, GNR2_OFF_053, GNR2_EF_051, GNR2_OFF_166, GNR2_OFF_162, GNR2_OFF_161, GNR2_OFF_157, GNR2_OFF_152, GNR2_OFF_061, GNR2_OFF_062, GNR2_OFF_063, GNR2_OFF_064, GNR2_OFF_068, GNR2_OFF_072, GNR2_OFF_075, GNR2_OFF_076, GNR2_OFF_084, GNR2_OFF_085, GNR2_OFF_087, GNR2_OFF_088, GNR2_OFF_092, GNR2_OFF_093, GNR2_OFF_094, GNR2_OFF_099,			

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_OFF_103, GNR2_OFF_105, GNR2_OFF_109, GNR2_OFF_114, GNR2_OFF_118, GNR2_OFF_121, GNR2_OFF_125, GNR2_OFF_127, GNR2_OFF_128, GNR2_OFF_133, GNR2_OFF_134, GNR2_OFF_137, GNR2_OFF_142, GNR2_OFF_143, GNR2_OFF_144, GNR2_OFF_146, GNR2_OFF_148, GNR2_FF_0047			
GNR2_FF_0005, GNR2_EF_021, GNR2_EF_032, GNR2_L_008, GNR2_L_011, GNR2_L_014, GNR2_L_015, GNR2_L_018, GNR2_L_019, GNR2_OFF_028, GNR2_OFF_101, GNR2_OFF_029, GNR2_OFF_031,	Respondents expressed concern about the Development's impact to soils and nutrients of agricultural land. One respondent expressed that soil should be designated and treated as natural capital.		There is considerable evidence to show that soils will benefit from being in long-term grassland use rather than intensive arable use. Soils will be treated carefully, and guidance is set out in the Outline Soil Management Plan (oSMP) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.17.2]**. This

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_OFF_036, GNR2_OFF_041, GNR2_OFF_043, GNR2_OFF_061, GNR2_OFF_065, GNR2_OFF_066, GNR2_OFF_083, GNR2_OFF_003, GNR2_OFF_096, GNR2_EF_040, GNR2_EF_044, GNR2_EF_052, GNR2_OFF_089, GNR2_FF_0048	One respondent expressed that cleaning material and toxic chemicals from panels can degrade soil.		includes the operational phase, and cleaning of the panels which involves only water, not chemicals.
GNR2_L_014, GNR2_L_015, GNR2_L_018, GNR2_L_019, GNR2_OFF_028, GNR2_OFF_101, GNR2_OFF_029, GNR2_OFF_031, GNR2_OFF_036, GNR2_OFF_041, GNR2_OFF_043, GNR2_OFF_061, GNR2_OFF_065, GNR2_OFF_066, GNR2_OFF_083, GNR2_OFF_003,	Respondents suggested that the Development should incorporate a rich network of species-rich farmland to support wildlife, pollinators, and species controlling agricultural pests and diseases.	Yes	Benefits to the environmental and ecology, planting and species support are covered in the Environmental Statement in the Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]**. • The Applicant now proposes 64,500 trees to be planted, 50km of new hedgerow and over 1,000 acres of land allotted outside the PV areas for biodiversity enhancements

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_OFF_096, GNR2_EF_040, GNR2_EF_044, GNR2_EF_052			• The Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) for the Development as below • Habitat units +60% • Hedgerow units +26.46% • Watercourse units +11.05%
GNR2_L_003, GNR2_FF_0005, GNR2_FF_0006, GNR2_FF_0041, GNR2_EF_020, GNR2_EF_021, GNR2_EF_025, GNR2_OFF_010, GNR2_OFF_017, GNR2_OFF_152, GNR2_OFF_053, GNR2_OFF_076, GNR2_OFF_088	Respondents expressed concern about the impact of the Development on local farming, farmers, and tenant farmers.	Yes	The Applicant has fully assessed the effects on farms in the ES Chapter 17, Agricultural Land **[EN010162/APP/6.2.17]**. Chapter 17 outlines there are impacts but no significant effects arise from the Development. The Applicant has had regard to local farming and land has been returned to agriculture as demonstrated by the reduction in Order Limits.
GNR2_FF_0040, GNR2_L_010, GNR2_L_013, GNR2_OFF_078	Respondent requested any new grassland planting be done with non-toxic flora so not to harm horses. They request working closely with the British Horse Society on this.	Yes	The Applicant confirms grass mixes will be non-toxic as described in the Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]**.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_FF_0008, GNR2_OFF_001, GNR2_OFF_050	Respondents support the grazing of sheep and regenerative agriculture initiatives to utilize the land during the Development.	Yes	The Applicant acknowledges this comment. Grazing by sheep may be able to take place and is intended, as described in the ES Chapter 17, Agricultural Land **[EN010162/APP/6.2.17]**.
GNR2_L_011, GNR2_OFF_166, GNR2_OFF_152	Respondents expressed the grazing of sheep is tokenistic and, in any case, most lamb is exported out of the country.	Yes	The Applicant has engaged a local shepherd to further this aim. Grazing of sheep is common, and in land use statistics from June 2024 about half of land under solar panels was being grazed on 1st June (Agricultural land use in England on 1 June 2024, Defra (26 September 2024).
GNR2_L_008, GNR2_FF_0021, GNR2_EF_045	Respondents expressed concern that sheep grazing will be difficult as herding flocks in between panels will not be easy.	Yes	The Applicant notes sheep grazing under panels is common, as outlined in Agricultural land use in England on 1 June 2024, Defra (26 September 2024).
GNR2_EF_045	Respondent expressed concern for the welfare of the sheep grazing on the solar PV sites.	Yes	Sheep grazing under panels is common and there are positive effects on sheep welfare through access to shade from panels.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_OFF_107	Respondent expressed any continued agricultural use of the land should be in consultation with HHP's current research methods, which would guide on things such as small machinery access.	No	The Applicant has set out ongoing maintenance in the Outline Soil Management Plan (oSMP) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.17.2].**
GNR2_EF_021	Respondent expressed concern that sheep being grazed on site were advertised as being Cameroon sheep and not a British breed.	No	The breed of sheep has not been specified.
GNR2_FF_0008	Respondent supports the use of low-grade agricultural land.	Yes	The use of low-grade agricultural land was part of site layout considerations as set out in ES Chapter 4, Site Selection and Design **[EN010162/APP/6.2.4]**.
GNR2_L_010	Respondent expressed that project should be on flat and not undulating land.	Yes	Layouts are set out in ES Chapter 4, Site Selection and Design **[EN010162/APP/6.2.4]**.
GNR2_L_009	Respondent expressed concern that no ALC testing had been completed for areas adjacent to Kneesall Lodge.	Yes	All areas have now been surveyed and are reported in the ES Chapter 17, Agricultural Land **[EN010162/APP/6.2.17]**.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_OFF_008	Respondent suggested tilting panels higher would allow for growth and grazing on the land.	Yes	The Applicant notes the panel design will allow for sheep to graze.
GNR2_EF_021	Respondent expressed concern that poisonous invasive weed will spread onto agricultural land.	Yes	Grassland will be managed by grazing or, if necessary, mechanically and such effects will not arise as set out in the Outline Landscape and ecological Management Plan (LEMP) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1].**
GNR2_OFF_134	Respondent expressed agricultural land is important for the development of biofuel air travel in the future.	No	In Defra's 27 June 2024 Official Statistics Document – Bioenergy crops in England the UK 2008-2023: • In 2023, 133 thousand hectares of agricultural land in the UK were used to grow crops for bioenergy. This area represents 2.2% of the arable land in the UK. • In 2023, 36% of land used for bioenergy was for biofuel (biodiesel and bioethanol) in the UK road transport market with the remainder mostly

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			used for heat and power production. Biofuel production for transport therefore takes up a small percentage of UK land. Government policy clearly supports the usage of appropriate land for solar power production.
GNR2_PDF_0001, GNR2_EF_010, GNR2_EF_006, GNR2_EF_007, GNR2_EF_013, GNR2_EF_021, GNR2_L_003, GNR2_L_005, GNR2_L_007, GNR2_L_011, GNR2_L_012, GNR2_L_014, GNR2_L_015, GNR2_L_016, GNR2_L_017, GNR2_L_018, GNR2_L_019, GNR2_L_020, GNR2_L_022, GNR2_L_023, GNR2_FF_0006, GNR2_FF_0021, GNR2_FF_0033, GNR2_EF_041, GNR2_L_008, GNR2_EF_045, GNR2_EF_049, GNR2_OFF_001, GNR2_OFF_010, GNR2_OFF_016,	Respondents expressed concern about food security, for example the Development's impact on food imports, limited production of food, food security is more important than energy security. One respondent suggested alternative food growing sites should be identified. One respondent expressed concern that land is being removed from the National food land bank.	Yes	There is adequate UK land to deal with food security, but threats from climate change and dependence on imports for fruit, seafood, as well as rising food costs threaten food insecurity for many low-income households. The overall land take for the Development has reduced significantly, allowing more of the proposed land to return to agriculture. Onsite food production will take place with the Applicants

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_OFF_017, GNR2_OFF_020, GNR2_OFF_025, GNR2_OFF_028, GNR2_OFF_042, GNR2_OFF_052, GNR2_OFF_167, GNR2_OFF_163, GNR2_OFF_162, GNR2_OFF_157, GNR2_OFF_152, GNR2_OFF_054, GNR2_OFF_062, GNR2_OFF_063, GNR2_OFF_064, GNR2_OFF_071, GNR2_OFF_076, GNR2_OFF_082, GNR2_OFF_087, GNR2_OFF_101, GNR2_OFF_029, GNR2_OFF_031, GNR2_OFF_036, GNR2_OFF_041, GNR2_OFF_043,			partnership with a local shepherd, ensuring food production will occur via the grazing of sheep. ES Chapter 17, Agricultural Land **[EN010162/APP/6.2.17]** and Chapter 13, Socio-economics and Tourism and Chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.13]** cover issues around food security. To effectively tackle food insecurity, the world must tackle climate change, which disrupts both food supply and distribution.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_OFF_061, GNR2_OFF_065, GNR2_OFF_066, GNR2_OFF_083, GNR2_OFF_003, GNR2_OFF_096, GNR2_EF_040, GNR2_EF_044, GNR2_EF_052, GNR2_OFF_088, GNR2_OFF_092, GNR2_OFF_102, GNR2_OFF_103, GNR2_OFF_114, GNR2_OFF_125, GNR2_OFF_132, GNR2_OFF_133, GNR2_OFF_134, GNR2_OFF_143, GNR2_OFF_144, GNR2_OFF_146, GNR2_FF_0047			
GNR2_FF_0038	Respondent expressed they are not sure how food security relates to the Development.	Yes	The Development implications are described in the ES Chapter 17, Agricultural Land [**EN010162/APP/6.2.17**].
GNR2_OFF_025, GNR2_FF_0047	Respondents expressed particular concern for DB062 as it is good	Yes	All land has been surveyed, and the results and implications are

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	quality loam and highly productive agricultural land.		described in the ES Chapter 17, Agricultural Land **[EN010162/APP/6.2.17]**.
Topic Area: Air Quality			
GNR2_L_011, GNR2_L_014, GNR2_L_015, GNR2_L_018, GNR2_L_019, GNR2_OFF_028, GNR2_OFF_067, GNR2_OFF_101, GNR2_OFF_029, GNR2_OFF_031, GNR2_OFF_036, GNR2_OFF_041, GNR2_OFF_043, GNR2_OFF_061, GNR2_OFF_065, GNR2_OFF_066, GNR2_OFF_083, GNR2_OFF_003, GNR2_OFF_096, GNR2_EF_040, GNR2_EF_044, GNR2_EF_052	Respondents express concerns of the proposals on local air quality. One respondent specified air quality deterioration from infrastructure fires.	Yes	ES Chapter 16, Miscellaneous Issues **[EN010162/APP/6.2.16],** addresses the potential for significant air quality effects by considering the baseline environment and setting out the potential impacts that could occur during the construction, operation, and decommissioning phases of the Development. With one respondent stating they're specifically concerned about air quality deterioration from infrastructure fires, it's important to note that this ES Chapter 16, Miscellaneous Issues **[EN010162/APP/6.2.16]** is supported by the Fire Safety Management Plan (FSMP)**;** an outline of which is provided in

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			Technical Appendix A5.4 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.4],** and in preparation, the following policy relating to air quality has been reviewed: Overarching National Policy Statement (NPS) for Energy (EN-1): Section 5.2 (Air Quality and Emissions), paragraphs 5.2.1 to 5.2.3, which refer to potential dust and pollutant emissions to air from combustion sources. In summary, background air quality in the vicinity of the Order Limits is good, with low levels of air pollution. Based on the activities comprising the Development, it is anticipated that there would be limited, and not significant, effects on air quality during the construction, operation, and decommissioning phases. However, pollution effects are not threshold-based,

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			and hence mitigation to further reduce impacts is set out in the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) (Technical Appendix A5.3; **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.3]**), Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) (Technical Appendix A5.2; **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.2]**) and Outline Decommissioning and Restoration Plan (DRP) (Technical Appendix A5.6; [**EN010162/APP/6.4.5.6]**).
Topic Area: Climate Change			
GNR2_EF_002, GNR2_EF_001, GNR2_EF_021, GNR2_L_002, GNR2_L_003, GNR2_L_007, GNR2_L_008, GNR2_L_010, GNR2_L_012, GNR2_L_014, GNR2_L_015, GNR2_L_016, GNR2_L_017, GNR2_L_018, GNR2_L_019, GNR2_L_020, GNR2_FF_0011, GNR2_FF_0036, GNR2_EF_030, GNR2_EF_040,	Respondents support renewable energy in principle.	No	Noted.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_EF_042, GNR2_EF_045, GNR2_OFF_028, GNR2_OFF_029, GNR2_OFF_030, GNR2_OFF_037, GNR2_OFF_042, GNR2_EF_054, GNR2_OFF_150, GNR2_OFF_063, GNR2_OFF_064, GNR2_OFF_072, GNR2_OFF_079, GNR2_OFF_085, GNR2_OFF_101, GNR2_OFF_031, GNR2_OFF_036, GNR2_OFF_041, GNR2_OFF_043, GNR2_OFF_061, GNR2_OFF_065, GNR2_OFF_066, GNR2_OFF_083, GNR2_OFF_003, GNR2_OFF_096, GNR2_EF_044, GNR2_EF_052, GNR2_OFF_094,			

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_OFF_105, GNR2_OFF_130, GNR2_OFF_146			
GNR2_EF_021, GNR2_EF_026, GNR2_EF_042, GNR2_L_008, GNR2_FF_0021, GNR2_FF_0042, GNR2_OFF_001, GNR2_OFF_0167, GNR2_OFF_056, GNR2_OFF_062, GNR2_OFF_070, GNR2_OFF_082, GNR2_OFF_094, GNR2_OFF_099, GNR2_OFF_134, GNR2_OFF_137	Respondents expressed concern that project will not be very efficient with lack of sunlight and no production at night. One respondent expressed solar farm batteries are not sufficient for long term use in such a climate.	No	Efficiency of solar PV is improving, and panels do continue to generate electricity on cloudy and overcast days. The incorporation of the BESS allows for excess electricity generated during the day to be stored for use at night when demand is high. The operational life of the BESS infrastructure is shorter than the operational phase, and so it is assumed in ES Chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15]**, that 50% of BESS inverters and 150% of BESS cells will be replaced during the operational phase of the Development.
GNR2_EF_032, GNR2_FF_0037, GNR2_PDFF_0003,	Respondents expressed general scepticism about net zero efforts.	No	Regardless of net zero goals, the Development will lead to a net reduction of 789,292 teCO2e in

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_OFF_042, GNR2_OFF_017, GNR2_OFF_157	One respondent said net zero efforts are politically and economically unsound, so the case for solar infrastructure is exaggerated. Some respondents expressed project is a net zero tick box exercise.		emissions, actively contributing to mitigating the risk of severe climate change.
GNR2_L_022, GNR2_FF_0021, GNR2_OFF_029, GNR2_OFF_157, GNR2_OFF_063, GNR2_OFF_082, GNR2_OFF_092, GNR2_OFF_126, GNR2_OFF_133	Respondents expressed concern that project construction may be more damaging for the climate than the eventual good it can do. Include references to carbon costs of emissions.	Yes	In ES Chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15]**, assess the worst-case outcomes for the Development's emissions. The production, construction, operation (including equipment replacement) and decommissioning of the Development is estimated to be 3,194,264 teCO2e. By replacing fossil fuel electricity production with lower-carbon renewable energy, the development will save 3,983,556 teCO2e, resulting in a net emissions saving of 789,292 teCO2e.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_L_002, GNR2_L_013, GNR2_L_017, GNR2_L_020, GNR2_FF_0040, GNR2_OFF_078	Respondents expressed worry about 'heat island' effect locally and lack of scientific understanding on heat damage to the land beneath. One person expressed concern that panels will produce excessive heat.	No	Research has focused on solar panels in arid areas. Current research indicates that the presence of grassland under panels mitigates any potential heat impacts, and therefore this is not anticipated to be a concern for the Development.
GNR2_L_008, GNR2_L_010, GNR2_OFF_104, GNR2_OFF_112	Respondent expressed concern about the capacity of the local grid network. Some respondents mentioned the upcoming RWE Carbon Capture Project adding pressure.	No	The Applicant has obtained a grid connection agreement prior to the DCO Application submission. Due to this, grid capacity is not an issue. Further detail can be found in the Grid Connection Statement **[EN010162/APP/7.15].**
GNR2_FF_0011, GNR2_OFF_063, GNR2_EF_010, GNR2_OFF_163	Respondents expressed concern that energy generated and stored will benefit the rest of the country and not the immediate area.	No	While the electricity generated by the Development will be fed into the national grid rather than directly supplying the local area, the Development will still bring benefits to the local area. By increasing the supply of clean, low-cost energy on the grid, the Development helps stabilise

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			energy prices, reduce carbon emissions, and support the UK's transition to renewable energy. These benefits reach every community, including the immediate area. In addition, the Development brings local economic opportunities, such as construction jobs, ongoing maintenance roles, and community benefit schemes.
GNR2_FF_0009, GNR2_OFF_031, GNR2_OFF_153	Respondents express concern for climate change in general.	No	The Development will lead to a net reduction of 789,292 teCO2e in emissions, actively contributing to mitigating the risk of severe climate change as detailed in ES Chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15]**.
GNR2_L_016, GNR2_OFF_053, GNR2_OFF_071	Respondent expressed Nottinghamshire already provides enough energy, more than it needs for its own usage / has done its bit already for energy generation.	No	While it's true that Nottinghamshire already contributes to the UK's energy generation, the transition to a low-carbon energy system requires

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	Some respondents specified Trent Valley is oversaturated with energy generating schemes.		continued Development of renewable infrastructure across the country. The location for the Development was chosen based on a range of technical factors, including grid capacity, land suitability, and solar potential, which are not evenly distributed across all regions. The Trent Valley is an energy generating region historically. The Development has been designed with local interests in mind, incorporating consultation feedback at each stage to ensure the delivery of community benefits and environmental enhancements.
GNR2_OFF_025, GNR2_FF_0047	Respondents expressed there is minimal coordination by National Grid and Elements Green on need for energy.	No	The need for Clean Power by 2030 is a matter of agreement between National Grid Electricity Transmission, National Grid Energy System Operator, Ofgem

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			and DESNEZ (Department for Energy Security and Net Zero). The Applicant agrees with the need for the very stretched target to achieve a Clean Power electricity system by 2030 and this aligns with National Grid. See Statement of need **[EN010162/APP/7.2]** and Grid Connection Statement **[EN010162/APP/7.15].**
GNR2_L_023, GNR2_OFF_072	Respondents expressed that Eakring Village has done its bit for power generation as it already has solar areas around the A614 and 2 more on the road leading to Eakring. One respondent said there are enough wind turbines for the village's size.	Yes	The transition to a low-carbon energy system requires continued development of renewable infrastructure across the country. The location for the Development was chosen based on a range of technical factors, including grid capacity, land suitability, and solar potential, which are not evenly distributed across all regions and detailed in ES Chapter 4, Site Selection and Design **[EN010162/APP/6.2.4]**. The Development has been

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			designed with local interests in mind, incorporating consultation feedback at each stage to ensure the delivery of community benefits and environmental enhancements.
GNR2_EF_015	One respondent expressed concern for sheep grazing emitting methane gas.	Yes	Methane emissions from sheep grazing are assessed within ES Chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15]**.
GNR2_OFF_025	One respondent expressed plans for energy use are not published, including potentially increasing grid capacity or upgrades.	Yes	The grid connection statement contained within the planning documents **[EN010162/APP/7.15]** shows the Point of Connection (PoC) for the Development. There are not significant upgrades or increases in grid capacity required to deliver the Development, using as it does the existing Staythorpe National Grid Substation at an existing connection bay. It is an efficient place to connect the Development to export electricity onto the National Grid network.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_OFF_042	One respondent expressed that fossil fuels / fracking is a better alternative.	No	The UK Government has set ambitious targets to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 2050. The Development, along with other renewable energy schemes, will provide a significant reduction of the net GHG emissions within the UK by replacing fossil fuel electricity production with lower-carbon renewable energy. The development would result in a net emissions saving of **789,292** teCO2e **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15]**.
Topic Area: Community Benefits			
GNR2_EF_006, GNR2_EF_007, GNR2_L_003, GNR2_L_005, GNR2_L_007, GNR2_L_008, GNR2_L_009, GNR2_L_011, GNR2_L_012, GNR2_L_013, GNR2_L_014, GNR2_L_015, GNR2_L_016, GNR2_L_017, GNR2_L_018, GNR2_L_019, GNR2_L_020, GNR2_FF_0006, GNR2_FF_0011, GNR2_FF_0024,	Respondents expressed concern about project's potential impact on residents' quality of life, mental wellbeing / financial impact. Some respondents expressed concern for the effect it may have on their businesses.	Yes	Impacts on businesses and the local economy are assessed in the ES Chapter 13, Socio-Economics and Tourism **[EN010162/APP/6.2.13],** Chapter 16, Miscellaneous Issues **[EN010162/APP/6.2.16]** assesses the health effects of the Development.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_FF_0028, GNR2_FF_0036, GNR2_FF_0037, GNR2_FF_0040, GNR2_FF_0041, GNR2_FF_0042, GNR2_FF_0044, GNR2_EF_020, GNR2_EF_026, GNR2_EF_032, GNR2_EF_035, GNR2_EF_040, GNR2_EF_042, GNR2_EF_044, GNR2_EF_045, GNR2_EF_046, GNR2_EF_047, GNR2_OFF_001, GNR2_OFF_002, GNR2_OFF_005, GNR2_OFF_007, GNR2_OFF_024, GNR2_OFF_025, GNR2_FF_0028, GNR2_OFF_033, GNR2_OFF_035, GNR2_EF_051, GNR2_OFF_040, GNR2_EF_052, GNR2_OFF_042, GNR2_OFF_045, GNR2_EF_054, GNR2_OFF_0172, GNR2_OFF_055, GNR2_OFF_064, GNR2_OFF_067, GNR2_OFF_068, GNR2_OFF_071,			The Development has been sensitively designed to minimise effects, as can be viewed in the Design Approach Document, **[EN010162/APP/5.6]** Site Selection and Design further considers this in **[EN010162/APP/6.2.4]** Benefits to local communities include: • The NG+ package offers £1m per annum in Community Benefit across the 40-year life of the Development. • The extensive new access to the countryside through 27 new permissive routes. • Biodiversity Net Gain of 60% for habitat units, 26% for hedgerow and 11% for watercourses. • The Development creating 64,500 new trees, over 50km of new hedgerow and over

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_OFF_075, GNR2_OFF_076, GNR2_OFF_078, GNR2_OFF_080, GNR2_OFF_101, GNR2_OFF_029, GNR2_OFF_031, GNR2_OFF_036, GNR2_OFF_041, GNR2_OFF_043, GNR2_OFF_061, GNR2_OFF_065, GNR2_OFF_066, GNR2_OFF_083, GNR2_OFF_003, GNR2_OFF_096, GNR2_OFF_088, GNR2_OFF_089, GNR2_OFF_094, GNR2_OFF_102, GNR2_OFF_103, GNR2_OFF_104, GNR2_OFF_106, GNR2_OFF_116,			1,000 acres of ecological enhancement area. • The innovative EG Academy programme which has helped 113 local students gain renewable qualifications, -The substantial business rates the Development will pay to the local councils to improve local services. • The meaningful and well-paid job creation both in construction and permanent roles.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_OFF_125, GNR2_OFF_132, GNR2_FF_0047			
GNR2_L_008, GNR2_L_011, GNR2_L_014, GNR2_L_015, GNR2_L_017, GNR2_L_018, GNR2_L_019, GNR2_L_020, GNR2_OFF_016, GNR2_OFF_020, GNR2_OFF_028, GNR2_OFF_067, GNR2_OFF_101, GNR2_OFF_029, GNR2_OFF_031, GNR2_OFF_036, GNR2_OFF_041, GNR2_OFF_043, GNR2_OFF_061, GNR2_OFF_065, GNR2_OFF_066, GNR2_OFF_083, GNR2_OFF_003, GNR2_OFF_096, GNR2_EF_040, GNR2_EF_044, GNR2_EF_052	Respondents expressed concern about untested biological effects of electromagnetic fields, construction emissions close to communities etc. One respondent expressed long term vision issues as a possibility. One respondent expressed communication channels could be jammed by electromagnetic fields. One respondent stressed that solar panels are known to contain Cadmium which is a known health hazard.	Yes	ES Chapter 16, Miscellaneous Issues **[EN010162/APP/6.2.16]** outlines the effects of electromagnetic fields. The panels will comply with EMC standards, which are designed to set limits on the amount of electromagnetic radiation that a piece of equipment is allowed to emit. They also define levels of external interference that a piece of equipment can tolerate while functioning correctly. There are various organisations that contribute to EMC standards. Commercial electronic devices, including solar panels, are subject to EMC testing. Long term vision being affected by solar panels is unlikely as they

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			absorb irradiation rather than emitting it. See ES Chapter 16, Miscellaneous Issues, under Glint and Glare **[EN010162/APP/6.2.16.3].** ES Chapter 14, Traffic and Transport **[EN010162/APP/6.2.14]** describes the Developments traffic construction emissions. Cadmium is found in thin-film solar panels, which are used primary for niche applications representing around 2% of the Solar PV market. Cadmium is not found in panels used for modern solar farms.
GNR2_FF_0011, GNR2_FF_0038, GNR2_EF_032, GNR2_L_011, GNR2_EF_012, GNR2_OFF_017, GNR2_OFF_029, GNR2_OFF_035,	Respondents believe community benefit package is too small / too insignificant for the size of the Development.	Yes	Benefits to local communities include: • The NG+ package offers £1m per annum in Community Benefit across the 40-year life

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_OFF_038, GNR2_OFF_047, GNR2_OFF_048, GNR2_EF_050, GNR2_OFF_163, GNR2_OFF_063, GNR2_OFF_067, GNR2_OFF_072, GNR2_OFF_075, GNR2_OFF_080, GNR2_OFF_088, GNR2_OFF_089, GNR2_OFF_125, GNR2_OFF_128, GNR2_OFF_133, GNR2_OFF_143, GNR2_OFF_144	Some respondents expressed there is no benefit the scheme can provide. One respondent expressed the £1 million size of the grant, will work out just under £100 per person based on their calculations and that devaluation and inflation will make this meaningless. One respondent expressed the terms of application and administering of funds is too vague and could involve a lot of red tape.		of the Development, which is industry leading. It will be administered by an independent charity (Nottinghamshire Community Fund) when the further phase of the scheme is put into action, with small grants having already been distributed. • The extensive new access to the countryside through 27 new permissive routes. • Biodiversity Net Gain of 60% for habitat areas, 26% for hedgerows and 11% for watercourses, with the Development creating 64,500 new trees, 50km of new hedgerow and over 1,000 acres of ecological enhancement area. • The innovative EG Academy programme which has helped

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			113 local students gain renewable qualifications. • The substantial business rates the Development will pay to the local councils to improve local services. • The meaningful and well-paid job creation both in construction and permanent roles.
GNR2_OFF_013, GNR2_OFF_029, GNR2_OFF_046, GNR2_OFF_159, GNR2_OFF_099, GNR2_OFF_109, GNR2_OFF_137, GNR2_OFF_148	Respondents expressed that community investment is a bribe.	No	Community Benefit is not assessed as part of the consideration for a DCO application, rather the Government expects applicants to make such arrangements alongside major infrastructure. Host communities receive recognition in their efforts to benefit the country as a whole. Residents may make representations on the proposed Development whilst separately supporting the Community Benefits package.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_OFF_014, GNR2_OFF_029, GNR2_OFF_054, GNR2_OFF_125	Respondents expressed scepticism if the community benefit will deliver. One respondent expressed scepticism on delivery because administering the fund will be expensive.	No	The NG+ scheme has already begun issuing small grants to communities. Administration of the fund will need to be done correctly and properly, this will come at a price but set in the context of the £1m per annum fund, should have a negligible effect on the overall programmes.
GNR2_EF_008, GNR2_EF_001, GNR2_OFF_155	Respondents express concern impacts of the Development will outweigh community benefits.	Yes	Impacts of the Development are varied and fully assessed in the Chapters of the ES. Benefits to local communities include: • The NG+ package offers £1m per annum in Community Benefit across the 40-year life of the Development. • The extensive new access to the countryside through 27 new permissive routes. • Biodiversity Net Gain of 60% for habitats, 26% for hedgerows and 11% for watercourses.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			• The Development creating 64,500 new trees, 50km of hedgerow and 1,000 acres of ecological enhancement area. • The innovative EG Academy programme which has helped 113 local students gain accredited renewable qualifications. • The substantial business rates the Development will pay to the local councils to improve local services. • The meaningful and well-paid job creation both in construction and permanent roles.
GNR2_L_017, GNR2_L_020	Respondent expressed that because they have a business in the area, an alternative working environment would need to be provided.	Yes	Environmental effects in the ES have not been assessed as severe enough to warrant a change in working environment.
GNR2_OFF_067	One respondent expressed that they want to see a mechanism to monitor mental and physical health	Yes	ES Chapter 16, Miscellaneous Issues **[EN010162/APP/6.2.16]** assesses effects on human

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	of residents during and after construction.		health. The Applicant notes from the assessments; significant effects are not expected.
GNR2_OFF_128	One respondent expressed opposition to visitor centre and associated infrastructure. One respondent expressed EG had promised at a consultation event in July 2024 that this will be removed.	Yes	There has not been a proposal for a visitor centre on the Development, there was a visitor hub proposed in Muskham and this has been removed following consultee responses.
GNR2_FF_0011, GNR2_FF_0013, GNR2_FF_0024, GNR2_FF_0018, GNR2_FF_0035, GNR2_L_010, GNR2_OFF_001, GNR2_OFF_002, GNR2_OFF_004, GNR2_OFF_006, GNR2_OFF_007, GNR2_OFF_008, GNR2_OFF_019, GNR2_OFF_023, GNR2_OFF_052, GNR2_OFF_053, GNR2_OFF_066,	Respondents suggest funds should be used to increase energy efficiency measures/grants for individual properties and community buildings. One respondent expresses energy efficiency is a worthy cause but not easy in an area with high rates of renting.	Yes	The energy efficiency grant scheme established as part of NG+ has had over 150 enquiries and survey efforts began in late 2024 and are ongoing. We are very pleased with the progress of the scheme so far and measures are due to begin in full in 2026.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_OFF_083, GNR2_OFF_087, GNR2_OFF_090, GNR2_OFF_092, GNR2_OFF_101, GNR2_OFF_108, GNR2_OFF_116, GNR2_OFF_118, GNR2_OFF_125, GNR2_OFF_130, GNR2_OFF_131, GNR2_OFF_138			
GNR2_EF_012	One respondent expressed concern for being missed within the first phase of energy efficiency forms.	Yes	We believe everyone is now signed up with the forms, but the scheme is growing, and we anticipate will continue to grow as awareness grows in the implementation phase.
GNR2_OFF_037	One respondent suggested energy efficiency works for grade II listed properties in Eakring Conservation Area, as buildings cannot be altered with double glazing currently.	Yes	The energy efficiency scheme as part of NG+ has had over 150 enquiries and survey efforts began in late 2024 and are ongoing. We are very pleased with the progress of the scheme so far and measures are due to begin in full in 2026.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_OFF_072	One respondent expressed that because some houses are so old the size of the grants would be too small, and it would come at a considerable cost for people on low incomes.	Yes	There are many properties in the catchment area of the Energy Efficiency scheme that sit within Conservation Area boundaries. The size of grants available to individual property owners is to be determined by the NG+ board and there has been no cap placed on this at this stage. It will be a matter for the independent board to administer once it is in place, but the individual grants could be substantial.
GNR2_OFF_0171	One respondent expressed general support the energy efficiency scheme.	No	Noted.
GNR2_OFF_105	One respondent expressed they wanted more information on how the Development will aide rooftop solar development.	Yes	The Energy Efficiency scheme intends to provide rooftop solar PV, as well as a host of other measures to properties via grant funding. The NG+ Development will aide rooftop solar development.
GNR2_OFF_105	One respondent expressed some grants to be made available to	Yes	The Applicant aims to ensure that 'early adopters' are not unfairly

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	those with energy efficient measures such as panels on roofs, before the Development was proposed at all i.e. forms of compensation for those being energy efficient 'for the last 10 years'.		treated in processes because they've taken green measures already to improve their properties. The Energy Efficiency scheme may provide battery technology (for example) for a property benefiting from Solar PV.
GNR2_FF_0006, GNR2_FF_0009. GNR2_L_014, GNR2_L_015, GNR2_L_018, GNR2_L_019, GNR2_OFF_023, GNR2_OFF_025, GNR2_OFF_028, GNR2_OFF_036, GNR2_EF_050, GNR2_OFF_050, GNR2_OFF_163, GNR2_OFF_150, GNR2_OFF_060, GNR2_OFF_064, GNR2_OFF_065, GNR2_OFF_081, GNR2_OFF_083, GNR2_OFF_101, GNR2_OFF_029, GNR2_OFF_031,	Respondents express support for enhancement of biodiversity/local environment as a community benefit. Some respondents suggested the deployment of bird boxes. hedgehog dens and bat boxes. One respondent questioned what the maintenance plans for such wildlife boxes could be so they don't fall into disrepair.	Yes	The Development itself will offer bird and bat boxes in the overall design of the scheme please find in Technical Appendix A5.1 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]** oLEMP Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan, but biodiversity enhancements could also be offered through NG+. It may be worthwhile viewing the overall biodiversity offering and then applying for any measures through the NG+ scheme in terms of wider ecological programmes. The Applicant will gladly collaborate with those members of the public keen on ecology and biodiversity, alongside the trusts

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_OFF_041, GNR2_OFF_043, GNR2_OFF_061, GNR2_OFF_066, GNR2_OFF_003, GNR2_OFF_096, GNR2_EF_040, GNR2_EF_044, GNR2_EF_052, GNR2_OFF_090, GNR2_OFF_094, GNR2_OFF_100, GNR2_OFF_105, GNR2_OFF_108, GNR2_OFF_126, GNR2_OFF_127, GNR2_OFF_131, GNR2_OFF_138, GNR2_FF_0047			and NGOs in partnership on the Development.
GNR2_EF_040, GNR2_EF_044, GNR2_L_014, GNR2_L_015, GNR2_L_018, GNR2_L_019, GNR2_OFF_020, GNR2_OFF_028, GNR2_OFF_081, GNR2_OFF_101, GNR2_OFF_029, GNR2_OFF_031,	Respondents support the creation of the proposed community orchard/picnic areas.	Yes	The community orchard has been adopted in the final design with picnic tables as can be observed in ES Chapter 18, Recreation **[EN010162/APP/6.2.18]**.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_OFF_036, GNR2_OFF_041, GNR2_OFF_043, GNR2_OFF_061, GNR2_OFF_065, GNR2_OFF_066, GNR2_OFF_083, GNR2_OFF_003, GNR2_OFF_096, GNR2_EF_052			
GNR2_OFF_064, GNR2_L_014, GNR2_L_015, GNR2_L_018, GNR2_L_019, GNR2_OFF_028, GNR2_OFF_101, GNR2_OFF_029, GNR2_OFF_031, GNR2_OFF_036, GNR2_OFF_041, GNR2_OFF_043, GNR2_OFF_061, GNR2_OFF_065, GNR2_OFF_066, GNR2_OFF_083, GNR2_OFF_003, GNR2_OFF_096, GNR2_EF_040, GNR2_EF_044, GNR2_EF_052	Respondent expressed funding for recreation and cultural activities for community benefits.	Yes	Such activities and benefits can be applied for through the NG+ fund, which has already begun to distribute grants in its first phase.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_L_014, GNR2_L_015, GNR2_L_018, GNR2_L_019, GNR2_OFF_028, GNR2_OFF_101, GNR2_OFF_029, GNR2_OFF_031, GNR2_OFF_036, GNR2_OFF_041, GNR2_OFF_043, GNR2_OFF_061, GNR2_OFF_065, GNR2_OFF_066, GNR2_OFF_083, GNR2_OFF_003, GNR2_OFF_096, GNR2_EF_040, GNR2_EF_044, GNR2_EF_052	Respondents expressed that signage for the community orchard use invertebrate refuge poles.	Yes	The outline design for the signage for the community orchard can be found in Technical Appendix A5.1 oLEMP **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]**, Outline Landscape and Ecological Masterplan. There is also a section in that document on provision to accommodate invertebrates.
GNR2_FF_0004, GNR2_FF_0006, GNR2_FF_0009, GNR2_FF_0042, GNR2_L_011, GNR2_L_016, GNR2_OFF_004, GNR2_OFF_008, GNR2_OFF_012, GNR2_OFF_042, GNR2_OFF_048, GNR2_OFF_163,	Respondents suggest subsidising electricity bills or free energy as a community benefit.	Yes	The Energy Efficiency scheme has had 150 households respond with interest so that energy bills can be reduced through technologies and structurally reduce demand on the grid simultaneously. The Applicant would encourage more households to take part and has

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_OFF_083, GNR2_OFF_087, GNR2_OFF_105, GNR2_FF_0048			regularly promoted the scheme through parish councils.
GNR2_FF_0010, GNR2_FF_0041, GNR2_FF_0042, GNR2_FF_0043, GNR2_PDFF_0003, GNR2_L_011, GNR2_OFF_004, GNR2_OFF_018, GNR2_OFF_038, GNR2_OFF_044, GNR2_OFF_048, GNR2_OFF_153, GNR2_OFF_076, GNR2_OFF_087, GNR2_OFF_132	Respondents express that the community fund and relevant investment consultation should be used for immediate parishes and communities.	Yes	Parishes and communities in the immediate vicinity have generally been the most engaged in the NG+ programme. NG+ covers all 19 parish council areas, and an independent board will oversee grant decisions to ensure the distribution of the same is fair and even where this is achievable. The terms of reference of the scheme will ensure as much equality as practicable.
GNR2_FF_0006, GNR2_FF_0008, GNR2_OFF_165, GNR2_OFF_019, GNR2_OFF_083, GNR2_OFF_090, GNR2_OFF_094, GNR2_OFF_098, GNR2_OFF_138, GNR2_OFF_147	Respondents express support for the increase of employment and education as a community benefit. One respondent suggested collaborating with Newark College to provide apprenticeship opportunities.	Yes	We are proud of the EG Academy, and the support shown through the community and the local college. With 113 students enrolled and 142 courses taken, there is clear interest in local people working in the energy transition. For further info on this and job and apprenticeship opportunities, the Employment

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			and Skills Plan (ESP) for the Development is found in the ES in Technical Appendix A.13.12 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.13.2]**.
GNR2_L_002, GNR2_FF_0041, GNR2_OFF_048, GNR2_FF_0042, GNR2_EF_045, GNR2_OFF_067, GNR2_OFF_104, GNR2_OFF_105	Respondents suggest that project must deliver direct monetary compensations for the loss of property, easement rights and other impacts.	Yes	Impacts and their assessed level are detailed in the different Chapters of the ES. Community Benefit is available for host communities for Nationally Significant Infrastructure and the Applicant encourages engagement with NG+ for local property owners, for grant measures to improve local communities and properties. The draft DCO includes compensation provisions in respect of the exercise of compulsory purchase powers in the Order which would include the acquisition of land and rights and other specified impacts. A summary of these provisions is contained in the Explanatory

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			Memorandum **[EN010162/APP/3.3]**.
GNR2_OFF_0172, GNR2_OFF_064, GNR2_OFF_116, GNR2_OFF_125, GNR2_OFF_126, GNR2_OFF_127, GNR2_OFF_139, GNR2_OFF_146	Respondents suggest a flood alleviation/management strategy as a community benefit.	Yes	In response to this request the Applicant has collaborated with the Trent Rivers Trust, with guidance from Newark and Sherwood District Council, the Environment Agency and Internal Drainage boards to devise flood alleviation measures for communities with pre-existing flooding issues. Hydraulic modelling has taken place in collaboration with communities with local ground truthing to identify the most effective measures that can be taken. Planning applications for these proposed measures with be forthcoming as the next stage in the process. NG+ funding will be utilised to deliver the schemes for the host community.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_FF_0009, GNR2_OFF_171, GNR2_OFF_167, GNR2_OFF_163, GNR2_OFF_154, GNR2_OFF_083, GNR2_OFF_090, GNR2_OFF_138	Respondents suggest wellbeing areas as a community benefit.	Yes	The Applicant has created a community orchard and an extensive new network of 27 permissive paths and bridleways, Technical Appendix A 4.1 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.4.1]**. The Development includes proposals for 64,500 trees also. Wellbeing and sporting areas can form part of NG+ requests to be considered by its independent board.
GNR2_OFF_025, GNR2_OFF_064, GNR2_OFF_083, GNR2_OFF_090, GNR2_OFF_094, GNR2_OFF_138, GNR2_FF_0047	Respondents expressed support for food security / tackling food poverty as a focus of community benefits.	Yes	NG+ grants for community fridges and various measures to tackle food poverty in communities are open for residents to apply for. There is also a community orchard proposed as part of the main Development.
GNR2_FF_0009, GNR2_FF_0035, GNR2_L_010, GNR2_OFF_044, GNR2_OFF_118	Respondents suggest providing funds to increase local public transport.	Yes	NG+ grants are available to apply for any public good members of the community wish to apply for. Transport grants could be made available if approved by the independent NG+ board which to be founded.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_OFF_029, GNR2_OFF_045, GNR2_OFF_108, GNR2_OFF_110	Respondents expressed general support for funds going towards community infrastructure such as village halls. Some respondents suggested footpath lighting, more parking spaces, play areas, flood relief kits, an amenity store, local parks.	Yes	NG+ has already begun issuing some small improvement grants to village halls and this will continue in future. Some flood relief kit measures have been funded already and the other measures stated can all be considered in the NG+ scheme.
GNR2_FF_0024, GNR2_OFF_045, GNR2_OFF_0170	Respondents suggest some community benefits be earmarked for road improvements and maintenance. One responded specified around Norwell Woodhouse.	Yes	Whilst this could be complex under NG+ it could be possible. However, required road improvements through Nottinghamshire County Council are possible and the significant business rates the Development generates will go into those coffers. There will also be road improvements proposed as part of the development, both in terms of repairs and passing places, detailed in ES Chapter 14, Traffic and Transport **[EN010162/APP/6.2.14]**.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_L_010, GNR2_OFF_131, GNR2_OFF_146	Respondent suggested significant investment in pothole repairs / road improvements.	Yes	Required road improvements through Nottinghamshire County Council are possible and the significant business rates the Development generates will go into those coffers. There will also be road improvements proposed as part of the development, both in terms of repairs and passing places, detailed in ES Chapter 14, Transport and Transport **[EN010162/APP/6.2.14]**.
GNR2_FF_0037, GNR2_OFF_113	Respondent expressed there would be no need for NG+ if the Development did not exist in the first place.	No	It is correct to state that NG+ would not be proposed without the Development.
GNR2_L_010, GNR2_OFF_150	Respondent suggested supporting the reduction of speed on village roads.	Yes	NG+ could potentially support speed traffic camera funds as a public good and grant applications should be made for the same.
GNR2_FF_0008	One respondent suggests helping address social and economic inequalities such as rural poverty as a community benefit.	Yes	The Development offers many opportunities in terms of socio-economics and inward investment into the community, detailed in

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			ES Chapter 13, Socio-Economics and Tourism **[EN010162/APP/6.2.13]**. NG+ can be used for measures to tackle poverty, whether through the energy efficiency scheme, or through other poverty action measures to be proposed by the local community.
GNR2_OFF_105	One respondent expressed that community orchard/picnic areas could create littering and rubbish buildup. One respondent suggested general waste bins / dog waste bins dotted around to avoid this.	Yes	The community orchard proposal has generally been met with a positive response. The detailed design will be a matter for the Recreational Routes Management Plan (RRMP) when formulated but the outline RRMP can be found at Technical Appendix 6.4.18 of ES Chapter 18, Recreation **[EN010162/APP/6.2.18]**.
GNR2_OFF_094	One respondent suggested community funding go towards archaeological and heritage support.	Yes	NG+ funding could potentially be made available for such measures, walk boards are proposed along recreational routes which could also discuss

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			archaeology. More information on walk boards is available in ES Chapter 18, Recreation, Technical Appendix 6.4.18 **[EN010162/APP/6.2.18]**. The Cultural Heritage and Archaeology Chapter is also available for interest at Chapter 11, Cultural Heritage and Archaeology **[EN010162/APP/6.2.11]**.
GNR2_FF_0024	One respondent expressed support for regional electricity pricing.	No	Regional electricity pricing is a matter for the UK government, but the Applicant is supportive of current UK energy policy.
GNR2_FF_0026	One respondent suggested a community evaluation for local archaeology groups to aid data gathering.	Yes	ES Chapter 11, Cultural Heritage and Archaeology **[EN010162/APP/6.2.11]** details further investigations and involving local communities in a public dig could be proposed as part of NG+ should an opportunity arise with an interesting find.
GNR2_FF_0038	One respondent noted it is not clear what a visitor hub is.	Yes	Visitor hub proposals have now been removed following

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			consultation and picnic tables and walk boards continue to be proposed as can be viewed in Technical Appendix 6.4.18 oRRMP (outline Recreational Routes Management Plan) of the ES Chapter 18, Recreation **[EN010162/APP/6.2.18]**.
GNR2_FF_0018	One respondent suggested a new car park for the visitor centre.	No	There has not been a visitor centre proposal for the Development.
GNR2_FF_0011	One respondent suggest properties could be bought off residents at market value so they can relocate to a similar rural setting in the future.	No	There are no plans to acquire properties from residents
GNR2_OFF_079	One respondent suggested looking at flood mitigation schemes in their own remits as opposed to as part of the NG+ scheme.	Yes	The Applicant wishes to pursue the flood alleviation schemes through the NG+ route, because it is a quicker mode of delivery for the schemes. The schemes cannot form part of the main planning application.
GNR2_L_016	One respondent suggested an annual grant, index linked, for each	Yes	The NG+ scheme will be managed by an independent

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	village affected for the lifetime of the Development to be agreed before consent is given.		board to ensure the £1m per annum is distributed as fairly as practicable across the different programmes it is supporting and geographies receiving the funds.
GNR2_OFF_034	One respondent suggested improving wind turbines as a community benefit.	Yes	Small scale wind turbines could potentially be offered via NG+, providing income for villages. This would be a matter for the independent board and such proposals would need to achieve planning consent from the local authority.
GNR2_OFF_110	One respondent suggested funding flood wardens from community benefit fund.	Yes	Flooding support through NG+ to assist communities affected by pre-existing flooding has already begun, with a grant having been issued for emergency flood measures. NG+ can assist in the many aspects of flood prevention and control, but crucially also aims to build mitigation schemes to address the cause directly.
GNR2_FF_0032	One respondent expressed the community orchard proposals are	Yes	The orchard planting methodology is detailed in

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	not sound, as the ground is not suitable for trees.		Technical Appendix A.5.1 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]** technical appendix of the ES Chapter 7, Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, which is the oLEMP (outline Landscape and Ecology Masterplan) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]**.
GNR2_OFF_029	One respondent suggested fund should look at other comparable community benefits for good practice, such as Severn Trent Community Fund.	Yes	NG+ is open to peer review but has been shaped by the desires of and issues faced by the local community so far. Ultimately it will take the shape that local residents want it to, but the Energy Efficiency scheme and Flood Alleviation initiatives were all founded in response to public consultation. This will continue in the future in the run up to the appointment of the NG+ board.
GNR2_OFF_029,	One respondent suggested funding should be administered in consultation with Nottinghamshire Rural Communities Action Network.	No	Funding is proposed to be managed and administered by Nottingham Community Fund (NCF), a charity with experience

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			of managing Community Benefit funds.
GNR2_FF_0035	One respondent suggested scheme could help decrease the use of pesticides and intensive farming methods.	Yes	The Development will help decrease the use of pesticides and intensive farming methods, thus improving water quality, which is positive for biodiversity. Detail in Chapter 8 of the ES **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**, Ecology and water courses close to the development are discussed in Chapter 9 of the ES **[EN010162/APP/6.2.9]**, Water resources. The positive effects on soils of not pursuing intensive farming methods are examined in Chapter 17, ALC Agricultural Land Classification **[EN010162/APP/6.2.17]**.
GNR2_OFF_044	One respondent suggested the creation of walking groups as a community benefit.	Yes	NG+ could facilitate walking groups, proposals for this should be discussed with the Applicant's NG+ co-ordinator.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_OFF_105	One respondent expressed that community could be involved in rewilding efforts, green space conversions as well as clubs and societies.	Yes	NG+ could facilitate many aspects of ecological improvement, having invested in a roof garden at the Newark Air and Space institute already, proposals for this should be discussed with the Applicant's NG+ co-ordinator.
GNR2_OFF_105	One respondent expressed they would like to see local community be updated with the workings of the community fund in six-month reports.	Yes	The NG+ scheme's terms of reference could include reporting to local parish councils on a six-monthly basis and form part of management board responsibilities.
GNR2_OFF_138	One respondent expressed picnic/play areas are not so urgent as they can be accessed anywhere else.	No	The Applicant makes note of this comment, however with the offering of 27 new permissive rights of way, it is appropriate to offer places to rest enroute.
GNR2_OFF_106	One respondent expressed if panels are removed from near Ossington Airfield, the site could host information boards on WW2 efforts and the history of the airfield as a community benefit.	Yes	There are walk boards proposed on the Development as per the outline Recreational Routes Management Plan Technical Appendix 18.1 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.18.1]**

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	Some boards could also be used to promote the work of GNR itself as the site overlooks other development fields.		Chapter 18 of the ES **[EN010162/APP/6.2.18]**, Recreation. Cultural Heritage is discussed in Chapter 11 **[EN010162/APP/6.2.11]** and opportunities to highlight the historical background of the area and the workings of the solar farm will be central in the detailed design of the walk boards.
GNR2_EF_014, GNR2_FF_0008, GNR2_FF_0018, GNR2_FF_0024, GNR2_OFF_0171, GNR2_OFF_154, GNR2_OFF_081, GNR2_OFF_126	Respondents suggest the development of more PRoWs. Some respondents specified bridleways near Sutton on Trent.	Yes	There are 21 new Permissive Walkways, and 6 new Permissive bridleways proposed across the Development, to be found in Technical Appendix 018.1 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.18.1]** Chapter 18 of the ES **[EN010162/APP/6.2.18]**, Recreation. Permissive bridleways 2 and 2 are proposed for Sutton-on-Trent.
GNR2_EF_040, GNR2_OFF_154. GNR2_OFF_081, GNR2_OFF_083	Respondents suggest safe off-road multi-use pathways as a community benefit.	Yes	There are 21 new Permissive Walkways, and 6 new Permissive bridleways proposed across the Development to be found in

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			Technical Appendix 018.1 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.18.1]** Chapter 18 of the ES **[EN010162/APP/6.2.18]**.
GNR2_EF_031, GNR2_EF_036	Respondents suggest a circular route with access from the western side of the drain south of the proposed split in the access paths (Moorhouse Dyke).	Yes	Public Rights of Way Plan and the Recreation Plan, as set out in Technical Appendix A18.1 Outline RRMP **[EN010162/APP/6.4.18.1]**, as part of the DCO application show how the Applicant has designed this circulate route south of the proposed split in the access paths at Moorhouse Beck.
GNR2_FF_0017, GNR2_OFF_069	Respondents requested the Development consider enhancing current cycle route on the side of the A1. One respondent expressed enhancement of current cycle route could include barriers against A1 or even a relocation away from the main road.	No	Due to minimal demand for cycle routes in consultation response, these are no longer proposed.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	One respondent expressed project should work with Highways England to make this route safer.		
GNR2_OFF_107, GNR2_OFF_118	One respondent suggested a cycle path from Eakring to Bilsthorpe.	No	Due to minimal demand for cycle routes in consultation response, these are no longer proposed.
GNR2_FF_0038	One respondent noted it is not clear if routes proposed will be pedestrian or cyclists.	Yes	Due to minimal demand for cycle routes in consultation response, these are pedestrian only.
GNR2_OFF_091	One respondent expressed support for bike hire centres on the proposed circular long-distance path.	No	Due to minimal demand for cycle routes in consultation response, these are no longer proposed.
GNR2_EF_053	One respondent suggested enhancing PRoWs on the Muskham Vale Loops.	Yes	Public Rights of Way Plan **[EN010162/APP/2.4]** and the Recreation Chapter 18 in the ES **[EN010162/APP/6.2.18]** show how the Applicant has designed extra permissive routes around North and South Muskham.
GNR2_PDFF_0003	One respondent requested enhancements to the PRoW facilities in North Muskham and Bathley.	Yes	Public Rights of Way Plan **[EN010162/APP/2.4]** and the ES Recreation Chapter 18 **[EN010162/APP/6.2.18]** as part of the DCO application show how

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			the Applicant has designed extra permissive routes around North Muskham and Bathley.
GNR2_EF_031	One respondent request access into the Kelham Hills fields via a permissive bridleway stay open and maintained.	Yes	This permissive bridleway at Kelham Hills will remain open and maintained as requested.
GNR2_FF_0022	One respondent suggested improvements be made to the footpath along the B6325 linking North Muskham to South Muskham as it currently is unfit for wheelchairs pushchairs etc.	Yes	This may be possible as part of NG+ proposals but improving this existing route is not part of the Development proposal.
GNR2_FF_0032	One respondent believe project is a good opportunity to construct a path from the old blacksmiths shop to Caunton Barking Road as it is currently unusable because of a sinkhole.	Yes	This may be possible as part of NG+ proposals but improving this existing route is not part of the Development proposal.
GNR2_EF_031	One respondent suggested the cycle route on the Access Plan that runs westwards towards the BESS along the southern edge of Kelham woods to serve as a bridleway as well.	No	Due to minimal demand for cycle routes in consultation response, these are no longer proposed.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_FF_0032	One respondent expressed that a path down to Caunton/Eakring road would make access to church lane much safer.	Yes	This has not been considered for the Development but could potentially form part of NG+ initiatives.
GNR2_OFF_020	One respondent expressed support for new bridleways and Yes footpaths as proposed by North Kesteven Parish Council.	Yes	There are 21 new Permissive Walkways, and 6 new Permissive bridleways proposed across the Development, to be found in Technical Appendix 018.1 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.18.1]** Chapter 18 of the ES **[EN010162/APP/6.2.18]**, Recreation.
GNR2_FF_0004	One respondent suggested widening the cycling path from Cromwell to Muskham.	Yes	Although there is no longer a cycle route at this location, the permissive footpath remains.
GNR2_OFF_105	One respondent expressed concern that footpaths would be much thinner than the 10m in project material, with the space between it and hedgerows taken into account.	Yes	The hedgerow and grassland strips will be included within the 10m width.
GNR2_OFF_105	One respondent requested a footpath management strategy for	Yes	The (oRRMP) outline Recreational Routes Management Plan

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	the 40-year lifetime of the Development.		**[EN010162/APP/6.4.18.1]** is found in Technical Appendix 018.1 Ch 18 of the ES **[EN010162/APP/6.2.18]**, Recreation.
GNR2_FF_0041, GNR2_FF_0042	Respondents requested funding for Moorhouse chapel.	Yes	NG+ serviced electrical works at Moorhouse Chapel in spring 2025 and further engagement will be ongoing.
GNR2_FF_0032	One respondent expressed that NG+ funding should be made available to a local volunteer group that helps clean and maintain Caunton.	Yes	NG+ is designed provide benefits to host communities and would welcome an application on this basis for volunteers at Caunton.
GNR2_FF_0032	One respondent expressed that Caunton would benefit from a village room, as the current one not usable.	Yes	NG+ is designed provide benefits to host communities and would welcome an application on this basis for a village room at Caunton.
GNR2_FF_0015	One respondent suggested funding for maintenance of Maplebeck Village Church.	Yes	NG+ is designed provide benefits to host communities and would welcome an application for maintenance of Maplebeck Village Church having already funded a shed to house flood

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			signage, barriers, and boiler fuel for the village Hall.
GNR2_L_011	One respondent suggested a specific human health and mental wellbeing impact assessment on the residents of Hagg Lane.	Yes	Assessment of human health impacts is made across the Order Limits in Chapter 16.4 of the ES **[EN010162/APP/6.2.16]**, Miscellaneous issues. No effects are predicted on the health of residents.
GNR2_FF_0032	One respondent requested a new road from top of Hollows across the left-hand field onto Private Drive.	Yes	No new roads are proposed, other than internal haul roads and access tracks for substations, details of which can be found in Chapter 14 of the ES **[EN010162/APP/6.2.14]**, traffic and transport.
GNR2_FF_0038	One respondent suggested re-opening Southwell swimming pool.	Yes	NG+ would welcome such grant applications for sporting measures.
GNR2_OFF_048	One respondent expressed that flood prevention measures should be considered for Moorhouse as well as repairing damage to the bridge downstream, by the phone box, from Moorhouse Beck.	Yes	NG+ serviced electrical works at Moorhouse Chapel in spring 2025 and further engagement will be ongoing on flood alleviation measures.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_OFF_129	One respondent suggested a new library for Southwell.	Yes	NG+ would welcome such grant applications for educational support.
Topic Area: Cultural Heritage			
GNR2S_PDF_0001, GNR2_EF_016, GNR2_L_003, GNR2_L_005, GNR2_L_007, GNR2_L_008, GNR2_L_017, GNR2_L_020, GNR2_PDFF_0001, GNR2_EF_023, GNR2_EF_027, GNR2_EF_040, GNR2_FF_0026, GNR2_FF_0028, GNR2_EF_042, GNR2_OFF_048, GNR2_OFF_053, GNR2_OFF_014, GNR2_EF_051, GNR2_OFF_059, GNR2_OFF_084, GNR2_OFF_088, GNR2_OFF_089, GNR2_OFF_089, GNR2_OFF_094, GNR2_OFF_104, GNR2_OFF_128, GNR2_OFF_137	Respondents expressed concern about the Development's impact on the cultural and heritage legacy of the area, including the potential impact on listed and historical buildings, ancient woodland, conservation areas, and archaeological sites. One respondent expressed concern that the insertion of thousands of anchor points into the ground will be the source of damage.	No	Effects on the historic environment are submitted with the DCO. The ES describes the design changes made to mitigate cultural heritage impacts where these have been identified. An archaeological mitigation strategy (TA11.8 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.11.8])** will set out how post-consent works will be undertaken to mitigate effects which have not otherwise been designed out.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_FF_0026	Respondent expressed concern that it's not clear who will be responsible for overseeing archaeological damage mitigation.	No	An archaeological Mitigation Strategy (TA11.8 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.11.8])** is submitted with the Application. The strategy details the responsibilities for oversight of archaeological works.
GNR2_L_008	Respondent express some form of land access should be available for possible archaeological excavations in the future after construction is completed.	No	Archaeological works will be carried out prior to construction
GNR2_L_002	Respondent expressed that they commissioned an independent heritage impact assessment which was they feel should have been used for methodology of heritage impact.	No	Heritage assessment methodology was agreed following the issue of a Scoping Opinion and by agreement with the technical stakeholders (see Chapter 11: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology, of the ES **[EN010162/APP/6.2.11]** section 11.2).
GNR2_EF_016, GNR2_EF_027, GNR2_EF_028, GNR2_EF_029, GNR2_EF_032, GNR2_L_006, GNR2_EF_025, GNR2_EF_043,	Respondents expressed concern for Ossington aerodrome historical legacy being impacted.	No	The Applicant acknowledges Ossington Airfield to have historical significance (see Archaeological Desk-Based

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_EF_045, GNR2_EF_054, GNR2_OFF_077, GNR2_OFF_084, GNR2_OFF_106	Some respondents specified the WW2 heritage, the memorial, underground bunker.		Assessment TA11.1 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.11.1]**).
GNR2_FF_0028, GNR2_EF_042, GNR2_OFF_033, GNR2_OFF_037, GNR2_EF_051, GNR2_OFF_072	Respondent expressed particular concern about Eakring Conservation area.	No	Eakring Conservation Area is discussed in section 11.8.2.2 of Chapter 11, Cultural Heritage and Archaeology **[ENO010162/APP/6.2.11]**. The development is not assessed to result in harm to the heritage significance of the Conservation Area.
GNR2_FF_0026, GNR2_OFF_025, GNR2_FF_0047, GNR2_OFF_089, GNR2_FF_0047	Respondents expressed concern for archaeological sites that could be damaged in specifically DB061, DB062, DB057 and DB058.	Yes	DB058, DB061 and DB062 are no longer within order limits. DB057 is now an ecological mitigation area. No impact on the archaeological remains is expected.
GNR2_L_002, GNR2_L_017, GNR2_L_020	Respondent expressed concern that non-designated heritage assets were excluded from the assessment of heritage impacts contrary to NPS EN-1 and EN-3. One respondent specified Caunton	No	There are no built heritage non-designated heritage assets within the Order Limits. Selected unregistered parks and gardens have been included within the settings assessment (see TA11.2 Settings Baseline Assessment

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	Lodge Farm. One respondent expressed Mainwood Farm.		**[EN010162/APP/6.4.11.2]** and Chapter 11 Cultural Heritage and Archaeology section 11.8.2.2 **[EN010162/APP/6.2.11]**). Direct effects to non-designated archaeological assets are included within the assessment (Section 11.8.1). Concern noted regarding Caunton Lodge Farm and Mainwood Farm.
GNR2_FF_0040, GNR2_L_013, GNR2_OFF_078	Respondents expressed that the field owned by the Taylor Family houses a stone age settlement.	Yes	Fields north and west of Cromwell have been removed from the Order Limits.
GNR2_L_003, GNR2_OFF_048, GNR2_OFF_053, GNR2_FF_0041,	Respondents expressed concern for Grade II listed Moorhouse Chapel, Aggrie House, North Park Farmhouse, Church Farmhouse.	Yes	All of these assets are assessed in TA11.2 Setting Assessment Baseline **[EN010162/APP/6.4.11.2]** and where appropriate in section 11.8.2.2 of Chapter 11 Cultural Heritage and Archaeology **[EN010162/APP/6.2.11]**.
GNR2_L_008	Respondent expressed that area around Knapthorpe village is ancient woodland which is	No	Ancient Woodland is not a heritage designation and is therefore not assessed in Chapter 11 Cultural Heritage and

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	designated by the Woodland Trust as a unique site.		Archaeology **[EN010162/APP/6.2.11]**.
GNR2_L_002	Respondent expressed concern for impacts on Caunton Lodge Farm, a non-designated heritage asset	No	Concern regarding Caunton Lodge Farm is noted. The assessment undertaken for the ES has been informed by NSDC Guidance on Non-Designated Heritage Assets (noting that a Local List of non-designated heritage assets has yet to be adopted by NSDC)
GNR2_OFF_053	Respondent expressed particular concern about the ancient medieval farming fields of Laxton and Moorhouse.	No	The Development does not extend into the medieval field system defined by Laxton Conservation Area (see Works Areas ES Figure 5.1 **[EN010162/APP/6.3.5.1]**). Laxton Conservation Area and the medieval fields within it are considered in TA11.2 Settings Assessment Baseline **[EN010162/APP/6.4.11.2]**.
GNR2_EF_023	Respondents expressed concern about heritage assets in the Vale of Belvoir.	No	The study area for the heritage assessment is set out in section 11.4 of Chapter 11 Cultural

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			Heritage and Archaeology **[EN010162/APP/6.2.11]**. The study area does not extend to the vale of Belvoir.
Topic Area: Decommissioning and Construction			
GNR2_EF_040, GNR2_L_008, GNR2_L_013, GNR2_L_014, GNR2_L_015, GNR2_L_016, GNR2_L_018, GNR2_L_019, GNR2_FF_0025, GNR2_FF_0026, GNR2_FF_0027, GNR2_FF_0040, GNR2_OFF_028, GNR2_OFF_030, GNR2_OFF_063, GNR2_OFF_064, GNR2_OFF_078, GNR2_OFF_101, GNR2_OFF_029, GNR2_OFF_031, GNR2_OFF_036, GNR2_OFF_041, GNR2_OFF_043, GNR2_OFF_061, GNR2_OFF_065, GNR2_OFF_066,	Respondents expressed concern about the decommissioning of the site and return of land use to agricultural purposes.	Yes	The Development Consent Order will last for the operational phase and decommissioning phase, but not beyond. The actions to be taken at decommissioning will be set out in a Decommissioning and Restoration Plan (DRP) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.6]** to be agreed through consultation shortly before decommissioning itself occurs. An outline DRP is provided with the ES as Technical Appendix A5.6. This is considered appropriate, as it allows decommissioning to respond to the needs and wishes applicable at that time.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_OFF_083, GNR2_OFF_003, GNR2_OFF_096, GNR2_EF_040, GNR2_EF_044, GNR2_EF_052, GNR2_OFF_096, GNR2_OFF_101, GNR2_EF_060			
GNR2_EF_040, GNR2_L_014, GNR2_L_015, GNR2_L_018, GNR2_L_019, GNR2_OFF_028, GNR2_OFF_101, GNR2_OFF_029, GNR2_OFF_031, GNR2_OFF_036, GNR2_OFF_041, GNR2_OFF_043, GNR2_OFF_061, GNR2_OFF_065, GNR2_OFF_066, GNR2_OFF_083, GNR2_OFF_003, GNR2_OFF_096, GNR2_EF_044, GNR2_EF_052	Respondents suggest retaining established infrastructure such as orchards, hedgerows, grasslands during and after the decommissioning phase.	Yes	The actions to be taken at decommissioning will be set out in a Decommissioning and Restoration Plan (DRP) to be agreed through consultation shortly before decommissioning itself occurs. An outline DRP is provided with the ES as Technical Appendix A5.6 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.6]**. This is considered appropriate, as it allows decommissioning to respond to the needs and wishes applicable at that time.
GNR2_EF_032, GNR2_EF_044, GNR2_L_008, GNR2_L_011, GNR2_FF_0021, GNR2_OFF_049,	Respondents expressed concern about the solar panels being discarded or landfilled at the end of	Yes	Solar panel recycling exists already in the UK, despite the solar PV industry only having

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_OFF_063, GNR2_FF_0006, GNR2_OFF_067, GNR2_OFF_094, GNR2_OFF_126	their life / stress the need to safely recycle panels. One respondent expressed that there is only one company in the UK that is qualified to recycle panels. One respondent expressed panels will release hydrochloric acid if not disposed of properly which will degrade soil and water.		been substantially active in the UK for around 15 years. By the time of decommissioning of the Development, in c. 2070, it is likely that solar PV recycling will be a well-developed and active industry. It is expected that the metals comprising the cabling, solar PV mounting pole structures, inverters/transformers and fencing will be recycled as it is now. There are currently at least three waste handlers capable of recycling solar PV: • Recycle Solar: Located in Scunthorpe, Recycle Solar is one of the few facilities in the UK that operates on an industrial scale. • Solar Recycling Solutions (SRS): Based in Dartford, SRS offers a comprehensive approach to solar panel recycling. They utilize

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			advanced scanning technology to identify and separate different materials. • Waste Experts: Situated in Huddersfield. There is no evidence of solar panels leaking hydrochloric acid if not disposed of properly, cells are a solid matter encased in glass are made of silicon. The silicon would need to be broken down and liquified to release hydrochloric acid.
GNR2_OFF_015, GNR2_OFF_161	Respondents expressed decommissioning plans in 40 years are unclear.	Yes	The actions to be taken at decommissioning will be set out in a Decommissioning and Restoration Plan (DRP) to be agreed through consultation shortly before decommissioning itself occurs. An outline DRP is provided with the ES as Technical Appendix A5.6 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.6]**. This is considered appropriate, as it

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			allows decommissioning to respond to the needs and wishes applicable at that time.
GNR2_L_016	Respondent suggested a substantial bond or by way of insurance to cover the cost of decommissioning.	Yes	The Development Consent Order will last for the operational phase and decommissioning phase, but not beyond. The actions to be taken at decommissioning will be set out in a Decommissioning and Restoration Plan (DRP) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.6]** to be agreed through consultation shortly before decommissioning itself occurs. An outline DRP is provided with the ES as Technical Appendix A5.6. This is considered appropriate, as it allows decommissioning to respond to the needs and wishes applicable at that time. Landowners have access to the decommissioning bond in the unlikely event that there should there not be an operator of the

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			Development in place at some stage in the future.
GNR2_FF_0021	Respondent expressed that if developer is not operating in the next 25 - 30 years no one will claim responsibility for decommissioning activity.	Yes	The Development Consent Order will last for the operational phase and decommissioning phase, but not beyond. The actions to be taken at decommissioning will be set out in a Decommissioning and Restoration Plan (DRP) to be agreed through consultation shortly before decommissioning itself occurs. An outline DRP is provided with the ES as Technical Appendix A5.6 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.6]**. This is considered appropriate, as it allows decommissioning to respond to the needs and wishes applicable at that time. Landowners have access to the decommissioning bond in the unlikely event that there should there not be an operator of the Development in place at some stage in the future.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_L_014, GNR2_L_015, GNR2_L_018, GNR2_L_019, GNR2_OFF_028, GNR2_OFF_101, GNR2_OFF_029, GNR2_OFF_031, GNR2_OFF_036, GNR2_OFF_041, GNR2_OFF_043, GNR2_OFF_061, GNR2_OFF_065, GNR2_OFF_066, GNR2_OFF_083, GNR2_OFF_003, GNR2_OFF_096, GNR2_EF_040, GNR2_EF_044, GNR2_EF_052	Respondents expressed that a fly-tipping plan be created to counter potential health effects from contaminated materials.	Yes	Commentary on the potential for the Development to lead to an increase in fly tipping is provided in ES Chapter 16, Miscellaneous Issues, section 16.7, Waste **[EN010162/APP/6.2.16]**.
GNR2_EF_006, GNR2_L_013, GNR2_OFF_003, GNR2_OFF_016, GNR2_OFF_020, GNR2_OFF_143, GNR2_OFF_144	Respondents expressed concern for the disturbance general construction activity may cause.	Yes	Construction effects are assessed in the ES Chapter 12, Noise and Vibration, with respect to potential disturbance, **[EN010162/APP/6.2.12]**, Chapter 14, Traffic and Transport **[EN010162/APP/6.2.14]** (including Technical Appendix A5.2, Construction Traffic

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			Management Plan **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.2]**), and Chapter 18, Recreation **[EN010162/APP/6.2.18]**.
GNR2_EF_006	One respondent expressed concern for construction attracting criminality in the area.	Yes	The construction site will be secured with fencing and normal construction site security measures.
GNR2_EF_013	One respondent expressed concern for the use of unsafe materials.	Yes	Materials with the potential to cause contamination will be managed in accordance with the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP), provided in ES Technical Appendix A5.3 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.3]**.
GNR2_FF_0006	One respondent supports the use of UK manufactured products.	Yes	The Developer also supports the use of UK manufactured products and has begun procurement conversations with UK manufacturers, but not all components are manufactured in the UK. Decisions on procurement would be taken post consent.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_PDFF_0003	One respondent requested community be given oversight role post-construction.	Yes	The Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan (OEMP) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.5]** sets out that the operator will provide a point of contact for the public during the operational phase, so that observations can be reported and acted on.
GNR2_OFF_012	One respondent suggested they did not know how long construction would take and what funding is needed to complete it.	Yes	Construction is anticipated to take two years, from late 2027 to late 2029. Funding will be provided privately - the Applicant will secure this from their own funds and, if needed, private investment. No public money is required for the construction. The Applicant's Funding Statement can be viewed at **[EN010162/APP/4.2]**
Topic Area: Ecology and Biodiversity			
GNR2_PDF_0001, GNR2_EF_002, GNR2_EF_009, GNR2_EF_013, GNR2_EF_016, GNR2_L_003, GNR2_L_005, GNR2_L_006, GNR2_L_007, GNR2_L_008,	Respondents expressed concern about damage to the local ecology, ecosystems, and biodiversity, from the construction phrase to throughout the Development.	Yes	Potential ecological effects arising during construction are assessed in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**. The

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_L_011, GNR2_L_012, GNR2_L_013, GNR2_L_014, GNR2_L_015, GNR2_L_016, GNR2_L_017, GNR2_L_018, GNR2_L_019, GNR2_L_020, GNR2_PDFF_0001, GNR2_EF_026, GNR2_EF_027, GNR2_EF_032, GNR2_EF_025, GNR2_EF_035, GNR2_EF_040, GNR2_FF_0037, GNR2_FF_0040, GNR2_EF_041, GNR2_EF_042, GNR2_EF_045, GNR2_EF_046, GNR2_EF_047, GNR2_EF_044, GNR2_EF_052, GNR2_OFF_001, GNR2_OFF_002, GNR2_OFF_003, GNR2_OFF_004, GNR2_OFF_005, GNR2_OFF_007, GNR2_OFF_017, GNR2_OFF_022, GNR2_OFF_024, GNR2_OFF_028, GNR2_OFF_029, GNR2_OFF_033,			oCEMP (Technical Appendix A5.3 of the ES **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.3]**) provides details of mitigation to safeguard ecological features during construction. The Solar and Biodiversity Park has partnered with Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust, the RSPB, Sherwood Forest Trust, and the Trent Rivers Trust to assist with the development of the oLEMP (Technical Appendix A5.1 of the ES **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]**) It creates a Biodiversity Net Gain of 60% for habitat areas, 26% for hedgerows and 11% for watercourses, with the Development creating 64,500 new trees, 50km of new hedgerow and over 1,000 acres of ecological enhancement area. 27 new permissive paths and bridleways will allow the public to

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_OFF_031, GNR2_OFF_036, GNR2_OFF_043, GNR2_OFF_061, GNR2_OFF_047, GNR2_OFF_055, GNR2_OFF_058, GNR2_OFF_059, GNR2_OFF_060, GNR2_OFF_064, GNR2_OFF_065, GNR2_OFF_066, GNR2_OFF_083, GNR2_OFF_067, GNR2_OFF_078, GNR2_OFF_081, GNR2_OFF_096, GNR2_OFF_101, GNR2_OFF_089, GNR2_OFF_126, GNR2_OFF_128, GNR2_OFF_132, GNR2_OFF_143, GNR2_OFF_144			enjoy some of these areas and the benefits to wildlife and biodiversity they will bring.
GNR2_OFF_0172, GNR2_OFF_138, GNR2_OFF_139	Respondent praised the Development's partnerships with	No	The Applicant welcomes this comment. The partnerships have

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	RSPB, NWT, Trent Rivers Trust, and Sherwood Forest Trust.		positively influenced the oLEMP (Technical Appendix A5.1 of the ES **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1])** and will create long-term benefits for local biodiversity projects.
GNR2_L_003	Respondent expressed that a number of sites affected are sites of Significant Scientific Interest and have biological SINC designations.	No	Statutory and non-statutory designated sites are identified in Technical Appendix A8.2: Ecology and Biodiversity Designated Sites Baseline of the ES **[EN010162/APP/6.4.8.2]**. Potential effects to these sites are assessed in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**.
GNR2_L_001, GNR2_L_002, GNR2_L_003, GNR2_L_004, GNR2_L_006, GNR2_L_007, GNR2_L_008, GNR2_L_011, GNR2_L_012, GNR2_L_013, GNR2_L_014, GNR2_L_015, GNR2_L_017, GNR2_L_018, GNR2_L_019, GNR2_L_020, GNR2_L_023, GNR2_FF_0014, GNR2_FF_0028, GNR2_FF_0033,	Respondents believe that the Development will have adverse impacts on the activities of various wildlife species and their habitats. Some respondents specified the following species: lapwing, yellow hammer, little egret, badgers, deer Great Crested Newts, tawny owls, little owls, tree sparrows, skylark,	Yes	A range of baseline studies has been undertaken to establish the status and distribution of these and other ecological features. The potential effects to them are assessed in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**. The Applicant has partnered with

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_EF_026, GNR2_EF_032, GNR2_EF_025, GNR2_FF_0036, GNR2_FF_0039, GNR2_FF_0040, GNR2_EF_042, GNR2_PDF_0001, GNR2_EF_010, GNR2_EF_006, GNR2_EF_007, GNR2_EF_009, GNR2_EF_021, GNR2_L_005, GNR2_FF_0021, ,GNR2_FF_0041, GNR2_FF_0042, GNR2_EF_045, GNR2_EF_049, GNR2_OFF_001, GNR2_OFF_006, GNR2_OFF_016, GNR2_OFF_028, GNR2_OFF_033, GNR2_OFF_035, GNR2_OFF_037, GNR2_EF_051, GNR2_OFF_040, GNR2_OFF_045, GNR2_OFF_047, GNR2_OFF_151, GNR2_OFF_055, GNR2_OFF_060, GNR2_OFF_062, GNR2_OFF_067, GNR2_OFF_070,	starlings, linnets fieldfares, barn owls, Red Kite, Kestrels, Buzzards, brown hare, water voles, otters, eels trout in the Beck, wild fowl, toads, frogs, meadow pipit, corn bunting, shrews, butterflies, partridges. One respondent expressed concern that birds will mistake panels for drinking water.		Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust, the Trent Rivers Trust and RSPB who will assist the Applicant in increasing benefits of the scheme for wildlife. The GNR Solar and Biodiversity Park proposes a Biodiversity Net Gain of 60% for habitat areas, 26% for hedgerows and 11% for watercourses, with the Development creating 64,500 new trees, 50km of new hedgerow and over 1,000 acres of ecological enhancement area. There is no evidence that birds mistake solar farms for drinking water and the RSPB as partners are great proponents of the benefits of solar farms for ground-nesting birds.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_OFF_071, GNR2_OFF_072, GNR2_OFF_073, GNR2_OFF_077, GNR2_OFF_078, GNR2_OFF_082, GNR2_OFF_101, GNR2_OFF_029, GNR2_OFF_031, GNR2_OFF_036, GNR2_OFF_041, GNR2_OFF_043, GNR2_OFF_061, GNR2_OFF_065, GNR2_OFF_066, GNR2_OFF_083, GNR2_OFF_003, GNR2_OFF_096, GNR2_EF_040, GNR2_EF_044, GNR2_EF_052, GNR2_OFF_088, GNR2_OFF_089, GNR2_OFF_104, GNR2_OFF_105, GNR2_OFF_106, GNR2_OFF_118,			

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_OFF_127, GNR2_OFF_132, GNR2_OFF_137, GNR2_OFF_142, GNR2_OFF_143, GNR2_OFF_144, GNR2_OFF_149, GNR2_FF_0047			
GNR2_L_014, GNR2_L_015, GNR2_L_018, GNR2_L_019, GNR2_OFF_028, GNR2_OFF_101, GNR2_OFF_029, GNR2_OFF_031, GNR2_OFF_036, GNR2_OFF_041, GNR2_OFF_043, GNR2_OFF_061, GNR2_OFF_065, GNR2_OFF_066, GNR2_OFF_083, GNR2_OFF_003, GNR2_OFF_096, GNR2_EF_040, GNR2_EF_044, GNR2_EF_052	Respondents expressed particular concern for otter Lutra Lutra and Water Vole Arvicola Amphibious as they are protected under the Countryside Act 1981 and have European protection.	No	Potential ecological effects to otter and water vole are fully assessed in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**.
GNR2_L_014, GNR2_L_015, GNR2_L_018, GNR2_L_019,	Respondents expressed that wildlife studies and surveys were	Yes	A range of baseline studies has been undertaken to establish the

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_OFF_028, GNR2_OFF_101, GNR2_EF_040, GNR2_EF_044, GNR2_EF_052, GNR2_OFF_003, GNR2_OFF_096, GNR2_OFF_029, GNR2_OFF_031, GNR2_OFF_036, GNR2_OFF_041, GNR2_OFF_043, GNR2_OFF_061, GNR2_OFF_065, GNR2_OFF_066, GNR2_OFF_083, GNR2_OFF_105	inadequate. One respondent expressed concern that core activity areas and home ranges have not been calculated for large mammals.		status and distribution ecological features. The surveys have followed good practice guidelines, and any limitations have been reported. The home ranges of species are considered in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**.
GNR2_L_003, GNR2_L_006, GNR2_L_008, GNR2_L_011, GNR2_EF_040, GNR2_FF_0028, GNR2_FF_0042, GNR2_OFF_020, GNR2_OFF_037, GNR2_OFF_167, GNR2_OFF_151, GNR2_OFF_067, GNR2_OFF_071, GNR2_OFF_089, GNR2_OFF_104, GNR2_OFF_105	Respondents expressed concern about the impact of fencing on local wildlife / movement of species across parcels of land being hindered. One respondent specified west of Sutton on Trent.	No	The potential effects of fencing are assessed in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8].** The fencing design will include mammal passes to allow the free movement of species of conservation concern.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_L_001, GNR2_L_004, GNR2_OFF_016, GNR2_OFF_020	Some respondents express concern about spread of TB and Foot and Mouth disease among wildlife. Some respondents expressed this would make sheep grazing futile.	No	Foot and mouth disease is not currently present in the UK. The populations and landscape-scale movements of deer and badger, two of the most important wildlife reservoirs of bovine TB, are not expected to change as a result of the Development. Sheep grazing will be undertaken to high welfare standards and in line with prevailing biosecurity good practice.
GNR2_L_002, GNR2_L_011	Respondents expressed there has not been adequate consultation regarding the bat population.	No	Technical Appendix A8.6 Bats Baseline **[EN010162/APP/6.4.8.6]** reported the methods and results of a range of bat surveys, including bespoke surveys for barbastelle bats.
GNR2_OFF_128	Respondent noted there are currently no proposed compensation measures for habitat loss.	No	ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]** and the oLEMP (Technical Appendix A5.1: Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]) provide details of mitigation, compensation, and enhancement for habitats.
GNR2_OFF_050	Respondent suggested that strong fencing will be needed in some areas to deter predator species such as badgers and foxes.	No	The specification of the fencing (ES Chapter 5, Development Design **[EN010162/APP/6.2.5]**) will be sufficient to exclude such species.
GNR2_L_011	Respondent expressed particular concern for nocturnal species who may see sleep patterns disrupted.	No	Potential effects to nocturnal species are assessed in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**. Night-time lighting will be limited and otherwise designed sensitively with regard to wildlife. The oCEMP (Technical Appendix A5.3: Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.3]**) includes details about lighting.
GNR2_OFF_025	Respondent expressed there is no accountability measures on behalf	No	The measures in the oCEMP Technical Appendix A5.3: Outline Construction Environmental

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	of EG for reducing seasonal habitat disturbance.		Management Plan **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.3]** and oLEMP Technical Appendix A5.1: Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]** will be secured by a Requirement of the DCO thereby ensuring the management of habitat disturbance.
GNR2_L_007	Respondent expressed that lapwing nesting sites are in fact not situated on areas covered by panels.	No	Technical Appendix A8.4: Breeding Birds Baseline **[EN010162/APP/6.4.8.4]**) describes a standardised, repeatable method to determine the breeding status and location of birds. The locally observed activity of birds does not necessarily reflect the breeding status of the species.
GNR2_OFF_0172	Respondent express concern for the lack of wildlife projects proposed in each parish.	No	Technical Appendix A5.1: Outline Landscape and Ecological management Plan (oLEMP) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]** includes

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			biodiversity enhancements throughout the Order Limits.
GNR2_OFF_105	Respondent expressed they would like to see details on biodiversity proposals.	No	ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]** and Technical Appendix A5.1: Outline Landscape and Ecological management Plan (oLEMP) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]** provide details of biodiversity proposals.
GNR2_OFF_107	Respondent expressed they would like to see land that is unsuitable (awkward shape) for solar to be maintained for biodiversity.	Yes	This principle has been adopted throughout the landscape design process.
GNR2_OFF_118	Respondent expressed that including scrub as a screening measure would be a valuable resource for Turtle Dove nest sites - Eakring has a small population of these endangered birds.	No	Scrub (included as key part of 'Ecotones') is proposed in the Technical Appendix A5.1: Outline Landscape and Ecological management Plan (oLEMP) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]**.
GNR2_OFF_105	Respondent questioned if wildlife surveys will be carried out regularly throughout the 40-year lifetime of the Development.	No	Technical Appendix A5.1: Outline Landscape and Ecological management Plan (oLEMP) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]** includes details of the monitoring that will

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			be undertaken throughout the lifetime of the Development.
GNR2_OFF_105	Respondent questioned if the grazing of sheep will be on grassland that is of local species or if a variety of species will be used for this.	No	The grassland species mix will vary across the solar PV areas to reflect localised conditions. The grassland will be 'modified grassland'.
GNR2_EF_002, GNR2_EF_040, GNR2_L_014, GNR2_L_015, GNR2_L_016, GNR2_L_018, GNR2_L_019, GNR2_OFF_004, GNR2_OFF_028, GNR2_OFF_083, GNR2_OFF_101, GNR2_OFF_029, GNR2_OFF_031, GNR2_OFF_036, GNR2_OFF_041, GNR2_OFF_043, GNR2_OFF_061, GNR2_OFF_065, GNR2_OFF_066, GNR2_OFF_003, GNR2_OFF_096, GNR2_EF_040,	Respondents expressed concern about the potential destruction of local trees and hedgerows. One respondent specified ancient trees and hedgerows.	No	Potential effects to trees, woodland and hedgerow are assessed in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**. Technical Appendix A8.12: Arboricultural Impact Assessment **[EN010162/APP/6.4.8.12]**) includes consideration of Ancient and Veteran trees. Mitigation is proposed to avoid and reduce potential adverse effects to retained trees.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_EF_044, GNR2_EF_052, GNR2_OFF_088, GNR2_OFF_132			
GNR2_FF_0038, GNR2_EF_044, GNR2_L_014, GNR2_L_015, GNR2_L_018, GNR2_L_019, GNR2_OFF_016, GNR2_OFF_028, GNR2_OFF_043, GNR2_OFF_083, GNR2_OFF_101, GNR2_OFF_029, GNR2_OFF_031, GNR2_OFF_036, GNR2_OFF_041, GNR2_OFF_061, GNR2_OFF_065, GNR2_OFF_066, GNR2_OFF_003, GNR2_OFF_096, GNR2_EF_040, GNR2_EF_052	Respondents support the inclusion of more woodland and hedgerow planting.	Yes	Woodland and hedgerow planting are priorities for the Development. 64,500 new trees are now proposed (rather than the earlier proposals of 50,000 trees and 50km of hedgerow. The Applicant has now partnered with the Sherwood Forest Trust on the scheme delivery. Details are provided in Technical Appendix A5.1: Outline Landscape and Ecological management Plan (oLEMP) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]**.
GNR2_L_014, GNR2_L_015, GNR2_L_018, GNR2_L_019, GNR2_OFF_028, GNR2_OFF_101, GNR2_OFF_029,	Respondents expressed that ponds should be indicated as priority habitat in future engagements and treated as such.	No	Ponds are identified as Priority Habitats in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_OFF_031, GNR2_OFF_036, GNR2_OFF_041, GNR2_OFF_043, GNR2_OFF_061, GNR2_OFF_065, GNR2_OFF_066, GNR2_OFF_083, GNR2_OFF_003, GNR2_OFF_096, GNR2_EF_040, GNR2_EF_044, GNR2_EF_052			
GNR2_L_014, GNR2_L_015, GNR2_L_018, GNR2_L_019, GNR2_OFF_028, GNR2_OFF_101, GNR2_OFF_029, GNR2_OFF_031, GNR2_OFF_036, GNR2_OFF_041, GNR2_OFF_043, GNR2_OFF_061, GNR2_OFF_065, GNR2_OFF_066, GNR2_OFF_083, GNR2_OFF_003,	Respondents expressed that any new hedgerows should be disease free, climate resilient and taken from UK stock.	No	Technical Appendix A5.1: Outline Landscape and Ecological management Plan (oLEMP) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]** provides details about the provenance of planting stock.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_OFF_096, GNR2_EF_040, GNR2_EF_044, GNR2_EF_052			
GNR2_FF_0040, GNR2_L_013, GNR2_OFF_078	Respondent expressed plans do not detail where hedgerow planting will take place.	No	The Masterplan (Figure 5.2 of the PEIR **[EN010162/APP/6.3.5.2]**) showed indicative locations of the newly proposed 50km of hedgerows. Figure A5.1 in the oLEMP **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]** shows the revised locations.
GNR2_EF_040	Respondent suggests hay cropping to increase biodiversity.	No	The grassland across the Development will be managed in a variety of ways, including cutting of some a way that is akin to hay cropping.
GNR2_OFF_075	Respondent expresses that potential 'green corridors' and 'proposed woodland' are a drop in the ocean in comparison with the impact on the area.	No	Woodland planting, increased landscape connectivity and improved watercourse health are recognised as some of the most important contributors to ecosystem health. ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]** predicts a range of beneficial effects, including significant ones for habitats.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_OFF_083	Respondent suggested water should be profiled providing different depths, which is attractive to more flora and fauna.	No	The creation of wildlife scrapes (described in Technical Appendix A5.1: Outline Landscape and Ecological management Plan (oLEMP) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]**) includes graded bank profiles.
GNR2_EF_044, GNR2_L_014, GNR2_L_015, GNR2_L_018, GNR2_L_019, GNR2_OFF_028, GNR2_OFF_101, GNR2_OFF_029, GNR2_OFF_031, GNR2_OFF_036, GNR2_OFF_041, GNR2_OFF_043, GNR2_OFF_061, GNR2_OFF_065, GNR2_OFF_066, GNR2_OFF_083, GNR2_OFF_003, GNR2_OFF_096, GNR2_EF_040, GNR2_EF_052	Respondents support the creation and restoration of species rich grassland. Some respondents specified areas in Kelham.	No	A range of grassland types will be enhanced or created throughout the Development and are described in the Technical Appendix A5.1: Outline Landscape and Ecological management Plan (oLEMP) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]**. Areas north of Kelham benefit from riparian corridors and species rich grassland
GNR2_L_014, GNR2_L_015, GNR2_L_018, GNR2_L_019,	Respondents expressed that any enhancement of riparian corridor	No	The riparian corridors will be beneficial for watercourses.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_OFF_028, GNR2_OFF_101, GNR2_OFF_029, GNR2_OFF_031, GNR2_OFF_036, GNR2_OFF_041, GNR2_OFF_043, GNR2_OFF_061, GNR2_OFF_065, GNR2_OFF_066, GNR2_OFF_083, GNR2_OFF_003, GNR2_OFF_096, GNR2_EF_040, GNR2_EF_044, GNR2_EF_052	has to be sensitive to aquatic plants that are sensitive to changes in water quality.		
GNR2_EF_044, GNR2_L_014, GNR2_L_015, GNR2_L_018, GNR2_L_019, GNR2_OFF_028, GNR2_OFF_101, GNR2_OFF_029, GNR2_OFF_031, GNR2_OFF_036, GNR2_OFF_041, GNR2_OFF_043, GNR2_OFF_061, GNR2_OFF_065,	Respondents support the enhancement of riparian corridors.	No	Riparian corridors are a valuable addition to the Development. Further details are provided in the Technical Appendix A5.1: Outline Landscape and Ecological management Plan (oLEMP) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]**.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_OFF_066, GNR2_OFF_083, GNR2_OFF_003, GNR2_OFF_096, GNR2_EF_040, GNR2_EF_052			
GNR2_EF_033, GNR2_L_016, GNR2_OFF_006, GNR2_OFF_130, GNR2_OFF_132, GNR2_OFF_133	Respondents expressed scepticism about the level of biodiversity net gain.	No	A biodiversity net gain (BNG) target was not proposed at PEIR, other than an aspiration to exceed 10%. The BNG calculation (Technical Appendix A8.13: Biodiversity Net Gain [BNG] Assessment **[EN010162/APP/6.4.8.13]**) demonstrates a gain across all three-unit types of 60% for habitats, 26% for hedgerows and 11% for watercourses. The Development also includes a wide range of biodiversity benefits that are not reflected in the BNG calculation.
GNR2_EF_003, GNR2_EF_015, GNR2_EF_044, GNR2_OFF_019, GNR2_OFF_083	Respondents support biodiversity net gain and wildlife management proposals.	No	ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]** and the oLEMP (Technical Appendix A5.1:

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	Some respondents specified support for wildflowers enhancement/management measures. Some respondents specified support for creation/management of green corridors.		Outline Landscape and Ecological management Plan **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]**) provide details of mitigation, compensation, and enhancement for a range of wildlife.
GNR2_EF_003	Respondent suggests their beekeeping services to increase biodiversity net gain.	No	The potential of the Development to support beekeeping has been considered from an early stage and has influenced proposals in the Technical Appendix A5.1: Outline Landscape and Ecological management Plan (oLEMP) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]** and is a focus for the long-term management of some areas.
GNR2_OFF_0167	Respondent expressed scepticism for the planting of trees to increase biodiversity net gain.	No	Tree planting and woodland creation are recognised, well-evidenced ways to increase biodiversity. It is true to state that their effect on project BNG calculations has a drag effect, but

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			the benefits of the 64,500 proposed trees are widespread. The Applicant is separately designating over 1,000 acres to various biodiverse enhancement areas so there are different aspects of the Biodiversity Park.
GNR2_EF_004	Respondent enquired about the maintenance of the ecological enhancement.	No	Technical Appendix A5.1: Outline Landscape and Ecological management Plan (oLEMP) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]** sets out the management prescriptions for all habitats.
GNR2_L_014, GNR2_L_015, GNR2_L_018, GNR2_L_019, GNR2_OFF_028, GNR2_OFF_101, GNR2_OFF_029, GNR2_OFF_031, GNR2_OFF_036, GNR2_OFF_041, GNR2_OFF_043, GNR2_OFF_061, GNR2_OFF_065, GNR2_OFF_066,	Respondent suggested riparian planting should be considered in Kelham.	No	Riparian habitat management has been proposed in a variety of locations and at various scales throughout the Development, including along the River Trent to the north of Kelham.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_OFF_083, GNR2_OFF_003, GNR2_OFF_096, GNR2_EF_040, GNR2_EF_044, GNR2_EF_052			
GNR2_L_014, GNR2_L_015, GNR2_L_018, GNR2_L_019, GNR2_OFF_028, GNR2_OFF_101, GNR2_OFF_029, GNR2_OFF_031, GNR2_OFF_036, GNR2_OFF_041, GNR2_OFF_043, GNR2_OFF_061, GNR2_OFF_065, GNR2_OFF_066, GNR2_OFF_083, GNR2_OFF_003, GNR2_OFF_096, GNR2_EF_040, GNR2_EF_044, GNR2_EF_052	Respondents expressed that new enhanced plans for hedgerow planting should be developed along northern, northwestern, and northeastern edge boundaries.	No	This is established good practice for solar PV developments and has influenced the landscape design. Hedgerows in other locations may also be enhanced and created, and proposals offer 50km of new hedgerow.
GNR2_L_014, GNR2_L_015, GNR2_L_018, GNR2_L_019, GNR2_OFF_028, GNR2_OFF_101, GNR2_OFF_029,	Respondents expressed general support for enhancements of Eakring and Maplebeck Meadows Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), alongside Kersall	No	The habitat management proposed around Maplebeck may benefit these nearby designated sites. Further details are provided in the landscape design oLEMP

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_OFF_031, GNR2_OFF_036, GNR2_OFF_041, GNR2_OFF_043, GNR2_OFF_061, GNR2_OFF_065, GNR2_OFF_066, GNR2_OFF_083, GNR2_OFF_003, GNR2_OFF_096, GNR2_EF_040, GNR2_EF_044, GNR2_EF_052	Grassland LWS, Hunt's Meadow LWS, Eakring Meadows LWS		(Technical Appendix A5.1: Outline Landscape and Ecological management Plan **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]**) and will be developed post-consent.
GNR2_EF_032, GNR2_L_006, GNR2_OFF_077	Respondents expressed concern for Ossington Airfield's decreasing biodiversity.	No	A range of baseline studies has been undertaken to establish the status and distribution of ecological features in this area. The potential effects to them are assessed in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**.
GNR2_FF_0040, GNR2_L_013, GNR2_OFF_078	Respondents expressed concern about the impact on wildlife in ponds at the end of field DB053.	Yes	Technical Appendix A5.3: Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.3]** provides measures to safeguard ponds during construction. No

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			ponds will be lost or adversely affected. DB053 is a field which no longer contains panels.
GNR2_OFF_025, GNR2_FF_0047	Respondents expressed particular concern about species being disturbed on DB062.	Yes	A range of baseline studies has been undertaken to establish the status and distribution of ecological features in this area. The potential effects to them are assessed in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**. DB062 is a field that which longer contains panels.
GNR2_L_017, GNR2_L_020	Respondent expressed that the field north west to DB027 which is currently blank on project maps, is prime for biodiversity enhancement work.	No	This is assumed to be the field between Laxton Wood and Laxton Middle Wood. This field is not in the Order Limits and so has not been included in proposals.
GNR2_L_017, GNR2_L_020	Respondent expressed particular concern about bat population in Mainwood Farm.	No	Extensive bat surveys have been conducted (Technical Appendix A8.6: Bats Baseline **[EN010162/APP/6.4.8.6]**). Potential effects to bats are assessed in ES Chapter 8,

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**.
GNR2_OFF_048, GNR2_OFF_053, GNR2_EF_040,	Respondents expressed concern for species and habitats in Moorhouse in particular.	No	A range of baseline studies has been undertaken to establish the status and distribution of ecological features in this area. The potential effects to them are assessed in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**. Riparian corridors for wildlife have been created including one in Moorhouse.
GNR2_L_003	Respondent expressed particular concern for wildlife species in North Wood and Speakers plantation woodlands.	No	A range of baseline studies has been undertaken to establish the status and distribution of ecological features in this area. Additional, specialist bat surveys of these woodlands has been undertaken. The woodlands will not be directly impacted. The potential effects to these and other off-site woodland are assessed in ES Chapter 8,

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**.
GNR2_OFF_077	Respondent suggested moving panels on the Ossington Airfield perimeter track (west) to lessen impact on biodiversity.	No	A range of baseline studies has been undertaken to establish the status and distribution of ecological features in this area. The potential effects to them are assessed in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**.
GNR2_L_006	Respondent expressed concern that trees and mature hedges along Primrose Farms on the line of the old runway leave insufficient room for solar panels.	No	The layout of solar PV modules accommodates the presence of trees and hedgerows. Technical Appendix A5.3: Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.3]** provides measures to safeguard these habitats.
GNR2_FF_0034	Respondent suggested improving habitat and biodiversity within the Beck would help increase local enjoyment and drive an increase in interest for the watercourse.	No	The Beck is a focus for ecological enhancement and a large area around it has been assigned to habitat management (as set out in the oLEMP in Technical Appendix A5.1: Outline

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			Landscape and Ecological Management Plan **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]**).
GNR2_L_006	Respondent expressed concern about disruption to biodiversity and wildlife near the Laxton Sykes SSSI and baulks, and The Ancient Woodland of North Wood.	No	Potential effects to both Laxton Sykes SSSI and ancient woodlands are assessed in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**.
GNR2_EF_045	Respondent expressed that the area next to Ossington's Church of the Holy Rood contains a significant amount of wildlife and ecology.	No	This general area is outside the Order Limits. The potential effects to nearby designated sites and wildlife are assessed in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**.
GNR2_EF_045	Respondent request that the mature oak tree in site DB041 is retained.	No	This tree and the vast majority of in-field and hedgerow trees will be retained and protected during construction.
GNR2_EF_034	Respondent suggest considering half of field BD031 for biodiversity enhancement.	No	This field is no longer part of the Development.
GNR2_OFF_077	Respondent expressed concern that DB030 hosts Barbastelle bats	No	Barbastelle bats roost in woodland and are strongly

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			associated with this habitat. Extensive bat surveys have been conducted, including in this area (Technical Appendix A8.6: Bats baseline **[EN010162/APP/6.4.8.6]**). Potential effects to bats are assessed in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**.
GNR2_OFF_105	Respondent expressed anecdotally DB032 and DB053 are deer population areas and respondent is concerned these in particular will be disturbed, requesting a wildlife survey on these fields if not conducted already.	Yes	These areas have been included in all necessary baseline ecology studies, located in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**. DB053 is an area that no longer houses solar panels.
GNR2_OFF_105	Respondent expressed particular concern about fields DB029 and DB030, as the length of these fields could significantly affect mammal movement.	No	The fences surrounding solar PV areas contain mammal passes which will allow all mammal species of conservation concern to move freely in these areas in the areas around Norwell Woodhouse and Ossington

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Topic Area: General Comments			
GNR2_PDFF_0001, GNE2_FF_0011, GNR2_FF_0021, GNR2_FF_0027, GNR2_FF_0036, GNR2_FF_0042, GNR2_EF_040, GNR2_FF_0040, GNR2_EF_044, GNR2_L_010, GNR2_L_011, GNR2_L_013, GNR2_L_014, GNR2_L_015, GNR2_L_016, GNR2_L_017, GNR2_L_018, GNR2_L_019, GNR2_L_020, GNR2_L_023, GNR2_EF_045, GNR2_OFF_001, GNR2_OFF_009, GNR2_OFF_010, GNR2_OFF_013, GNR2_OFF_015, GNR2_OFF_017, GNR2_OFF_018, GNR2_OFF_020, GNR2_OFF_022, GNR2_OFF_028, GNR2_OFF_030, GNR2_OFF_033, GNR2_OFF_035, GNR2_EF_051,	Respondents expressed concern about the scale and size of the Development. Comments include references to sizing of site-specific equipment such as substations etc. Comments include references regarding a reduction in the size of the Development.	Yes	The Development is an NSIP, delivering 800MW of clean energy into the National Grid in line with the UK Government's Clean Power by 2030 (CP30) target. Substations have been sited in sensitive locations and the land selected for the Development has been carefully considered to reduce environmental effects to a minimum, whilst balancing the need for the development. As panel efficiency has increased and as environmental effects have been assessed in detail, the scale of the Development has been reduced over time. The scale of the Development has also allowed the Applicant to offer significant benefits outside

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_OFF_053, GNR2_OFF_172, GNR2_OFF_170, GNR2_OFF_162, GNR2_OFF_150, GNR2_OFF_059, GNR2_OFF_063, GNR2_OFF_064, GNR2_OFF_067, GNR2_OFF_068, GNR2_OFF_071, GNR2_OFF_076, GNR2_OFF_078, GNR2_OFF_085, GNR2_OFF_101, GNR2_OFF_029, GNR2_OFF_031, GNR2_OFF_036, GNR2_OFF_041, GNR2_OFF_043, GNR2_OFF_061, GNR2_OFF_065, GNR2_OFF_066, GNR2_OFF_083, GNR2_OFF_003,			the core offering of clean power to the grid.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_OFF_096, GNR2_EF_052, GNR2_OFF_088, GNR2_OFF_094, GNR2_OFF_105, GNR2_OFF_114, GNR2_OFF_125, GNR2_OFF_126, GNR2_OFF_130, GNR2_OFF_133, GNR2_OFF_142, GNR2_FF_0048			
GNR2_PDF_0001, GNR2_EF_006, GNR2_EF_007, GNR2_L_002, GNR2_L_012, GNR2_L_013, GNR2_L_016, GNR2_L_017, GNR2_L_020, GNR2_L_022, GNR2_PDFF_0001, GNR2_EF_020, GNR2_EF_027, GNR2_EF_029, GNR2_EF_032, GNR2_EF_025, GNR2_FF_0021, GNR2_FF_0028, GNR2_FF_0039, GNR2_FF_0040, GNR2_FF_0042, GNR2_EF_042, GNR2_EF_045, GNR2_EF_046, GNR2_EF_047, GNR2_EF_049, GNR2_OFF_016, GNR2_OFF_020,	Respondents expressed general opposition to the Development. Include references to it not being needed, locally not beneficial, opposition to the developer	Yes	The need for the development is laid out in detail in the planning application. There are many local benefits to the Development which can be found in but are by no means limited to details in ES Chapters such as Chapter 13, Socio-Economics and Tourism **[EN010162/APP/6.2.13]**, Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**, and Chapter 9, Water Resources **[EN010162/APP/6.2.9]**.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_OFF_035, GNR2_OFF_046, GNR2_OFF_048, GNR2_OFF_052, GNR2_EF_051, GNR2_OFF_170, GNR2_OFF_164, GNR2_OFF_160, GNR2_OFF_154, GNR2_OFF_054, GNR2_OFF_056, GNR2_OFF_061, GNR2_OFF_067, GNR2_OFF_068, GNR2_OFF_078, GNR2_OFF_088, GNR2_OFF_089, GNR2_OFF_093, GNR2_OFF_099, GNR2_OFF_103, GNR2_OFF_114, GNR2_OFF_133, GNR2_OFF_143, GNR2_OFF_144, GNR2_OFF_146, GNR2_OFF_147, GNR2_OFF_149			Benefits to local communities include: • The NG+ package offers £1m per annum in Community Benefit across the 40-year life of the Development. • The extensive new access to the countryside through 27 new permissive routes. • Biodiversity Net Gain of 60% for habitats, 26% for hedgerows and 11% for watercourses. • The Development creating 64,500 new trees, 50km of hedgerow and 1,000 acres of ecological enhancement area. • The innovative EG Academy programme which has helped 113 local students gain accredited renewable qualifications. • The substantial business rates the Development will pay to

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			the local councils to improve local services. • The meaningful and well-paid job creation both in construction and permanent roles.
GNR2_L_005, GNR2_L_008, GNR2_L_014, GNR2_L_015, GNR2_L_018, GNR2_L_019, GNR2_FF_0028, GNR2_EF_006, GNR2_EF_007, GNR2_EF_009, GNR2_EF_013, GNR2_FF_0004, GNR2_FF_0011, GNR2_FF_0035, GNR2_FF_0036, GNR2_FF_0041, GNR2_FF_0042, GNR2_EF_042, GNR2_EF_045, GNR2_OFF_014, GNR2_OFF_018, GNR2_OFF_021, GNR2_OFF_028, GNR2_OFF_033, GNR2_OFF_0172, GNR2_OFF_085, GNR2_OFF_101, GNR2_OFF_029,	Respondents expressed concern for the cumulative impacts of other projects in the area. One respondent suggested developers plot out all known solar projects in the area to show overall cumulative impact on both area and the distribution grid. One respondent expressed concern that competing developers will fight for the same area of land. One respondent emphasised the proximity to One Earth Solar.	Yes	The various cumulative effects of the Development are assessed appropriately in each Chapter of the ES. The methodology for this assessment was agreed with the relevant local authorities and the Planning Inspectorate (PINs) at the scoping stage of the Development. The land parcels are secured with landowners for the Development so there is no prospect of competing developers fighting for the same area of land. Proximity to the One Earth project forms

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_OFF_031, GNR2_OFF_036, GNR2_OFF_041, GNR2_OFF_043, GNR2_OFF_061, GNR2_OFF_065, GNR2_OFF_066, GNR2_OFF_083, GNR2_OFF_003, GNR2_OFF_096, GNR2_EF_040, GNR2_EF_044, GNR2_EF_052, GNR2_OFF_089, GNR2_OFF_094, GNR2_OFF_103, GNR2_OFF_104, GNR2_OFF_105, GNR2_OFF_125, GNR2_OFF_128, GNR2_OFF_130, GNR2_OFF_132, GNR2_OFF_137, GNR2_OFF_143, GNR2_OFF_144			part of cumulative assessments as appropriate.
GNR2_L_011, GNR2_L_014, GNR2_L_015, GNR2_L_017, GNR2_L_018, GNR2_L_019,	Respondents expressed concern about fire hazard regarding battery and storage sites.	Yes	Technical Appendix A5.4: Outline Fire Safety Management Plan Outline Fire Safety Management

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_L_020, GNR2_EF_045, GNR2_OFF_016, GNR2_OFF_020, GNR2_OFF_028, GNR2_OFF_067, GNR2_OFF_101, GNR2_OFF_029, GNR2_OFF_031, GNR2_OFF_036, GNR2_OFF_041, GNR2_OFF_043, GNR2_OFF_061, GNR2_OFF_065, GNR2_OFF_066, GNR2_OFF_083, GNR2_OFF_003, GNR2_OFF_096, GNR2_EF_040, GNR2_EF_044, GNR2_EF_052, GNR2_OFF_133	Comments include references to lithium-ion battery fire worries, heatwave and wildfire problems through electrical malfunction that could decrease air quality Some respondents expressed concern local firefighting teams are not equipped to deal with such incidents.		Plan (oFSMP) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.4]** contains all details of how Fire Safety would be managed. The principles of this plan have been described by leading and respected fire safety industry professionals as 'Best in Class'.
GNR2_EF_010,GNR2_EF_007, GNR2_EF_009, GNR2_EF_001, GNR2_FF_0005, GNR2_FF_0040, GNR2_EF_020, GNR2_L_007, GNR2_L_013, GNR2_L_022, GNR2_EF_040, GNR2_OFF_010,	Respondents believe the main aim of the Development is to make profits. Comments include references to financial transparency,	Yes	The Development brings multiple benefits to local communities and nationally. Business rates are significant for the Development, the

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_OFF_155, GNR2_OFF_061, GNR2_OFF_062, GNR2_OFF_078, GNR2_OFF_102, GNR2_OFF_137, GNR2_OFF_147	shareholders benefiting more than locals.		Development offers an industry-leading community benefit of £1m per annum for the 40-year duration of the Development, extensive access to the countryside, widespread local ecological benefit, local jobs, training, and opportunities for the area.
GNR2_FF_0008, GNR2_FF_0017, GNR2_OFF_153, GNR2_OFF_064, GNR2_EF_054, GNR2_OFF_086, GNR2_OFF_116, GNR2_OFF_129, GNR2_OFF_139, GNR2_EF_058	Respondents expressed general support for the Development.	No	Noted.
GNR2_EF_007, GNR2_L_005, GNR2_EF_020, GNR2_L_007, GNR2_L_008, GNR2_EF_043, GNR2_OFF_082, GNR2_OFF_126, GNR2_OFF_133, GNR2_OFF_143, GNR2_OFF_144	Respondents expressed concern for the solar panel procurement being from abroad/ or specifically from China.	Yes	The Applicant has a Modern Slavery Statement and is a signatory of SEUK's declaration on this matter as detailed in ES Chapter 13, Socio-Economics and Tourism **[EN010162/APP/6.2.13]**.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_L_011, GNR2_OFF_024, GNR2_OFF_037, GNR2_OFF_082	Respondents expressed concern about general health and safety provisions.	No	All relevant and up to date UK laws will be followed accordingly.
GNR2_EF_013, GNR2_L_005, GNR2_OFF_143, GNR2_OFF_144	Respondents expressed the Development contravenes the policies of key strategic partners such as the Newark and Sherwood Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.	Yes	The Development aligns with the NPPF as laid out in the application documents, and although Newark and Sherwood are not the decision-making body, local policy is taken into consideration and the comment is noted.
GNR2_OFF_023, GNR2_OFF_029, GNR2_OFF_041, GNR2_OFF_068	Respondents expressed they support North Muskham Parish Council's feedback.	Yes	There are no longer solar panels proposed around North Muskham.
GNR2_OFF_029, GNR2_OFF_130, GNR2_OFF_131	Respondent expressed re-naming of the park to include 'biodiversity' was misleading/an insult to their intelligence.	Yes	There is nothing misleading about the description of the Development, ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]** details the sheer scale of biodiversity commitments, endorsed by four different ecology-focussed NGOs, the RSPB, Trent Rivers Trust, Sherwood Forest Trust, and Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			The Applicant has committed to a range of measures that enhance and protect key habitats within the Development. This includes the creation of 31 hectares of new woodland, 22 hectares of woodland ecotone, and 50 km of new hedgerows. As well as this, the site would comprise extensive grassland under the solar PV arrays (999 hectares), new and retained diverse grassland habitats (407 hectares), and retained arable land (144 hectares) managed with a high degree of conservation management for birds. Overall, the Development is expected to deliver a substantial biodiversity net gain, including increases of +60.7% in habitat units, +26.5% in hedgerow units, and +11.05% in watercourse units. These interventions are designed to

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			support important landscape features such as woodlands, watercourses, and Local Wildlife Sites (LWS), while also improving ecological connectivity and reducing habitat fragmentation. Further detail is provided in Chapter 8: Ecology and Biodiversity, of the ES **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**.
GNR2_FF_0043, GNR2_OFF_054, GNR2_OFF_131	Respondents expressed there are few changes made from the first round of community consultations.	Yes	Changes made between consultations are detailed in ES Chapter 4, Site Selection and Design **[EN010162/APP/6.2.4]** These changes were extensive.
GNR2_L_008, GNR2_OFF_125	Respondents expressed concern that local authorities won't have final say under the DCO process. One respondent expressed that contrary to the Localism Act 2011 councillors did not play an active role and therefore process is undemocratic.	No	The DCO will ultimately be determined by the Secretary of State, but consultation with the local authorities has been extensive and is detailed in ES Chapter 3, Consultation **[EN010162/APP/6.2.3]**. The local authority will also produce a local impact report and be involved in the examination of the DCO

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_FF_0036	One respondent expressed they would support the Development if there was a field here and there over a great area.	No	The Design Approach Document (DaD) **[EN010162/APP/5.6]** explains the methodology used in field selection. The design is reasonably disaggregated.
GNR2_EF_051	One respondent expressed concern for the length of time the Development will be operational.	No	The Development's operational life of 40 years assures clean power into the grid for a generation.
GNR2_OFF_172	One respondent expressed support for the partnerships with NWT, RSPB, and TNT.	No	Noted.
GNR2_OFF_017	One respondent expressed project is only going ahead because land is cheap and that's not a good enough reason for it to progress.	No	The cost of land is not a significant factor in the overall reasoning for a solar development to progress.
GNR2_OFF_067	One respondent expressed particular concern about exposure to toxic chemicals from panels. Respondent specified chemicals will leak faster from panels in the event of a storm and that current panels can quickly be engulfed in	No	Solar panels contain cells, which are solid entities encased by glass. Cells are not liquid and do not leak in the event of a storm. Thermal runaway is a phenomenon associated with Lithium-Ion batteries. The oFSMP is contained in Technical Appendix A5.4: Outline Fire

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	'thermal runaway' and rapid acceleration in heating.		Safety Management Plan **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.4]** detailing fire safety management plans.
GNR2_EF_012	One respondent expressed frustration that the project team had come to a mitigation agreement with another stakeholder and not them.	No	The ES Chapter 3, Consultation **[EN010162/APP/6.2.3]** details how the public were consulted with over design changes throughout the DCO process.
GNR2_OFF_033	One respondent expressed they support Eakring Parish Council's feedback.	Yes	Noted.
GNR2_OFF_031	One respondent expressed they support South Muskham and Little Carlton Parish Council's feedback.	Yes	Noted.
GNR2_OFF_041	One respondent expressed they support Bathley Parish Council's feedback.	Yes	Noted.
GNR2_L_002	One respondent expressed concern for loss of legal easement rights for their property.	No	The draft DCO includes compensation provisions in respect of the exercise of compulsory purchase powers in the Order which would include the acquisition of land and rights and other specified impacts. A summary of these provisions is

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			contained in the Explanatory Memorandum **[EN010162/APP/3.3]**
GNR2_FF_0037	One respondent expressed they would support ground mounted panels only if the ground was not usable for anything else.	No	The Development involves multiple uses of the land, from, for example, solar panels, to substations. to ecological enhancement areas.
GNR2_OFF_083	One respondent expressed concern as to why solar panels are not lifted above the ground to make way for more land management underneath.	Yes	The panels are designed to be circa 1m from ground level to accommodate sheep grazing underneath.
GNR2_L_008	One respondent expressed concern that plans in rounds of consultations were presented as a thought they were already given the go ahead.	No	The Secretary of State decides whether to consent the DCO application. The presentation materials in consultations consistently referred to proposals, reference ES Chapter 3, Consultation **[EN010162/APP/6.2.3]**. It is refuted that consultation was presented in this manner
GNR2_OFF_126	One respondent expressed updated design doesn't represent	Yes	Cumulative effects on different environmental areas are

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	the full picture as it doesn't show many additional ground mounted solar panel projects already in the NSDC area or going through planning.		assessed in the Chapters of the ES.
GNR2_L_010	One respondent expressed concern that there are no guarantees that there will not be any more development of remaining greenbelt land in the future.	No	The Development is not located on the greenbelt. The Applicant cannot predict future development and has assessed cumulative impacts of planned developments in the Chapters of the ES.
GNR2_OFF_042	One respondent expressed that solar panels should not be used to be granted land subsidy.	No	Solar panels do not qualify UK landowners for land-based subsidies.
GNR2_L_006	One respondent expressed that proposals by developer deviates from the proposals presented in the Design Approach Document.	No	There is no evidence provided here that the Development deviates from the methodology set out in the DaD **[EN010162/APP/5.6]**.
GNR2_OFF_105	One respondent expressed they wanted to see agreements set out with landowners of development fields, as they feel unease about landowner arrangements.	No	Landowner agreements are confidential.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_OFF_105	Respondent noted although they had seen a GIS model on hydrology impacts, they would like working/interactive model for those who don't have a grasp of GIS models.	No	ES Chapter 9, Water Resources **[EN010162/APP/6.2.9]** may address some of the request, and the Applicant has removed panels from all areas of flood zones 2 and 3.
GNR2_L_014, GNR2_L_015, GNR2_L_018, GNR2_L_019, GNR2_OFF_028, GNR2_OFF_101, GNR2_OFF_029, GNR2_OFF_031, GNR2_OFF_036, GNR2_OFF_041, GNR2_OFF_043, GNR2_OFF_061, GNR2_OFF_065, GNR2_OFF_066, GNR2_OFF_083, GNR2_OFF_003, GNR2_OFF_096, GNR2_EF_040, GNR2_EF_044, GNR2_EF_052	Respondent expressed that project lacks clarity on land use changes in areas of the order limit, specifically cable and access corridors being unclear.	Yes	The DCO contains full descriptions of works within works number that are listed in Schedule 1 of the draft DCO **[EN010162/APP/3.1]**. The ES Chapter 5, Development Description **[EN010162/APP/6.2.5]** additionally contains a description of works.
GNR2_EF_038	One respondent expressed concern for cabling interfering with wireless networks.	No	Cabling on the Development is predominantly buried and there is

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			no evidence for it interfering with wireless networks.
GNR2_OFF_012	One respondent expressed they would like assurances that cables, grid, and BESS connections would be underground.	Yes	Cables are largely situated underground, with some limited areas of above ground cabling at the main 400kv substation and the 4 intermediate substations, which can be viewed in the illustrative design document.
GNR2_FF_0041	One respondent expressed references to cable routes are not very clear.	Yes	Cable routes are clearly depicted in Work Areas that are listed in Schedule 1 of the draft DCO **[EN010162/APP/3.1]**. ES Chapter 5, Development Description **[EN010162/APP/6.2.5]** additionally contains a description of works.
GNR2_OFF_025, GNR2_FF_0047	Respondents expressed general support for accountability and correct implementation if plans are accepted.	Yes	The DCO implementation would have the appropriate oversight of the relevant professional bodies and local authorities in order for successful and compliant implementation to take place. The Applicant has also entered into

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			partnerships with NGOs to assist with oversight of the ongoing LEMP (Technical Appendix A5.1: Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]**).
GNR2_FF_0025	One respondent expressed they would like to know who has funded the scheme so far and who will be involved in funding in the future.	Yes	The Funding Statement **[EN010162/APP/4.2]** in the Application documents details the manner in which the Development has been and would be funded.
GNR2_L_003	One respondent expressed concern that Elements Green Agri-voltaic and biodiversity aims and credentials are unsubstantiated.	Yes	The substance of the biodiversity aims is contained in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**. The Applicant has partnered with the RSPB, Trent Rivers Trust, Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust, and Sherwood Forest Trust. Substantial proposals are in place for the Solar and Biodiversity Park.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			• The extensive new access to the countryside through 27 new permissive routes. • Biodiversity Net Gain of 60% for habitats, 26% for hedgerows and 11% for watercourses. • The Development creating 64,500 new trees, 50km of hedgerow and 1,000 acres of ecological enhancement area.
GNR2_OFF_042	One respondent expressed general distrust with the developer.	Yes	It is unfortunate that there is an element of distrust, we would hope the substantial consultation process, outlined in ES Chapter 3, Consultation **[EN010162/APP/6.2.3]**, the partnerships signed with industry and the third sector, the Applicant's participation in Solar Energy UK matters, the many training courses the Applicant has delivered and the approach the Applicant has taken to ensure detailed involvement with

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			communities and local authorities on various matters would reassure.
GNR2_FF_0037	One respondent expressed scepticism the developer could deliver this project given their ethics.	Yes	The Applicant would contend that they take an ethical approach to Development, being members of SEUK, partners with RSPB, Trent Rivers Trust, Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust, and Sherwood Forest Trust. The Applicant has met 17 of the 18 host Parish Councils, some parishes on several occasions to gauge views and create extensive plans and initiatives in tandem with local communities. The Applicant has committed to Biodiversity measures at landscape scale. The Applicant has engaged with and used the services of local businesses. The Applicant has engaged the local college and delivered 142 training courses in renewable energy for local residents and their families. The

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			Applicant has carried out work to aim to tackle pre-existing flooding issues for local communities. The Applicant has constructed and managed 450MW of renewable energy projects worldwide and has strong credentials – see Funding Statement **[EN010162/APP/4.2]**
GNR2_OFF_105	One respondent expressed that the parent company of the development supports the work of the work conducted by the Hockerton Housing Project, and how work like this can be of high quality. They agree with this and would like development to take on board some measures on that project including wind turbines and local shares in the Development.	Yes	The Applicant is aware of and has collaborated with the educational work of the Hockerton Housing Project and looks forward to collaborating further
GNR2_OFF_105	One respondent expressed general support for community ownership/share in project scheme.	No	Community ownership is not proposed for the Development, however there is a substantial Community Benefit Scheme under development, which has

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			already made grants, but would be fully implemented post a granting of a DCO.
GNR2_FF_0040, GNR2_L_013, GNR2_OFF_078	Respondents expressed concern that fields - DB053 - were always communicated as not possible to remove however after consultation event EG informed respondent of the contrary.	Yes	Removal of panels over the course of Development is an iterative process, when full environmental surveys have taken place where they previously had not, panel area removal can become possible.
GNR2_L_017, GNR2_L_020	Respondents suggested that a detailed analysis of heat impacts be taken within a 750m radius of Mainwood Farm.	Yes	ES Chapter 16, Miscellaneous Issues **[EN010162/APP/6.2.16]**, fully assesses Electromagnetic Field effects.
GNR2_L_011	One respondent expressed that section 14.5.7 describes the location of the Order Limits in the context of the road network. However, Moorhouse Road and Weston Road, Egmanton which are all identified on Figure 14.5 have not been included in the study area.	Yes	There are updated Order Limits and an updated Transport within ES Chapter 14, Transport and Access **[EN010162/APP/6.2.14]** following changes made in response to consultation feedback on Traffic and Transport in this area.
GNR2_L_011	One respondent expressed that Table 14.12 lists the sensitivity	Yes	There are updated Order Limits and an updated Transport within

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	rating within the study area. However, Weston Road, Egmanton, Moorhouse and Moorhouse Road which are all identified on Figure 14.5 have not been included.		ES Chapter 14, Traffic and Transport **[EN010162/APP/6.2.14]** following changes made in response to statutory consultation feedback on Traffic and Transport in this area, changes were made to the Development to relieve traffic congestion in Moorhouse and Ossington and a targeted consultation exercise was undertaken on the same.
GNR2_L_011	One respondent expressed that 14.6.2 (144) states a newly proposed access is located on Moorhouse Road and Table 14.13 Access Nos. 22 and 23 state these are 'new and verge'. However, Figure 14.6 shows an existing site access No. 24 on Moorhouse Road and Nos. 22 and 23 to be on Ossington Road Moorhouse. This is incorrect.	Yes	There are updated Order Limits and an updated Transport within ES Chapter 14, Traffic and Transport **[EN010162/APP/6.2.14]** following changes made in response to statutory consultation feedback on Traffic and Transport in this area, changes were made to the Development to relieve traffic congestion in Moorhouse and Ossington and a targeted

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			consultation exercise was undertaken on the same.
GNR2_L_011	One respondent expressed that it is noted in Figure 14.4 - Traffic Survey Locations, this study is very limited and does not include villages like Moorhouse and roads like Moorhouse and Weston Road, Egmanton which will be significantly impacted by the construction traffic. Again, we are being totally ignored.	Yes	There are updated Order Limits and an updated Transport within ES Chapter 14, Traffic and Transport **[EN010162/APP/6.2.14]** following changes made in response to statutory consultation feedback on Traffic and Transport in this area, changes were made to the Development to relieve traffic congestion in Moorhouse and Ossington and a targeted consultation exercise was undertaken on the same. The Applicant has listened to the feedback, acted upon it, and made changes to the Development.
GNR2_EF_045	One respondent expressed concern for their property changing from an Agricultural Holdings Act 1986 (AHA) to a Farm Business Tenancy (FBT), decreasing the	Yes	Arrangements between landlords and tenants are private matters and not for the Applicant. ES Chapter 17, Agricultural Land **[EN010162/APP/6.2.17]** and

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	right to compensation for loss of land.		Chapter 13, Socio-Economics and Tourism **[EN010162/APP/6.2.13]** deal with matters around farm businesses.
GNR2_OFF_072	One respondent expressed confusion as to why simple alterations to their home has to go through the council as they live in Eakring Conservation Village, but this project can bypass the local authorities.	Yes	The local authorities have been consulted extensively on the Development as detailed in ES Chapter 3, Consultation **[EN010162/APP/6.2.3]**. The local authority will be heavily involved in the DCO examination stage and will submit their local impact report.
GNR2_L_009	One respondent expressed that they were promised a site visit at a consultation event, for Kneesall Lodge, that never happened.	No	The Applicant made every endeavour to visit individual properties, but where this did not occur, the approach to Landscape and visual assessments are detailed in ES Chapter 7, Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment **[EN010162/APP/6.2.7]**.
GNR2_L_002	One respondent expressed that mapping and descriptions of Caunton Lodge Farm contained	Yes	Mapping has been updated across the Development, with new hedgerows and existing

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	fundamental inaccuracies. One respondent expressed concern for the presentation of boundaries at this site as hedgerows depicted did not exist.		hedgerows clearly defined. **[EN010162/APP/2.11]**
GNR2_EF_004	One respondent proposed a map demonstrating the 850 acres dedicated to ecological enhancement.	Yes	The Applicant has provided further information in the LEMP, and the acreage of these enhancements has increased to over 1,000 (Technical Appendix A5.1: Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]**).
Topic Area: Glint and Glare			
GNR2_FF_0028, GNR2_FF_0040, GNR2_L_013, GNR2_L_017, GNR2_L_020, GNR2_OFF_004, GNR2_OFF_020, GNR2_OFF_067, GNR2_OFF_078, GNR2_OFF_094	Respondents expressed concern about the reflections which could occur from panels. Some respondents specified glare concerns for areas where the land rises away up from a property.	No	Glint and Glare impacts relating to the Development have been assessed through 3D modelling, which includes the effect of local terrain / elevation changes. Potential effects will be presented in Technical Appendix 16.1: Glint and Glare Assessment **[EN010162/APP/6.4.16.1]**.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_L_002, GNR2_L_011, GNR2_L_017, GNR2_L_020	Respondents express concern regarding light pollution. One respondents expressed concern that 'dark skies' status of area will be under threat by solar glares and reflection.	No	Glint and Glare impacts relating to the Development have been assessed in detail, and potential effects will be presented in Technical Appendix 16.1: Glint and Glare Assessment **[EN010162/APP/6.4.16.1]**. Only infra-red lighting is proposed for the development, which is not visible.
GNR2_OFF_067	One respondent expressed particular concern that glint and glare from panels will trigger epileptic seizures in individuals.	No	Reflections from solar panels are a steady (i.e. non-flickering) source of light and therefore do not trigger photosensitive seizures directly. Whilst certain specific situations may cause reflections to be perceived as a flickering effect (such as glare shining though trees when observed from a moving vehicle), any such effects would be of shorter duration, lower intensity, and lower contrast than those produced naturally by the sun itself under the same conditions).

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_L_011	One respondent expressed concern that Notts Air ambulance helicopters and other helicopters from Gamston and micro gliders from Head-on who regularly fly over have not been taken into consideration in the assessment.	No	Retford Gamston Airport and aircraft overflights have been considered, as discussed in Technical Appendix A16.1: Glint and Glare Assessment **[EN010162/APP/6.4.16.1]** of the PEIR and ES. These potential receptors have not come forward with objections to the Development
Topic Area: Hydrology			
GNR2_L_001, GNR2_L_003, GNR2_L_004, GNR2_L_008, GNR2_L_010, GNR2_L_017, GNR2_L_020, GNR2_L_023, GNR2_PDF_0001, GNR2_EF_006, GNR2_EF_008, GNR2_EF_009, GNR2_EF_012, GNR2_EF_016, GNR2_PDFF_0001, GNR2_FF_0009, GNR2_EF_024, GNR2_EF_032, GNR2_EF_034, GNR2_FF_0033, GNR2_FF_0035, GNR2_FF_0039, GNR2_FF_0041, GNR2_EF_049, GNR2_OFF_001, GNR2_OFF_004,	Respondents expressed concern about the Development's impact on flood risk as the area is already prone to flooding. Some respondents requested more information. Some respondents expressed no amount of drainage infrastructure will stop this.	No	The Applicant has carried out work with the Environment Agency, Internal drainage boards and ongoing work with local communities to understand the flood risk in the area. The Applicant has completed a flood risk assessment, which must be approved by the Environment Agency. The Applicant has identified solar parks do not increase flood risk nor do they intend to build in either Flood Zones 2 or 3. Technical Appendix

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_OFF_006, GNR2_OFF_012, GNR2_OFF_018, GNR2_OFF_053, GNR2_EF_050, GNR2_FF_0043, GNR2_OFF_048, GNR2_OFF_0172, GNR2_OFF_154, GNR2_OFF_151, GNR2_OFF_054, GNR2_OFF_088, GNR2_OFF_089, GNR2_OFF_099, GNR2_OFF_104, GNR2_OFF_105, GNR2_OFF_111, GNR2_OFF_114, GNR2_OFF_115, GNR2_OFF_117, GNR2_OFF_119, GNR2_OFF_125, GNR2_OFF_128, GNR2_OFF_136, GNR2_OFF_149			A9.1: Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy (FRA) is found at **[EN010162/APP/6.4.9.1]**
GNR2_L_001, GNR2_L_003, GNR2_L_004, GNR2_L_008, GNR2_L_011, GNR2_EF_006,	Respondents expressed concern about the Development increasing water runoff from the solar panels.	No	As outlined in Technical Appendix A9.1: Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy (FRA)

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_FF_0034, GNR2_OFF_004, GNR2_OFF_012, GNR2_OFF_048, GNR2_OFF_0172, GNR2_OFF_053, GNR2_OFF_061, GNR2_OFF_067, GNR2_OFF_076, GNR2_OFF_082, GNR2_OFF_088, GNR2_OFF_089, GNR2_OFF_115, GNR2_OFF_117	One respondent expressed concern for overflowing of Moorhouse Beck in particular. One respondent enquired what the increase in drying time for wet ground is after solar panel run-off.		**[EN010162/APP/6.4.9.1]**, research outlines that solar panels do not have a significant effect on runoff volumes or peak flows, however where ground beneath panels is bare there may be an increase in peak discharge. Grassland under the PV arrays will act to bind the soil and slow the flow of water from the PV arrays. Areas in flood zones 2 and 3 around Moorhouse Beck have been avoided in the final design, as have all flood zone 2 and 3 areas across the Development.
GNR2_L_014, GNR2_L_015, GNR2_L_018, GNR2_L_019, GNR2_OFF_028, GNR2_OFF_067, GNR2_OFF_101, GNR2_OFF_029, GNR2_OFF_031, GNR2_OFF_036,	Respondents expressed general concern for water pollution.	No	Technical Appendix A5.3: Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.3]** outlines good construction practice measures to protect the water environment.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_OFF_041, GNR2_OFF_043, GNR2_OFF_061, GNR2_OFF_065, GNR2_OFF_066, GNR2_OFF_083, GNR2_OFF_003, GNR2_OFF_096, GNR2_EF_040, GNR2_EF_044, GNR2_EF_052			One of the benefits of the Development is the projected increase in water quality due to the decrease in pesticides and fertilizers reaching water courses from what was previously arable farmland.
GNR2_EF_006, GNR2_EF_024, GNR2_FF_0040, GNR2_L_013, GNR2_EF_049, GNR2_OFF_0172, GNR2_OFF_053, GNR2_OFF_078, GNR2_OFF_088, GNR2_OFF_089	Respondents expressed concern for the Development's impact on flooding of roads and access tracks. Some respondents specified Ossington/Moorhouse road, the A1, A16, east coast railway line, Cromwell, Carlton on Trent, Kelham.	No	As outlined in Technical Appendix A9.1: Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy (FRA) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.9.1]**, research outlines that solar panels do not have a significant effect on runoff volumes or peak flows, however where ground beneath panels is bare there may be an increase in peak discharge. Grassland under the PV arrays will act to bind the soil and slow the flow of water from the PV arrays therefore not contributing to or exacerbating existing flooding.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_L_008, GNR2_FF_0033, GNR2_OFF_004, GNR2_OFF_076, GNR2_OFF_082, GNR2_OFF_114, GNR2_OFF_125, GNR2_OFF_128	Respondents expressed concerns on the Development's impact on soil drainage and soil binding.	No	Grassland sown under the PV arrays will have a beneficial impact on the binding of soils compared the intensive arable baseline conditions.
GNR2_OFF_019, GNR2_OFF_053, GNR2_OFF_105,GNR2_OFF_117	Respondent expressed general support for further flood mitigation measures and improvements.	No	Flood alleviation measures are not proposed as part of the Development and are being brought forward via the NG+ fund
GNR2_EF_008, GNR2_OFF_076, GNR2_OFF_079	Respondents express concern for the sites ground being clay, restricting water absorption.	No	As outlined in Technical Appendix A9.1: Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy (FRA) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.9.1]**, research outlines that solar panels do not have a significant effect on runoff volumes or peak flows, however where ground beneath panels is bare there may be an increase in peak discharge. Grassland under the PV arrays will act to bind the soil and slow the flow of water from the PV arrays, regardless of soil type.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_OFF_086, GNR2_OFF_137, GNR2_OFF_139	Respondent praised design and project's engagement with regional agencies for flooding.	Yes	The Development layout has been modified to remove aboveground infrastructure from the 1% AEP + 39% climate change outline, and therefore the Development will remain operational in times of flood.
GNR2_OFF_079, GNR2_OFF_105	Respondents expressed that maintenance of the flood alleviation measures should be clearly stated as well as the mechanism of transferring the legal responsibility of such measures to future owners/operators of the development. Include any future liability for flood issues.	No	Flood alleviation measures are not proposed as part of the Development. They are being proposed for pre-existing flood issues via the NG+ scheme.
GNR2_L_001, GNR2_L_004	Respondents express interest in a future fund for flooded properties in case runoff increases.	No	As outlined in Technical Appendix A9.1: Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy (FRA) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.9.1]**, research outlines that solar panels do not have a significant

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			effect on runoff volumes or peak flows, however where ground beneath panels is bare there may be an increase in peak discharge. Grassland under the PV arrays will act to bind the soil and slow the flow of water from the PV arrays therefore not contributing to or exacerbating existing flooding.
GNR2_L_001, GNR2_L_004	Respondents express concern that panel support legs will damage land drains.	No	As outlined in the Water Resources PEIR Chapter **[EN010162/APP/6.2.9]**, the installation of the racking system has the potential to damage this network by piercing the pipework and impairing its functionality through blockage. In the absence of good construction practice, such as a watching brief and pipe reinstatement, the artificial drainage network is likely to still be able to function, as water would gravitate around racking

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			system and drain to the existing outfalls.
GNR2_FF_0009	Respondent suggest a 5-10 year commitment of monitoring flood risk due to the Development.	No	There are no PV areas in flood risk zones 2 and 3. Monitoring of the Development is outlined in Technical Appendix A5.1: Outline Landscape and ecological Management Plan (LEMP) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]**
GNR2_FF_0033	Respondent noted that the design of the scheme results in excess water from higher ground of the west.	No	As outlined in Technical Appendix A9.1: Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy (FRA) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.9.1]**, research outlines that solar panels do not have a significant effect on runoff volumes or peak flows, however where ground beneath panels is bare there may be an increase in peak discharge. Grassland under the PV arrays will act to bind the soil and slow the flow of water from the PV arrays therefore not contributing to or exacerbating existing flooding.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_OFF_125	Respondent expressed that taking land out of agricultural use means farmers will not be able to maintain drainage ditches and watercourses which will make flooding more likely.	No	The Development incorporates a 10 m of watercourses meaning access is still available for maintenance.
GNR2_OFF_105	Respondent expressed they would like to see a simulation of how project will handle a one in 10, 25, 50 and 100-year flooding events	Yes	The Development layout has been modified to remove aboveground infrastructure from the 1% AEP + 39% climate change outline, and therefore the Development will remain operational in times of flood.
GNR2_L_014, GNR2_L_015, GNR2_L_018, GNR2_L_019, GNR2_OFF_028, GNR2_OFF_101, GNR2_OFF_029, GNR2_OFF_031, GNR2_OFF_036, GNR2_OFF_041, GNR2_OFF_043, GNR2_OFF_061, GNR2_OFF_065, GNR2_OFF_066,	Respondents suggested that the northern end of the LWS drain beyond Moor House Lane should be controlled to avoid excessive mud dispersal and dust in the vicinity of the rain.	No	Technical Appendix A5.3: Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.3]** outlines good construction practice measures to protect the water environment, including dust suppression.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_OFF_083, GNR2_OFF_003, GNR2_OFF_096, GNR2_EF_040, GNR2_EF_044, GNR2_EF_052			
GNR2_L_001, GNR2_L_004, GNR2_FF_0034, GNR2_OFF_054, GNR2_OFF_079, GNR2_OFF_117, GNR2_OFF_120	Respondents express concern for flooding in Caunton in particular.	No	As outlined in Technical Appendix A9.1: Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy (FRA) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.9.2]**, research outlines that solar panels do not have a significant effect on runoff volumes or peak flows, however where ground beneath panels is bare there may be an increase in peak discharge. Grassland under the PV arrays will act to bind the soil and slow the flow of water from the PV arrays therefore not contributing to or exacerbating existing flooding.
GNR2_FF_0033, GNR2_OFF_089, GNR2_OFF_114, GNR2_OFF_125, GNR2_OFF_128	Respondents expressed concern that flooding issues in Little Carlton in particular have not been given enough consideration.	Yes	As outlined in Technical Appendix A9.1: Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy (FRA) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.9.1]**, research outlines that solar

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	One respondent expressed that the water from needs to be discharged to the river Trent quickly before water from Derbyshire reaches this area.		panels do not have a significant effect on runoff volumes or peak flows, however where ground beneath panels is bare there may be an increase in peak discharge. Grassland under the PV arrays will act to bind the soil and slow the flow of water from the PV arrays therefore not contributing to or exacerbating existing flooding. There are no longer panels in the Little Carlton area, as Solar PV is not taking place in Flood Zones 2 and 3
GNR2_EF_009, GNR2_EF_012, GNR2_OFF_0172, GNR2_OFF_105	Respondents expressed concern for an increase in flood risk in Sutton on Trent from the Development.	No	As outlined in Technical Appendix A9.1: Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy (FRA) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.9.1]**, research outlines that solar panels do not have a significant effect on runoff volumes or peak flows, however where ground beneath panels is bare there may

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			be an increase in peak discharge. Grassland under the PV arrays will act to bind the soil and slow the flow of water from the PV arrays therefore not contributing to or exacerbating existing flooding.
GNR2_OFF_114, GNR2_OFF_125, GNR2_OFF_128	Respondents expressed concern that flooding issues in South Muskham in particular have not been given enough consideration. One respondent expressed that the water from needs to be discharged to the river Trent quickly before water from Derbyshire reaches this area.	No	As outlined in Technical Appendix A9.1: Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy (FRA) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.9.1]**, research outlines that solar panels do not have a significant effect on runoff volumes or peak flows, however where ground beneath panels is bare there may be an increase in peak discharge. Grassland under the PV arrays will act to bind the soil and slow the flow of water from the PV arrays therefore not contributing to or exacerbating existing flooding. The Development layout has

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			been modified, and infrastructure has been removed in the vicinity of South Muskham.
GNR2_L_003, GNR2_EF_050, GNR2_OFF_053	Respondents expressed concern that any construction vehicle damage to bridges or blockages to Moorhouse Beck and its tributaries downstream will have significant impacts for local flooding.	No	Technical Appendix A5.3: Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.3]** identifies measures to reduce the potential for transfer of sediment during the construction phase and this will limit the potential for impediments to flow within watercourses.
GNR2_FF_0040, GNR2_L_013, GNR2_OFF_078	Respondent expressed concern that the boundary line on field DB053 does hold water and might cause issues for access routes.	No	The extent of the PV area in field 'DB053' has been reduced to avoid the floodplain and the 1% AEP + 39% climate change extent.
GNR2_L_009	One respondent expressed that there is a natural spring on the border of fields 96 and 98 that feeds water to Kneesall Lodge Farm, any disruption to this spring is opposed. Similar concerns	No	A hydrology walkover of Fields 96 to 100 on 18/02/2025 with the resident of Kneesall Lodge took place to ascertain the source of the spring and the likely drainage pathway to the pond adjacent to the property. Based on site

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	raised by respondent for the septic tank drain underneath field 100.		observations and anecdotal evidence, it is likely that the spring rises on the northern boundary of Field 96 within Work Area 3: Mitigation i.e. an area where no below ground infrastructure will occur. As such, the supply to the pond is unlikely to be directly impacted and good construction practice measures outlined in Technical Appendix A5.3: Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.3]** will limit the potential for pollution and sedimentation effects.
GNR2_FF_0041, GNR2_OFF_048, GNR2_OFF_053	Respondent expressed particular concern for flooding risks in Moorhouse/Moorhouse Beck. One respondent suggested fields that drain into Moorhouse Beck tributaries should be removed.	No	As outlined in Technical Appendix A9.1: Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy (FRA) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.9.1]**, research outlines that solar panels do not have a significant effect on runoff volumes or peak flows, however where ground

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			beneath panels is bare there may be an increase in peak discharge. Grassland under the PV arrays will act to bind the soil and slow the flow of water from the PV arrays therefore not contributing to or exacerbating existing flooding.
GNR2_OFF_016, GNR2_OFF_020	Respondents express general support for any drainage and flood mitigation measures in Bathley Main St and Hopyard Lane.	No	Flood alleviation measures are not proposed as part of the Development. NG+ measures can be applied for separately for localised pre-existing flood alleviation.
GNR2_OFF_025, GNR2_FF_0047	Respondent expressed particular concern for flooding risks on DB062, specifically on the north side near the bridleway.	Yes	Field DB062 has been removed from the Development layout.
GNR2_EF_006	Respondent express concern about the Development's impact on flood risk/increased flooding from site D (Brookdale Farm, Moorhouse Newark, NG2323 6LS).	Yes	As outlined in Technical Appendix A9.1: Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy (FRA) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.9.1]**, research outlines that solar panels do not have a significant effect on runoff volumes or peak

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			flows, however where ground beneath panels is bare there may be an increase in peak discharge. Grassland under the PV arrays will act to bind the soil and slow the flow of water from the PV arrays therefore not contributing to or exacerbating existing flooding. The Development layout has been modified, and infrastructure has been removed in the vicinity of Brookdale Farm.
GNR2_EF_012	Respondent express concern for proposed grass flood mitigation in Sutton on Trent.	No	Following phase one the Applicant has dedicated funding through the NG+ programme for local flood alleviation schemes to protect local villages.
GNR2_L_008	Respondent expressed concern about flooding on Caunton Road, creating access problems for vehicles.	No	As outlined in Technical Appendix A9.1: Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy (FRA) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.9.1]**, research outlines that solar panels do not have a significant

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			effect on runoff volumes or peak flows, however where ground beneath panels is bare there may be an increase in peak discharge. Grassland under the PV arrays will act to bind the soil and slow the flow of water from the PV arrays therefore not contributing to or exacerbating existing flooding.
GNR2_FF_0028	Respondent expressed particular concern about flooding risk on the road opposite Eakring Meadow LWS and Eakring and Maplebeck Meadows SSSI.	No	As outlined in Technical Appendix A9.1: Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy (FRA) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.9.1]**, research outlines that solar panels do not have a significant effect on runoff volumes or peak flows, however where ground beneath panels is bare there may be an increase in peak discharge. Grassland under the PV arrays will act to bind the soil and slow the flow of water from the PV arrays therefore not contributing to or exacerbating existing

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			flooding. Following phase one the Applicant has dedicated funding through the NG+ programme for local flood alleviation schemes to protect local villages such as Maplebeck.
GNR2_FF_0034	Respondent suggested further hydrology surveys be carried out in the section between Maplebeck and Caunton, plus the section between Bathley and Bathley Bridge.	No	All surveys undertaken to date are appropriate to inform the ES and no additional surveys are required.
GNR2_L_023	Respondent expressed particular concern about flooding in Eakring, as farmers currently clean ditches in the spring ready for the rains. respondent enquires what will be done about this.	No	Following phase one the Applicant has dedicated funding through the NG+ programme for local flood alleviation schemes to protect local villages.
GNR2_OFF_076	Respondent expressed particular concern about flooding in Carlton on Trent.	No	As outlined in Technical Appendix A9.1: Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy (FRA) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.9.1]**, research outlines that solar

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			panels do not have a significant effect on runoff volumes or peak flows, however where ground beneath panels is bare there may be an increase in peak discharge. Grassland under the PV arrays will act to bind the soil and slow the flow of water from the PV arrays therefore not contributing to or exacerbating existing flooding. Following phase one the Applicant has dedicated funding through the NG+ programme for local flood alleviation schemes to protect local villages.
GNR2_OFF_079	Respondent expressed they note a separate flood alleviation plan in Maplebeck however it is not part of this proposal and the legal context of this is unclear. They noted the idea that the alleviation scheme will benefit villages downstream is	No	Following phase one the Applicant has dedicated funding through the NG+ programme for local flood alleviation schemes to protect local villages.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	anecdotal and offsets by the impact of the proposal itself.		
GNR2_OFF_079	Respondent suggested any project models should take into account the impact of pluvial flows over land emanating from the higher ground and fed into the Beck through its tributaries downstream	No	Following phase one the Applicant has dedicated funding through the NG+ programme for local flood alleviation schemes to protect local villages. This includes modelling pluvial / overland flow pathways.
GNR2_OFF_079	Respondent suggested any project model should take into account the resulting erosion along the maintenance strips between the panels caused by the rainwater washing over the edge of the panels. This in turn can speed the rate of discharge as well as reducing the time to peak flow especially if the flow creates channels for the rainwater	No	As outlined in Technical Appendix A9.1: Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy (FRA) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.9.1]**, research outlines that solar panels do not have a significant effect on runoff volumes or peak flows, however where ground beneath panels is bare there may be an increase in peak discharge. Grassland under the PV arrays will act to bind the soil and slow the flow of water from the PV arrays therefore not contributing

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			to or exacerbating existing flooding.
GNR2_OFF_132	Respondent expressed they have not seen anything that would alleviate their worries about flooding in Carlton on Trent to Ossington alongside the B1164.	No	As outlined in Technical Appendix A9.1: Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy (FRA) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.9.1]**, research outlines that solar panels do not have a significant effect on runoff volumes or peak flows, however where ground beneath panels is bare there may be an increase in peak discharge. Grassland under the PV arrays will act to bind the soil and slow the flow of water from the PV arrays therefore not contributing to or exacerbating existing flooding. Following phase one the Applicant has dedicated funding through the NG+ programme for local flood alleviation schemes to protect local villages.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_EF_057	Respondent suggested adjacent land ownership to the Dumble behind Forge Cottage and also tracked access to the Dumble for you to install and for your responsibilities to maintain for the duration are matters to be covered more in detail. Equally the same for the other suggested solutions (one to the side of Forge Cottage, one to the side of the road in the field down from Forge Cottage, towards Kersall and one in the big field to the rear of the Village Hall).	No	Following phase one the Applicant has dedicated funding through the NG+ programme for local flood alleviation schemes to protect local villages, including installation of leaky dams in the Dumbles. These are entirely separate to the Development.
Topic Area: Landscape and Visual			
GNR2_PDF_0001, GNR2_EF_002, GNR2_EF_006, GNR2_EF_007, GNR2_EF_009, GNR2_EF_013, GNR2_L_002, GNR2_L_003, GNR2_L_005, GNR2_L_007, GNR2_L_008, GNR2_L_009, GNR2_L_010, GNR2_L_011, GNR2_L_012, GNR2_L_013, GNR2_L_016, GNR2_L_017, GNR2_L_020, GNR2_L_021,	Respondents expressed concern about the visual impact of the Development. Include any references to "blighting the landscape", industrialisation of the landscape,	No	Visual impacts are an inevitable consequence of solar development at this scale. National planning policy recognises this but also indicates that reductions on the scale of a nationally significant solar farm in order to address landscape and visual effects should only be made in "exceptional

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_L_023, GNR2_EF_018, GNR2_PDFF_0001, GNR2_FF_0005, GNR2_FF_0011, GNR2_FF_0017, GNR2_FF_0021, GNR2_FF_0023, GNR2_FF_0024, GNR2_FF_0028, GNR2_FF_0036, GNR2_FF_0039, GNR2_FF_0040, GNR2_FF_0041, GNR2_FF_0042, GNR2_EF_023, GNR2_EF_026, GNR2_EF_027, GNR2_EF_029, GNR2_EF_032, GNR2_EF_025, GNR2_EF_033, GNR2_EF_034, GNR2_EF_039, GNR2_EF_040, GNR2_EF_042, GNR2_EF_045, GNR2_EF_046, GNR2_EF_047, GNR2_EF_049, GNR2_OFF_001, GNR2_OFF_002, GNR2_OFF_013, GNR2_OFF_014, GNR2_OFF_016, GNR2_OFF_017, GNR2_OFF_018, GNR2_OFF_020, GNR2_OFF_029, GNR2_OFF_031,			circumstances, where mitigation could have a very significant benefit and warrant a small reduction in function." Reductions in the scale of the Development have happened due to the iterations of environmental study and assessment.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_OFF_033, GNR2_OFF_035, GNR2_OFF_037, GNR2_EF_051, GNR2_OFF_040, GNR2_OFF_041, GNR2_OFF_045, GNR2_OFF_048, GNR2_EF_052, GNR2_OFF_053, GNR2_OFF_172, GNR2_OFF_170, GNR2_OFF_164, GNR2_OFF_163, GNR2_OFF_161, GNR2_OFF_159, GNR2_OFF_154, GNR2_OFF_150, GNR2_OFF_054, GNR2_OFF_056, GNR2_OFF_058, GNR2_OFF_059, GNR2_OFF_061, GNR2_OFF_063, GNR2_OFF_067, GNR2_OFF_068, GNR2_OFF_070,			

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_OFF_071, GNR2_OFF_072, GNR2_OFF_075, GNR2_OFF_076, GNR2_OFF_077, GNR2_OFF_078, GNR2_OFF_085, GNR2_OFF_089, GNR2_OFF_094, GNR2_OFF_099, GNR2_OFF_104, GNR2_OFF_105, GNR2_OFF_107, GNR2_OFF_114, GNR2_OFF_118, GNR2_OFF_121, GNR2_OFF_125, GNR2_OFF_126, GNR2_OFF_127, GNR2_OFF_128, GNR2_OFF_130, GNR2_OFF_132, GNR2_OFF_133, GNR2_OFF_135, GNR2_OFF_137,			

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_OFF_142, GNR2_OFF_143, GNR2_OFF_144, GNR2_OFF_146, GNR2_OFF_149,			
GNR2_EF_002, GNR2_EF_006, GNR2_EF_009, GNR2_L_002, GNR2_L_003, GNR2_FF_0028, GNR2_EF_045, GNR2_EF_046, GNR2_EF_047, GNR2_OFF_018, GNR2_OFF_041, GNR2_OFF_060, GNR2_OFF_067, GNR2_OFF_077, GNR2_OFF_094, GNR2_OFF_105,	Respondents expressed concern about visibility of project infrastructure / general support for screening to hide such infrastructure. Include references of installations of batteries, CCTV, technical equipment.	No	CCTV and batteries are no taller than the solar panels and are no more visually apparent. Batteries may be screened by a noise fence as detailed in ES Chapter 12, Noise and Vibration **[EN010162/APP/6.2.12]**.
GNR2_EF_006, GNR2_EF_012, GNR2_EF_034, GNR2_L_003, GNR2_L_008, GNR2_L_009, GNR2_L_013, GNR2_FF_0040, GNR2_EF_048, GNR2_OFF_002, GNR_L_016, GNR2_EF_052, GNR2_OFF_078, GNR2_OFF_102,	Respondents expressed concern about the size of buffer zones. Include any references to the proximity of the Development to residential or commercial buildings, the minimum buffer zone (e.g. 50m), proximity of the	No	Distances from residential properties, landscape features (such as trees and hedges), and the width of footpaths and bridleways have taken account of guidance and best practice. Distances from residential properties (where the panels would be visible) are sufficient to

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	Development to public rights of way (PRoW) and footpaths;		avoid large magnitude impacts on views.
GNR2_FF_0036, GNR2_EF_043, GNR2_EF_048, GNR2_OFF_018, GNR2_OFF_025, GNR2_OFF_163, GNR2_OFF_071, GNR2_OFF_126, GNR2_OFF_128, GNR2_FF_0047,	Respondent expressed that screening hedgerows take years to mature and usually leave acres of plastic tree guards that are not removed.	No	New hedges would be expected to take 7-10 years to mature to the design heights and that is taken account of in assessing the landscape and visual effects. However, in a lot of cases, screening would be provided by existing hedges, either at their current height, or allowed to grow a little taller and where this is the case mitigation will be achieved more rapidly. Removal of tree guards (if used) will be included within the Development maintenance plan. There are 50km of new hedgerows proposed, which is a huge boon to wildlife. The tree guards are proposed to be biodegradable material rather that plastic. Referenced in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_L_016	Respondent expressed that any cabling or panel installation work should only start after tree and hedgerow screenings are completed.	No	This approach would only be used where there is a particular need to achieve more rapid mitigation. Otherwise, there is a risk that cabling and other installation work would damage the recently established planting. No locations have been identified where advance planting would be particularly beneficial.
GNR2_OFF_066	Respondent expressed support for screening of the solar farm on the main road into Bathley Village. by hedging & trees needs to replace current poor hedging as well as new hedging & double hedging as seen on your bridleway examples as it would help to screen the solar farm in winter when the hedges are bare.	Yes	Design changes made to the Development have removed solar panels from this area avoiding flood zones 2 and 3.
GNR2_OFF_094	Respondents suggested hedgerow screening leave space between it and paths to maintain feeling of openness.	No	Footpath corridors will be further detailed within the final design but would not be too narrow.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_L_014, GNR2_L_015, GNR2_L_018, GNR2_L_019, GNR2_OFF_028, GNR2_OFF_101, GNR2_OFF_029, GNR2_OFF_031, GNR2_OFF_036, GNR2_OFF_041, GNR2_OFF_043, GNR2_OFF_061, GNR2_OFF_065, GNR2_OFF_066, GNR2_OFF_083, GNR2_OFF_003, GNR2_OFF_096, GNR2_EF_040, GNR2_EF_044, GNR2_EF_052	Respondents suggested proposed hedgerows on the corner of Trent Lane be put back to the boundaries of the cottages on Ollerton Road.	Yes	Design changes made to the Development have removed solar panels from this area avoiding flood zones 2 and 3.
GNR2_L_014, GNR2_L_015, GNR2_L_018, GNR2_L_019, GNR2_OFF_028, GNR2_OFF_101, GNR2_OFF_029, GNR2_OFF_031, GNR2_OFF_036, GNR2_OFF_041, GNR2_OFF_043,	Respondents suggested an additional area of woodland adjacent to the riparian corridor, Moor House Lane grassland and hedgerow habitats. This would in time create natural screening for upstairs rooms of Moor Lodge Farm.	Yes	Views from upstairs rooms do not require screening, however some additional woodland has been included in this area as part of the mitigation for public views from the village.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_OFF_061, GNR2_OFF_065, GNR2_OFF_066, GNR2_OFF_083, GNR2_OFF_003, GNR2_OFF_096, GNR2_EF_040, GNR2_EF_044, GNR2_EF_052			
GNR2_EF_033, GNR2_OFF_135,	Respondents expressed concern for the visual impact of the Development within High Wood Field (DB029) on nearby homes at Norwell Woodhouse.	Yes	The closest panels have been removed from this area.
GNR2_FF_0028, GNR2_L_012	Respondents expressed concern that DB015 and DB016 are on slightly sloped land and will be visible from local PRoW and the A616.	No	Some visibility from nearby PRoW is unavoidable for a development of this scale and nature. DB015 and DB016 are approximately 1.8km south of the A616. If they are visible over the roadside hedges, effects would be Negligible.
GNR2_OFF_025, GNR2_FF_0047	Respondents expressed that there used to be a swale and wide tree border at the north of DB062 that they would like to see reinstated which would provide a green	Yes	Design changes have been made to remove solar panels from this area due to buried archaeology and to avoid flood zones 2 and 3.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	corridor of at least 50m breadth all the way along the proposed bridleway between Oakfarm and Moorhouse.		
GNR2_FF_0042, GNR2_OFF_048,	Respondents expressed concern for visual impact on Moorhouse village in particular.	Yes	The Proposed Development has been designed such that visibility from Moorhouse would be relatively limited with viewpoint 13 **[EN010162/APP/6.3.7.11.13]** representing the most open public view available. Woodland has been included to screen the most visible part of the development from this location.
GNR2_L_017, GNR2_L_020	Respondents suggested a larger area of natural screening for the western side of DB029 to reduce visibility from residential properties.	Yes	This part of the development is located more than 250m from the properties in question and the Applicant proposes a hedge to provide adequate mitigation.
GNR2_L_017, GNR2_L_020,	Respondents suggested additional screening and expansion of greening site for DB026 in order to mitigate views from Mainwood Farm.	No	There are two hedgerows between Mainwood Farm and this part of the Proposed Development, which is considered adequate mitigation

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			for visual effects on this residential property.
GNR2_OFF_025, GNR2_FF_0047,	Respondents expressed particular concern for visual impacts on Oak Farm (from DB062) and that proposed visual mitigation will not be enough for upstairs rooms.	No	Changes to the design in order to remove panels from flood risk zones 2 and 3 have resulted in removal of solar development from DB062.
GNR2_EF_006	Respondents expressed concern about the visibility of solar panels to the south of Moorhouse (DB031) being visible for 3km to 6km due to the site being on a north facing hill.	Yes	The north facing slope of DB031 has been removed due to the technical inferiority of slope design and reduced output from a north facing parcel of land.
GNR2_EF_006	Respondents suggest not using the field to the south of Moorhouse (DB031) for solar panels due to visibility impacts and proximity to Brookdale Farm.	Yes	Design changes have been made which further set the panels back from this property.
GNR2_EF_052	Respondents suggest a larger buffer zone between Moor House, Moor House Lane, Bathley (NG23 6DX) to increase screening.	Yes	Design changes made to avoid flood risk zones 2 and 3 have in turn removed solar panels from this area.
GNR2_FF_0011	One respondent suggests their opposition to the Development	Yes	Final design changes were made after PEIR, based on further site survey work and consultation

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	would be reduced if field DB061 was not used.		feedback (both statutory and public). This has resulted in the removal of panels, and the reduction of the Order Limits, to reduce environmental effects in this area. There are no longer panels in field DB061. In certain areas mitigation/enhancement land, alongside permissive footpaths were retained.
GNR2_EF_052	Respondents suggest pushing the solar PV back 30 metres along the bridleway between Moor House (NG23 6DX) and Oak Farm (field 24) to increase hedgerow screening.	Yes	Design changes made to avoid flood risk zones 2 and 3 have in turn removed solar panels from this area.
GNR2_L_002	Respondents expressed concern about visual impacts on Caunton Lodge Farm.	Yes	The proposed development is located more than 250m from the house and this is set back along the field edge. With the proposed planting this is considered adequate mitigation.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_L_008	Respondent expressed concern that Knapthorpe will be completely surrounded by panels, and questioned why design adjustments were made to other nearby sites but not Knapthorpe .	No	Most of the potential solar farm development surrounding Knapthorpe arises from Muskham Wood and Knapthorpe Solar Farms proposed by other developers. There would be very limited visibility of the Development from Knapthorpe.
GNR2_EF_039	Respondents expressed concern for the visibility of DB007 from a residential property at Averham Park.	No	The property concerned is beyond the 250m RVAA study area and as such visibility from this home would not be a consideration in the design.
GNR2_FF_0023	Respondents expressed concern for the visual intrusion of the substation near Cromwell Crossing as the district is flat and requested it be screened with planting or by painting it a suitable colour.	Yes	This substation location is now omitted from the Proposed Development as part of the design refinement which reduced the candidate substation locations set out within the PEIR to the final locations.
GNR2_L_011	Respondents expressed particular concern for visual impacts on Moorhouse Road in Egmanton, specifically arising from the site	Yes	A site access is needed on Moor house road and moving it to a new location on the same road would move rather than reduce visual effects. The thin tree belt is

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	access and construction compound within DB032.		proposed to be supplemented with a hedge, which would reduce visibility of the solar arrays in winter.
GNR2_L_011	Respondents suggested evergreen screening alongside Moorhouse Road, Brookdale Farm.	No	Planting mixes will include a percentage of evergreens where appropriate. Fully evergreen planting is however not appropriate to the local landscape character
GNR2_L_011	Respondent requested that LVIA and RVAA be carried out to 1km from the Proposed Development.	No	ES Chapter 7, Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment **[EN010162/APP/6.2.7]** covers a 2km study area as agreed with NSDC and covers all public views - including from the street near homes. Extending the RVAA to 1km would be disproportionate as effects requiring such assessment would not arise at this distance.
GNR2_L_011	respondent expressed that a further area of woodland should be provided in addition to the existing vegetation on the edge of the	Yes	Solar panels have been set back within DB031 to the south of Brookdale Farm, and the area

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	development adjacent to North Wood/Speakers Plantation/Brookdale farm, Moorhouse (DB031)		closest to the house is proposed as wood pasture.
GNR2_EF_045	Respondents expressed concern for the visual impact of the Development from Ossington Airfield towards the Lincolnshire Cliff and Lincoln Cathedral.	No	Lincolnshire Cliff and Cathedral are many kilometres outside the LVIA study area. If the Proposed Development is visible from these locations, any effects would be Negligible.
GNR2_L_009,	Respondents expressed that they are opposed to the planting of natural screening alongside Kneesall Lodge Farm's drive as this would interfere with mains water supply as well. It would be preferable to have screening planted within the hedgerow on the northern edge of field 96.	Yes	The design has been amended to take account of these comments.
GNR2_OFF_037	Respondents suggested more trees for screening purposes along 'the access road' in Eakring as well as current ditches and hedgerows maintained.	No	Existing ditches and hedges will be maintained through the Proposed Development site. Tree planting will be included in mitigation planting along the northern boundaries of solar

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			areas (where they will not shade panels), this would include between the local road northeast of Eakring and the panel areas to the south of the road.
GNR2_OFF_050	Respondent suggested that panels be moved further north from Broadgate Lane in Kelham so as not to obstruct the view from No 1 The Brickyard (NG23 5RY)	Yes	Changes to the design in order to remove panels from flood risk zones 2 and 3 have in turn removed solar development from this area.
GNR2_OFF_053,	Respondent expressed particular concern about the visual impacts on the historic village of Laxton and its unique open field system.	No	The Proposed Development would be distantly visible from the historic field system but would not directly affect it.
GNR2_OFF_077	Respondents expressed concern that Ossington Airfield (DB030) has a natural open landscape, and trees and hedgerow screening will ruin this.	No	Ossington airfield is open, but this is a result of clearance for the airfield, not 'natural' and is atypical of the local landscape character which is more vegetated.
GNR2_OFF_105	Respondent expressed that with implementation of screening hedgerows in Sutton on Trent (around DB035-DB043 and occasionally around DB044-	No	Double-hedged routes are already relatively common in this area and views from roads and rights of way are relatively infrequent. Some of the more

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	DB050) vision will be tunnelled into the path in front, as opposed to the vast landscape.		open views will be enclosed, however others will not.
GNR2_OFF_118	Respondent expressed that west part of the site installations close to Eakring, is visible from Eakring Village houses and Kirklington Road, Triumph Lane and Back Lane and that that panels should be removed from the south west corner OS Grid Ref: SK 679 619 back to the public footpath at SK 681 620 and retain that path instead of closing it.	No	Visibility from the named locations in Eakring would be unlikely to arise (except perhaps from some upstairs windows). The extent of solar panels at the identified corner of DB 015 has been reduced for other design reasons, but not as far as suggested. The footpath closure is retained as the provision of an alternative route around the solar area is not needed given the retained north-south footpath nearby to the west.
GNR2_OFF_131	Respondents expressed general concern about visibility in Averham Park and requested widened footpaths and increasing screening.	No	Footpath corridors are designed not to be too narrow. The proposed hedgerow planting will largely screen solar panels in this area except from some stretches of footpath where there are views into fields on higher ground. Such

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			visibility cannot be readily screened.
GNR2_EF_064	Respondent expressed that parcel DB033 adjacent to the A1 by the bridge, is shown as "proposed grassland (PV areas) – species diverse" but as it is currently a concrete pad about 0.5m thick it will be difficult to establish any grass area without ripping up all the concrete. Once the Development is built and operating it would be preferable for the respondent if it was still an area, they can make use of for storage and not turned into a grass area, as long as it does not block access etc.	No	This is noted, and has been amended in the application, so that it remains hardstanding for use by the landowner and the Applicant.
GNR2_OFF_135	Respondent suggested DB029 have panels removed and instead woodland extended with native trees and pathways.	Yes	Part of DB029 (the area closest to Norwell Woodhouse) would no longer include solar panels.
GNR2_OFF_105	Respondent suggested that DB043 could be altered to incorporate a few extra green spaces; Squaring	No	Solar arrays on DB043 would be largely screened by the existing hedge in this area and the

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	off the west side of the field to a straight line rather than having the two jutting-out parts would reducing the tunnelling impact of this path in that area.		suggested squaring off would not provide further mitigation for users of the bridleway.
Topic Area: Noise and Vibration			
GNR2_EF_006, GNR2_L_003, GNR2_L_006, GNR2_L_008, GNR2_L_009, GNR2_L_011, GNR2_L_013, GNR2_L_016, GNR2_L_017, GNR2_L_020, GNR2_L_023, GNR2_EF_034, GNR2_FF_0028, GNR2_FF_0040, GNR2_EF_034, GNR2_EF_042, GNR2_EF_045, GNR2_EF_048, GNR2_OFF_003, GNR2_OFF_016, GNR2_OFF_020, GNR2_OFF_024, GNR2_OFF_025, GNR2_OFF_053, GNR2_OFF_059, GNR2_OFF_060, GNR2_OFF_063, GNR2_OFF_068,	Respondents express concern that the Development will be noisy. Some respondents specified during the construction period. Some respondents specified concerns about noise near bridleways and PRoW.	No	Potential noise effects are assessed in ES Chapter 12, Noise and Vibration **[EN010162/APP/6.2.12]**. The oCEMP (Technical Appendix A5.3: Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.3]**) provides details of mitigation which can be implemented minimise noise and vibration during construction activities. PRoW and bridleways are not considered to be noise sensitive receptors as their use by the public is transitory, and as such these receptors will not be subject to the long-term noise exposure

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_OFF_072, GNR2_OFF_076, GNR2_OFF_078, GNR2_OFF_088, GNR2_OFF_128, GNR2_OFF_132, GNR2_FF_0047, GNR2_EF_060			that would result in health impacts.
GNR2_L_003, GNR2_L_017, GNR2_L_020, GNR2_OFF_053	Respondents expressed the Noise Risk Assessment for the activities is made available to include the mitigation and constraints placed on the construction activity with regard to third party exposure, including wildlife.	No	The impact of noise and vibration on wildlife is presented in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**
GNR2_EF_042, GNR2_L_009, GNR2_L_011, GNR2_OFF_088	Respondents expressed concern for vibrational impact.	No	Potential vibration effects are assessed in ES Chapter 12, Noise and Vibration **[EN010162/APP/6.2.12]**. The oCEMP (Technical Appendix A5.3: Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.3]**) provides details of mitigation to minimise noise and vibration during construction activities.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_OFF_025, GNR2_FF_0047	Respondent expressed noisy equipment/converters are not clearly depicted on project material.	No	Details of noise emitting equipment is presented in ES Chapter 12, Noise and Vibration **[EN010162/APP/6.2.12]**. Location of noise emission equipment is shown on illustrative design.
GNR2_OFF_132	One respondent expressed that noise data is based on perfectly smooth roads which doesn't take into account the state of roads near their property.	No	Baseline measurements were undertaken at a number of locations around the development. Measurements therefore reflect the condition of roads at the time of the survey.
GNR2_EF_006	One respondent expressed concern for potential noise impacts in Moorhouse.	No	Potential noise effects at Moorhouse are assessed as part of in ES Chapter 12, Noise and Vibration **[EN010162/APP/6.2.12]**.
GNR2_FF_0028	One respondent expressed that noise and vibration will be particularly disruptive for St Andrews church where they enjoy quiet contemplation.	No	The impact of noise and vibration has been undertaken at the closest noise sensitive receptors, in agreement with the environmental health officer at NSDC. On the basis that noise is acceptable at these locations, it

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			will also be acceptable at receptors further from the Development, including St Andrews Church.
GNR2_L_011	One respondent expressed that noise impact assessments were not adequate for Hagg Lane, Egmanton.	No	Noise impact assessment as detailed in ES Chapter 12, Noise and Vibration **[EN010162/APP/6.2.12]** has been undertaken in line with relevant British Standards, and in consultation with the environmental health department at NSDC.
Topic Area: Site Selection and Alternatives			
GNR2_EF_007, GNR2_EF_021, GNR2_L_003, GNR2_L_007, GNR2_L_008, GNR2_L_011, GNR2_L_012, GNR2_L_013, GNR2_L_014, GNR2_L_015, GNR2_L_018, GNR2_L_019, GNR2_L_022, GNR2_L_023, GNR2_PDFF_0001, GNR2_FF_0005, GNR2_FF_0006, GNR2_FF_0021, GNR2_FF_0028, GNR2_FF_0040, GNR2_EF_027,	Respondents believe solar projects should be installed on residential rooftops, next to motorways etc. One respondent suggested National Grid deploy solar on its buildings and car parks first.	No	A large proportion of the 17.1GW of installed solar PV in the UK today is made up of solar farms, the UK simply cannot reach net-zero targets of 47GW of PV without ground mounted solar. The Applicant encourages roof-mounted solar and heat pumps hence our energy efficiency grant scheme for local residents.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_EF_028, GNR2_EF_029, GNR2_EF_040, GNR2_EF_042, GNR2_EF_045, GNR2_OFF_013, GNR2_OFF_016, GNR2_OFF_020, GNR2_OFF_025, GNR2_OFF_037, GNR2_OFF_040, GNR2_OFF_045, GNR2_EF_054, GNR2_OFF_164, GNR2_OFF_160, GNR2_OFF_159, GNR2_OFF_158, GNR2_OFF_155, GNR2_OFF_152, GNR2_OFF_056, GNR2_OFF_062, GNR2_OFF_063, GNR2_OFF_064, GNR2_OFF_071, GNR2_OFF_072, GNR2_OFF_078, GNR2_OFF_085, GNR2_OFF_087, GNR2_OFF_028,			National Grid have climate change targets, which involve decarbonisation of their operations and assets. National Grid decarbonisation is outside of the Development's remit.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_OFF_101, GNR2_OFF_029, GNR2_OFF_031, GNR2_OFF_036, GNR2_OFF_041, GNR2_OFF_043, GNR2_OFF_061, GNR2_OFF_065, GNR2_OFF_066, GNR2_OFF_083, GNR2_OFF_003, GNR2_OFF_096, GNR2_EF_044, GNR2_EF_052, GNR2_OFF_092, GNR2_OFF_093, GNR2_OFF_094, GNR2_OFF_099, GNR2_OFF_105, GNR2_OFF_121, GNR2_OFF_125, GNR2_OFF_126, GNR2_OFF_127, GNR2_OFF_132, GNR2_OFF_146, GNR2_OFF_147,			

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_OFF_148, GNR2_FF_0047, GNR2_FF_0048			
GNR2_PDFF_0001, GNR2_EF_020, GNR2_EF_026, GNR2_EF_030, GNR2_EF_049, GNR2_L_008, GNR2_L_014, GNR2_L_015, GNR2_L_018, GNR2_L_019, GNR2_L_023, GNR2_OFF_001, GNR2_OFF_016, GNR2_OFF_017, GNR2_OFF_020, GNR2_OFF_028, GNR2_OFF_042, GNR2_OFF_046, GNR2_OFF_160, GNR2_OFF_159, GNR2_OFF_062, GNR2_OFF_101, GNR2_OFF_029, GNR2_OFF_031, GNR2_OFF_036, GNR2_OFF_041, GNR2_OFF_043, GNR2_OFF_061,	Respondents believe other forms of renewable energy generation would be more effective. I.e. nuclear, wind energy, hydropower. Some respondents expressed objection to the use of ground mounted solar panels in particular as other renewable energy generation forms could be more efficient.	No	Other forms of energy generation have been investigated at this location. This is considered in ES Chapter 4, Site Selection and Design **[EN010162/APP/6.2.4]**, Section 4.2 Alternatives to the Development.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_OFF_065, GNR2_OFF_066, GNR2_OFF_083, GNR2_OFF_003, GNR2_OFF_096, GNR2_EF_040, GNR2_EF_044, GNR2_EF_052, GNR2_OFF_126			
GNR2_PDFF_0001, GNR2_EF_032, GNR2_L_012, GNR2_OFF_022, GNR2_OFF_025, GNR2_OFF_033, GNR2_OFF_036, GNR2_OFF_040, GNR2_OFF_088, GNR2_OFF_102, GNR2_OFF_105, GNR2_OFF_149, GNR2_FF_0047	Respondents expressed an opinion that site is unsuitable. One respondent expressed they are opposed to the locating of such projects near businesses. One respondent expressed general concern about field fragmentation.	No	The site suitability, site selection and design methodology is set out in ES Chapter 4, Site Selection and Design **[EN010162/APP/6.2.4]**. We have considered various land uses as part of the site selection and the design evolution. ES Chapter 13, Socio-Economics and Tourism **[EN010162/APP/6.2.13]** considers in further detail the effects on local businesses.
GNR2_PDF_0001, GNR2_EF_001, GNR2_EF_043	Respondents believe classification of land is wrong. i.e. brownfield or industrial	No	Most of the land used by the Development is classified as greenfield, not brownfield/industrial (ES Chapter

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			17, Agricultural Land **[EN010162/APP/6.2.17]**.
GNR2_OFF_025, GNR2_FF_0047	Respondent expresses Nottinghamshire was chosen because of its low socio-economic status and that home counties or prosperous areas would not have been chosen for such a project.	No	The site was chosen because of the availability of the grid connection at Staythorpe National Grid Substation as outlined in ES Chapter 4, Site Selection and Design **[EN010162/APP/6.2.4]**. Electricity infrastructure in the Trent corridor arose because of the coal mining history of the area leading to coal fired power stations. This Development carries the benefit of using this existing electrical infrastructure for its connection.
GNR2_EF_038, GNR2_L_016	Respondents expressed concern for the cable route in proximity to residential properties.	No	Potential effects from the buried cables are assessed in the ES in multiple chapters: Chapter 12, Noise and Vibration, Section 12.4 **[EN010162/APP/6.2.12]** -Chapter 16, Miscellaneous Issues, Air Quality, Section 16.2,

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			Electromagnetic Fields, Section 16.6 **[EN010162/APP/6.2.16]**.
GNR2_OFF_125	One respondent expressed that incentivising rooftop solar would benefit the wider public and undermine vast profits of large corporations.	No	Solar Farms generate low-cost electricity which benefits the wider public by contributing to reduced wholesale power prices and reducing reliance on importing electricity, whilst creating energy security.
GNR2_FF_0036	One respondent requested the total panel area be reduced by one third and area widened to increase the space between panels and homes as well as to make fields appear less crowded.	No	Generally, the opposite approach has been taken, to maximise generation from each field whilst minimising environmental effects and land take, as set out in ES Chapter 4, Site Selection and Design **[EN010162/APP/6.2.4]**
GNR2_FF_0019	One respondent expressed they would have liked to have been considered to house panels on their farmland.	No	As set out in ES Chapter 4, Site Selection and Design **[EN010162/APP/6.2.4]**, all land was considered, but not all land was potentially suitable (for a range of reasons), which is likely why the respondent wasn't approached.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_OFF_105	One respondent acknowledged that site benefits from road connectivity and national grid connection.	No	Noted.
GNR2_L_017, GNR2_L_020	Respondents suggested moving panels back from Mainwood Farm	Yes	The nearest panels to Mainwood Farm are now c. 100m.
GNR2_L_017, GNR2_L_020	Respondents expressed that DB027 be moved completely as they are too close and mostly in shade, therefore not efficient.	No	The illustrative design (ES Figure 5.3 **[EN010162/APP/6.3.5.3]**) takes account of potential shading of panels from trees and shows that the large majority of fields in this area remain effective for solar panels. The nearest panels are c. 225 m to the north of the nearest property.
GNR2_EF_041	One respondent suggested the use of a new gas reserve 20 miles away as an alternative.	No	This is not a low carbon alternative. Therefore, it does not align with the UK Government's Clean Power 2030 plan.
GNR2_EF_045	One respondent suggested siting the BESS nearer to the wind turbines towards Carlton.	No	As set out in ES Chapter 4, Site Selection and Design **[EN010162/APP/6.2.4]**, the BESS location was carefully considered in environmental and technical terms.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_FF_0023	One respondent expressed support for the relocation of arrays further back from the boundary of the Newlands on Norwell Lane.	Yes	Final design changes were made after PEIR, based on further site survey work and consultation feedback (both statutory and public). This has resulted in the removal of panels, and the reduction of the Order Limits, to reduce environmental effects in this area. In certain areas mitigation/enhancement land, alongside permissive footpaths were retained.
GNR2_EF_048	One respondent suggests the reduction of sites DB013 and DB014.	No	These fields were considered in ES Chapter 7, Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment **[EN010162/APP/6.2.7]** and no significant environmental effects were determined with the inclusion of these fields.
GNR2_L_010	One respondent expressed that a substation located in Cromwell would be less of a disruption than other options.	Yes	This comment is noted. The locations for the substations are based on environmental considerations and electrical

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			design requirements. This has led to only four areas for intermediate substations required for the Development.
GNR2_L_008	One respondent expressed that panels near Knapthorpe Manor should be removed completely.	No	ES Chapter 7, Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment **[EN010162/APP/6.2.7]** concluded no significant environmental effects on Knapthorpe Manor, particularly given the panels are more than 250m away
GNR2_L_009	One respondent expressed that even though they welcome plans to move panels away from Kneesall Lodge, they would like to see panels removed from northeast land parcel of field 97 and if this requires re-location to investigate panel deployment on the south of field 233.	Yes	All panels have been removed from field 97.
GNR2_EF_048	One respondent suggests setting back fencing and panels 50 metres on sites DB013 and DB014.	Yes	There will be substantial setbacks of panels from recreational routes, as set out in ES Chapter 18, Recreation **[EN010162/APP/6.2.18]**.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			Typically, these would be less than 50 m, but with hedge planting in between.
GNR2_L_003	One respondent express that installations on following fields should be relocated: fields 5, 13, 37, 82, 93, 109, 142,153, 154, 577.	Yes	Panels have been removed from fields 577 due to its technical inferiority as a north facing slope, and from the north facing slope of 154. Fields 13, 37, 82, 92, 109, 142 and 153 have been deemed suitable having been considered in ES Chapter 7, Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment **[EN010162/APP/6.2.7].**
GNR2_EF_064	Respondent expressed that parcel DB033 adjacent to the A1 by the bridge, is shown as "proposed grassland (PV areas) – species diverse" but as it is currently a concrete pad about 0.5m thick it will be difficult to establish any grass area without ripping up all the concrete. Once the Development is built and operating it would be preferable for the respondent if it was still an area,	Yes	This is noted, and has been amended in the application, so that it remains hardstanding for use by the landowner and the Applicant.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	they can make use of for storage and not turned into a grass area, as long as it does not block access etc.		
GNR2_EF_027, GNR2_EF_028, GNR2_EF_032, GNR2_EF_025, GNR2_EF_035, GNR2_EF_043, GNR2_EF_045, GNR2_L_006, GNR2_L_007, GNR2_L_021, GNR2_EF_054, GNR2_OFF_045, GNR2_OFF_077, GNR2_OFF_106	Respondents expressed objection to the use of Ossington Airfield (DB030) is a site for solar panels.	No	Former airfields are a positive and common location for solar development as they are by nature large expanses of flat land, which allows for more straightforward visual screening to take place and efficient design.
GNR2_L_007, GNR2_FF_0041	Respondents expressed that Ossington airfield infrastructure and facilities should remain intact.	No	There are no proposals to remove infrastructure and facilities at the airfield. The area proposed for solar PV is agricultural land.
GNR2_EF_043	One respondent expressed objection for the use of land beside Ossington Airfield for a public footpath and car park.	No	The proposed permissive path links existing paths to form an improved off-road walking route. There are no carparks proposed here, other than within compounds during construction and decommissioning. Updates to proposals are set out in ES Figure 5.2, Masterplan **[EN010162/APP/6.3.5.2]**

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_L_007	One respondent acknowledge that panels along northern boundary of Ossington Airfield is limited to a strip only.	No	Noted.
GNR2_FF_0040, GNR2_L_013, GNR2_OFF_078	Respondent expressed opposition to DB053 in particular.	Yes	Final design changes were made after PEIR, based on further site survey work and consultation feedback (both statutory and public). This has resulted in the removal of panels from DB053, and the reduction of the Order Limits, to reduce environmental effects in this area. In certain areas mitigation/enhancement land, alongside permissive footpaths were retained
GNR2_OFF_030, GNR2_OFF_064	Respondent expressed concern that as a horse owner in Kelham, installation of panels between Broadgate Lane, Ollerton Road and Trent Lane will cause disruption.	No	It is not clear which routes are referred to as Ollerton Road and Trent Lane. No panels are proposed either side of Broadgate Lane. The nearest panels are proposed in DB006 as shown on the masterplan, ES Figure 5.2

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			[EN010162/APP/6.3.5.2]. The only disruption is expected as a result of construction traffic, which would be managed via the Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP), provided as Technical Appendix A5.2: Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.2].**
GNR2_EF_061, GNR2_EF_062	Respondents expressed particular concern about panel installations on Highwood Field.	Yes	Panels have been excluded from fields 578 and 137 to the south of High Wood but remain in field 136 to the west of High Wood.
GNR2_L_002	One respondent opposes placement of panels on the field directly south of Caunton Lodge Farm.	No	The landscape and visual impact, and residential amenity impact, are assessed in ES Chapter 7, Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment **[EN010162/APP/6.2.7].**
GNR2_FF_0019	One respondent expressed that moving or the re-routing of paths near block 159 & 534 would be a big issue.	Yes	The changes proposed in this area are consistent with the general approach of avoiding routes running between areas proposed for solar PV, instead re-routing around the edge. In many

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			cases, this allows improvement of the surface of the path from ploughed arable soil/mud.
GNR2_EF_033	One respondent expressed opposition to the use of High Wood field.	Yes	Panels have been excluded from field 578 to the south of High Wood but remain in fields 136 and 137 to the west and southwest of High Wood.
GNR2_FF_0021	One respondent expressed that land parcels DB008 & DB007 are in shade most of the day.	No	The illustrative design (ES Figure 5.3 **[EN010162/APP/6.3.5.3]**) takes account of potential shading of panels from trees and shows that the large majority of fields in this area remain effective for solar panels.
GNR2_FF_0042	One respondent objected to panels next to Moorhouse village in particular.	No	The nearest panels to Moorhouse village itself are proposed 500 m south of Moorhouse, behind a tree belt.
GNR2_EF_045	One respondent expressed site DB041 is unsuitable for the BESS.	No	Area DB041 is not proposed for BESS. The only BESS proposed is proposed west of Kelham and northwest of Averham.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_EF_048	One respondent expressed concern for the proximity of solar sites to Maplebeck.	No	Solar PV areas near Maplebeck have been deliberately kept out of views from the village itself and are a minimum of 240 m from the nearest property, behind existing trees and behind a proposed thick woodland belt.
GNR2_OFF_005	One respondent expressed they are opposed to the visitor hub because it should not be on Crow Lane.	Yes	There is no longer a proposed visitor hub on Crow Lane, South Muskham. Final design changes were made after PEIR, based on further site survey work and consultation feedback. This has resulted in the removal of panels from this area, and the reduction of the Order Limits, to reduce environmental effects. In certain areas mitigation/enhancement land, alongside permissive footpaths were retained.
GNR2_OFF_163	One respondent expressed concern for the design changes from phase one to phase two now	No	These development areas are north of Averham Park Farm. Effects of these development

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	including solar near their property (work areas 49, 50, 39).		areas are assessed in the ES, and their inclusion followed a site selection process that considered environmental (including residential) constraints.
GNF2_OFF_163	One respondent expressed concern for safety and access to their property with solar work areas 36, 39, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53 in close proximity.	No	Construction traffic will be managed through a Construction Traffic Management Plan, an outline of which is included as Technical Appendix A5.2: Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.2]**, to minimise risks to safety.
GNR2_OFF_105	One respondent expressed that the accumulation of such schemes in Sutton on Trent is causing opposition to such projects to grow.	No	Noted.
GNR2_OFF_105	One respondent expressed that DB035 should have no panels and utilised for biodiversity. As well as connecting bridleways and paths could boost amenity.	No	Effects of these fields are assessed in the ES, and their inclusion followed a site selection process that considered environmental (including residential) constraints.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_OFF_105	One respondent suggested decreasing the field size of DB040.	No	The reason for this is not stated, and alternative locations were not identified in the ES Chapter 7, Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment **[EN010162/APP/6.2.7]**.
GNR2_OFF_135	One respondent expressed opposition to DB029, fields in front of High Wood.	No	The panels are a minimum of 300 m from the closest property Laxton Lodge. The ES Chapter 7, Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment **[EN010162/APP/6.2.7]** addresses such effects and appropriate setoff distances.
GNR2_EF_060	One respondent expressed Area 147 should not be used at all in the future.	Yes	Final design changes were made after PEIR, based on further site survey work and consultation feedback (both statutory and public). This has resulted in the removal of panels, and the reduction of the Order Limits, to reduce environmental effects in this area.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			There are no longer panels in field 147. In certain areas mitigation/enhancement land, alongside permissive footpaths were retained.
GNR2_EF_060	One respondent expressed access to Area 147 should be maintained for dog walking etc.	Yes	Final design changes were made after PEIR, based on further site survey work and consultation feedback (both statutory and public). This has resulted in the removal of panels, and the reduction of the Order Limits, to reduce environmental effects in this area. There are no longer panels in field 147
Topic Area: Recreation and Socio-Economics			
GNR2_EF_006, GNR2_EF_020, GNR2_EF_034, GNR2_FF_0009, GNR2_FF_0024, GNR2_FF_0040, GNR2_FF_0041, GNR2_EF_042, GNR2_L_011, GNR2_L_013, GNR2_L_014, GNR2_L_015, GNR2_L_018, GNR2_L_019,	Respondents expressed concerns about knock-on effects on housing. i.e. rising house prices, future housing developments.	No	Housing was scoped out of the Socio-Economic Assessment as there is no clear evidence of an effect on residential property values from solar Projects in the UK.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_OFF_012, GNR2_OFF_016, GNR2_OFF_020, GNR2_OFF_025, GNR2_OFF_028, GNR2_OFF_048, GNR2_OFF_161, GNR2_OFF_155, GNR2_OFF_063, GNR2_OFF_067, GNR2_OFF_068, GNR2_OFF_078, GNR2_OFF_101, GNR2_OFF_029, GNR2_OFF_031, GNR2_OFF_036, GNR2_OFF_041, GNR2_OFF_043, GNR2_OFF_061, GNR2_OFF_065, GNR2_OFF_066, GNR2_OFF_083, GNR2_OFF_003, GNR2_OFF_096, GNR2_EF_040, GNR2_EF_044, GNR2_EF_052,			The value of individual properties is not, in any case, a material planning consideration.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_OFF_088, GNR2_OFF_099, GNR2_OFF_104, GNR2_OFF_114, GNR2_OFF_125, GNR2_OFF_142, GNR2_FF_0047			
GNR2_EF_032, GNR2_FF_0024, GNR2_FF_0028, GNR2_FF_0036, GNR2_EF_043, GNR2_L_012, GNR2_L_014, GNR2_L_015, GNR2_L_017, GNR2_L_018, GNR2_L_019, GNR2_L_020, GNR2_L_021, GNR2_EF_049, GNR2_OFF_018, GNR2_OFF_028, GNR2_OFF_035, GNR2_OFF_045, GNR2_OFF_048, GNR2_EF_054, GNR2_OFF_059, GNR2_OFF_068, GNR2_OFF_076, GNR2_OFF_101, GNR2_OFF_029, GNR2_OFF_031, GNR2_OFF_036,	Respondents believe recreation and amenity is aesthetically worsened by sight of solar panels near villages. Include any references regarding new footpaths and trails for recreation purposes, as well as any references to project blocking countryside access.	No	32 km of new route will be created within the Development, enhancing the overall connectivity of the area, particularly between neighbouring villages. Certain routes are a distance away from solar PV areas and will not be impacted by views of panels. Where routes run adjacent to solar panels, a minimum corridor of 10 m will be in place between the fence line for any existing or new recreational route. The fence line will have a minimum offset of 3 m from solar panels, more typically 5 m, further distancing routes from panels. New and existing hedgerows will be

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_OFF_041, GNR2_OFF_043, GNR2_OFF_061, GNR2_OFF_065, GNR2_OFF_066, GNR2_OFF_083, GNR2_OFF_003, GNR2_OFF_096, GNR2_EF_040, GNR2_EF_044, GNR2_EF_052, GNR2_OFF_088, GNR2_OFF_132			maintained at approximately 2.5 m, with new trees incorporated throughout where appropriate, screening views of panels from the route. Impacts on recreational routes are assessed fully with Chapter 18: Recreation **[EN010162/APP/6.2.18]**
GNR2_EF_022, GNR2_EF_029, GNR2_EF_031, GNR2_L_007, GNR2_EF_025, GNR2_EF_035, GNR2_EF_036, GNR2_FF_0028, GNR2_FF_0041, GNR2_FF_0042, GNR2_EF_042, GNR2_L_011, GNR2_L_012, GNR2_L_016, GNR2_EF_045, GNR2_OFF_001, GNR2_OFF_002, GNR2_OFF_003, GNR2_OFF_030, GNR2_OFF_033, GNR2_OFF_035, GNR2_OFF_037, GNR2_EF_051, GNR2_OFF_0171,	Respondents worried that use of main roads for leisure purposes would be hindered. Include references to transportation of animals, recreational horse-riding, hiking groups etc. Some respondents expressed concern about the impact of construction on bridleways and their use of these routes with horses/other animals. Some respondents expressed concern that dog walking and	No	32 km of new permissive routes will be new off-road options to enhance the recreational amenity and safety of the network. Impacts on roads from construction, operation, and decommissioning traffic are assessed fully within ES Chapter 14, Traffic and Transport **[EN010162/APP/6.2.14]**. All recreational routes, including bridleways, will be managed throughout construction to ensure the safety of users. For those

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_OFF_159, GNR2_OFF_152, GNR2_OFF_055, GNR2_OFF_064, GNR2_OFF_065, GNR2_OFF_068, GNR2_OFF_073, GNR2_OFF_076, GNR2_OFF_077, GNR2_OFF_084, GNR2_OFF_094, GNR2_OFF_100, GNR2_OFF_105, GNR2_OFF_110, GNR2_OFF_118, GNR2_OFF_126, GNR2_OFF_127, GNR2_FF_0047	walking activities will be affected negatively.		which are directly impacted by construction activities, diversions and temporary closures will be put in place to ensure this. 32km of new permissive routes will be created within the Development, enhancing the overall connectivity of the area, particularly between neighbouring villages, and improving the overall recreational amenity for users. Within ES Chapter 14, Transport and Access **[EN010162/APP/6.2.14]** horse riders are considered as non-motorised users within the assessment – which includes delay, user amenity, and fear and intimidation. The ES chapter notes the presence of stables, liveries, and grazing areas, particularly near Caunton and Bathley, and Averham Park Farm.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_FF_0013, GNR2_FF_0017, GNR2_FF_0022, GNR2_FF_0023, GNR2_FF_0024, GNR2_FF_0035, GNR2_PDFF_0003, GNR2_EF_014, GNR2_EF_017, GNR2_OFF_002, GNR2_OFF_003, GNR2_OFF_016, GNR2_OFF_024, GNR2_OFF_024, GNR2_OFF_025, GNR2_EF_052, GNR2_OFF_041, GNR2_OFF_043, GNR2_OFF_044, GNR2_OFF_050, GNR2_OFF_058, GNR2_OFF_065, GNR2_OFF_081, GNR2_OFF_090, GNR2_OFF_096, GNR2_OFF_105, GNR2_OFF_110, GNR2_OFF_118, GNR2_OFF_121, GNR2_OFF_122, GNR2_FF_0047	Respondents expressed general support for cycle route, permissive footpath, and bridleway proposals (including circular route). Some respondents specified near Sutton on Trent, Bathley. One respondent expressed safe bridleways through ecological areas will promote understanding and education.	No	Noted.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_FF_0040, GNR2_L_010, GNR2_L_013, GNR2_L_017, GNR2_L_020, GNR2_EF_032, GNR2_EF_048, GNR2_OFF_078, GNR2_OFF_114, GNR2_OFF_125, GNR2_OFF_128	Respondents expressed any new footpaths paths may be a security and antisocial threat. Some respondent expressed concern there may be horse theft, breaking, entering with increase in signage and antisocial behaviour, fly tipping, cable theft.	Yes	A number of features, including small car parks and a visitor hub, have been removed from the proposal due to feedback from local residents regarding the potential for anti-social behaviours. A Community Liaison Officer will be available as a primary contact for any questions or complaints, including those listed, during the construction, operation, and decommissioning phases of the Development. See oEMP Roles and Responsibilities **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.5.1]**
GNR2_EF_032, GNR2_EF_025, GNR2_EF_035, GNR2_EF_045, GNR2_OFF_025, GNR2_OFF_056, GNR2_OFF_088, GNR2_OFF_114, GNR2_OFF_128, GNR2_FF_0047	Respondents express concern for the Development impacting the local/rural economy and tourism negatively.	No	Impacts on the visitor economy are assessed in detail within the Chapter 13: Socio-Economic, of the ES **[EN010162/APP/6.2.13]**.
GNR2_FF_0040, GNR2_L_013, GNR2_OFF_003,	Respondent expressed safety concerns for their horses who	No	32km of new permissive routes will be created to enhance the

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_OFF_060, GNR2_OFF_078, GNR2_OFF_127	graze/ride on proposed locations and may be startled.		recreational amenity and safety of the network. Impacts on roads from construction, operation, and decommissioning traffic are assessed fully within ES Chapter 14, Traffic and Transport **[EN010162/APP/6.2.14]**. All recreational routes, including bridleways, will be managed throughout construction to ensure the safety of users. For those which are directly impacted by construction activities, diversions and temporary closures will be put in place to ensure this. Within ES Chapter 14, horse riders are considered as non-motorised users within the assessment – which includes delay, user amenity, and fear and intimidation. The ES chapter notes the presence of stables, liveries, and grazing areas,

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			particularly near Caunton and Bathley, and Averham Park Farm.
GNR2_EF_032, GNR2_EF_025, GNR2_FF_0028, GNR2_EF_043, GNR2_EF_045	Respondents were concerned that any lack of access to countryside could damage community wellbeing and/or mental health.	No	The Development will not negatively impact access to the countryside or recreational routes. 32 km of new permissive routes will be created within the Development, enhancing the overall connectivity and recreational amenity of the area. Where construction activities intersect with routes, these works would be of very short duration and would be managed such that the route remained open, with a very localised diversion when works are occurring on the route. To avoid disruption, diversions that will be in place throughout operation will be in instated prior to the closure of the original route. Only one PRoW will be temporarily closed during part of the construction phase and part

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			of the decommissioning phase, NT|Weston|BW8.
GNR2_EF_058, GNR2_EF_059	Respondent expressed opposition to public access plans. One specified in Maplebeck estate.	Yes	The recreation routes have been adjusted in partnership with local landowners to address their concerns, while also improving connectivity and enhancing recreational amenity of the network.
GNR2_FF_0025	One respondent expressed concern that wheelchair users may not be catered for.	No	The appointed contractor would need to comply with the legal disabled access requirements as a matter of course
GNR2_EF_037	One respondent supports Fig.18.3 PR3 proposal.	No	Noted.
GNR2_OFF_089	One respondent expresses opposition to the visitor centre because it will increase criminal activity.	Yes	A number of features, including small car parks and a visitor hub, have been removed from the proposal due to feedback from local residents regarding the potential for anti-social behaviours.
GNR2_EF_045	One respondent expressed the circular long-distance route	No	The proposed circular long-distance route will add 32 km of

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	proposed is unsuitable due to lack of recreational amenity.		new route to the network and provide additional connectivity, particularly to the north-west where existing routes are limited between Ossington, Norwell Woodhouse, and Kersall. Parts of the route are set away from solar PV areas and will not be impacted by views of panels. Where routes run adjacent to solar panels, a minimum corridor of 10 m will be in place between the fence line for any existing or new recreational route. The fence line will have a minimum offset of 3 m from solar panels, more typically 5 m, further distancing routes from panels. New and existing hedgerows will be maintained at approximately 2.5 m, with new trees incorporated throughout where appropriate, screening views of panels from the route.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_L_014, GNR2_L_015, GNR2_L_018, GNR2_L_019, GNR2_OFF_028, GNR2_OFF_101, GNR2_OFF_029, GNR2_OFF_031, GNR2_OFF_036, GNR2_OFF_041, GNR2_OFF_043, GNR2_OFF_061, GNR2_OFF_065, GNR2_OFF_066, GNR2_OFF_083, GNR2_OFF_003, GNR2_OFF_096, GNR2_EF_040, GNR2_EF_044, GNR2_EF_052	One respondent suggested safe access points for horse riders on Ollerton Road and Trent Lane.	Yes	7 new bridleways have been created across the Development to increase safety and amenity for horse riders. The outline recreational routes management plan (RRMP) is found in Technical Appendix A18.1: Outline Recreational Routes Management Plan **[EN010162/APP/6.4.18.1].**
GNR2_L_014, GNR2_L_015, GNR2_L_018, GNR2_L_019, GNR2_OFF_028, GNR2_OFF_101, GNR2_OFF_029, GNR2_OFF_031, GNR2_OFF_036, GNR2_OFF_041, GNR2_OFF_043,	One respondent suggested the stretch along the western side of Moorhouse Dyke LWS as an access addition to the route, as it would provide additional recreational opportunities.	Yes	27 new permissive paths have been created across the Development to increase and amenity. The outline recreational routes management plan (RRMP) is found in Technical Appendix A18.1: Outline Recreational Routes Management Plan **[EN010162/APP/6.4.18.1].**

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_OFF_061, GNR2_OFF_065, GNR2_OFF_066, GNR2_OFF_083, GNR2_OFF_003, GNR2_OFF_096, GNR2_EF_040, GNR2_EF_044, GNR2_EF_052			
GNR2_FF_0010, GNR2_OFF_025, GNR2_OFF_027, GNR2_OFF_030, GNR2_OFF_064, GNR2_OFF_081, GNR2_OFF_105, GNR2_FF_0047	One respondent expressed wherever possible existing walkways/bridleways should be maintained and improved. One respondent expressed linking old and new bridleways.	Yes	21 permissive walkways and 6 new permissive bridleways have been created across the Development to increase safety and amenity for horse riders. Existing routes have been connected where practicable. The outline recreational routes management plan (RRMP) is found in Technical Appendix A18.1: Outline Recreational Routes Management Plan **[EN010162/APP/6.4.18.1].**
GNR2_L_007, GNR2_EF_025, GNR2_EF_035, GNR2_EF_043	One respondent expressed that paths crossing and around Ossington Airfield must be preserved.	Yes	Paths crossing around Ossington Airfield have been preserved and enhanced with additions The outline recreational routes management plan (RRMP) is

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			found in Technical Appendix A18.1: Outline Recreational Routes Management Plan **[EN010162/APP/6.4.18.1].**
GNR2_L_010, GNR2_L_011	One respondent expressed concern that project area has the National Cycle Route network within its proposed boundaries.	Yes	Due to low demand in consultation, cycle routes were not included in the final recreational routes plan.
GNR2_OFF_050	One respondent suggested a series of small circular routes be created to link each village.	Yes	Linkage of villages has been achieved to a certain with the circular route around the Development. The outline recreational routes management plan (RRMP) is found in Technical Appendix A18.1: Outline Recreational Routes Management Plan **[EN010162/APP/6.4.18.1].**
GNR2_FF_0003	One respondent supports the distance of solar panels in relation to a local air strip used by microlight aircrafts.	Yes	Noted.
GNR2_EF_019	One respondent supports the temporary diversion of bridleways	No	Noted.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	for safety purposes. Some respondents supported the diversion near Bathley and Newark.		
GNR2_EF_005	One respondent request more information on the proposed circular long-distance route.	No	The outline recreational routes management plan (RRMP) is found in Technical Appendix A18.1: Outline Recreational Routes Management Plan **[EN010162/APP/6.4.18.1].**
GNR2_FF_0010	One respondent expressed in any walkway improvement/scheme wherever possible walkers, cyclists and horse riders should be kept apart.	Yes	Cyclists have been separated from horse riders as there are no cycle routes proposed, and bridleways have taken account of existing cycle paths. The outline recreational routes management plan (RRMP) is found at **[EN010162/APP/6.4.18.1].**
GNR2_FF_0013	One respondent suggest that a more attractive pathway would be to go down the side of Moorhouse Beck.	Yes	Amends to pathways around Moorhouse can be found in the outline recreational routes management plan (RRMP) is found in Technical Appendix

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			A18.1: Outline Recreational Routes Management Plan **[EN010162/APP/6.4.18.1].**
GNR2_OFF_060	One respondent suggested bridleway access be away from main roads in Bathley.	Yes	Bridleways have avoided main roads in Bathley.
GNR2_L_014	One respondent expressed current bridleways from Cheveral Wood to Parkleas should be retained.	Yes	This route has been retained.
GNR2_L_014	One respondent suggested a proposed cycle route that runs westward towards the BESS along the southern edge of Kelham Woods, also could serve as a bridleway.	Yes	6 new bridleways have been created across the Development to increase safety and amenity for horse riders. The outline recreational routes management plan (RRMP) is found in Technical Appendix A18.1: Outline Recreational Routes Management Plan **[EN010162/APP/6.4.18.1].**
GNR2_OFF_105	One respondent suggested that changes should be made to widen the path between DB036 and DB038, to make it less cramped.	Yes	Where routes run adjacent to solar panels near Moorhouse, a minimum corridor of 10 m will be in place between the fence line for any existing or new recreational route. The fence line

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			will have a minimum offset of 3 m from solar panels, more typically 5 m, further distancing routes from panels. New and existing hedgerows will be maintained at approximately 2.5 m, with new trees incorporated throughout where appropriate, screening views of panels from the route.
GNR2_OFF_105	One respondent suggested widening path between DB040 and DB038 would lessen a tunnelling vision effect.	Yes	Where routes run adjacent to solar panels near Moorhouse, a minimum corridor of 10 m will be in place between the fence line for any existing or new recreational route. The fence line will have a minimum offset of 3 m from solar panels, more typically 5 m, further distancing routes from panels. New and existing hedgerows will be maintained at approximately 2.5 m, with new trees incorporated throughout where appropriate, screening views of panels from the route.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_OFF_105	One respondent suggested widening path between DB040 and DB039 to 20m, with the 12m added grassed over with wildflowers. Respondent stressed this would look a lot better for parking and walking up to the picnic area.	Yes	Where routes run adjacent to solar panels near Moorhouse, a minimum corridor of 10 m will be in place between the fence line for any existing or new recreational route. The fence line will have a minimum offset of 3 m from solar panels, more typically 5 m, further distancing routes from panels. New and existing hedgerows will be maintained at approximately 2.5 m, with new trees incorporated throughout where appropriate, screening views of panels from the route.
GNR2_OFF_106	One respondent suggested widening the path between DB045 and DB044.	Yes	Where routes run adjacent to solar panels, a minimum corridor of 10 m will be in place between the fence line for any existing or new recreational route. The fence line will have a minimum offset of 3 m from solar panels, more typically 5 m, further distancing routes from panels. New and existing hedgerows will be

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			maintained at approximately 2.5 m, with new trees incorporated throughout where appropriate, screening views of panels from the route.
GNR2_OFF_105	One respondent suggested DB037, could be straightened on the southwest corner of the field, allowing for more space around the bridleway.	Yes	The outline recreational routes management plan (RRMP) is found in Technical Appendix A18.1: Outline Recreational Routes Management Plan **[EN010162/APP/6.4.18.1].**
GNR2_OFF_105	One respondent suggested halfway through field DB038, where the hedge will be planted should be split at this point to create another footpath, This would make a walking loop from the picnic area to the woodland area around DB035 and DB036, respondent expresses this would be good for variations in routes.	Yes	21 permissive walkways have been created across the Development. Existing routes have been connected where practicable. The outline recreational routes management plan (RRMP) is found in Technical Appendix A18.1: Outline Recreational Routes Management Plan **[EN010162/APP/6.4.18.1].**
GNR2_OFF_066	One respondent suggested a footpath linking Bathley to Little Carlton and the enhancement of	Yes	21 permissive walkways and 6 new permissive bridleways have been created across the

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	the proposed pathway/bridleway in Bathley to make it circular.		Development to increase safety and amenity for horse riders. Existing routes have been connected where practicable. The outline recreational routes management plan (RRMP) is found in Technical Appendix A18.1: Outline Recreational Routes Management Plan **[EN010162/APP/6.4.18.1].**
GNR2_FF_0033	One respondent noted points about existing footpaths, but insisted consideration should be given to separate domestic dogs from livestock.	No	Domestic dogs will not have access to the sheep as they shall be grazing within the fence lines of the Development.
GNR2_EF_053	One respondent suggested an additional permissive route on the east side of the ECML.	Yes	This point at North Muskham has been noted and taken into account in the design of the 21 permissive pathways.
GNR2_OFF_100	One respondent expressed that as a horse rider and livery yard owner it was very important to have circular routes of between 5-10 miles and not linear routes that lead to main roads or dead ends.	Yes	This point is noted and in creating the 6 new bridleways, attention has been paid to accessibility, safety, and connectivity.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_EF_006, GNR2_EF_021, GNR2_FF_0005, GNR2_EF_032, GNR2_OFF_0167, GNR2_OFF_076	Respondents expressed concern for general job loss due to the Development including in the agricultural sector.	No	This has fully been assessed within the socioeconomic assessment in ES Chapter 13, Socio-Economics and Tourism **[EN010162/APP/6.2.13]**, and there is a net surplus of agricultural jobs and agricultural GVA.
GNR2_L_016, GNR2_OFF_042, GNR2_OFF_098	Respondent expressed local workers should be used on site wherever possible / job creation should be prioritised.	Yes	The oSSEP **[EN010162/APP/6.4.13.2]** will seek to prioritise local recruitment, training, and employment.
GNR2_L_016, GNR2_OFF_0167	Respondents expressed that creation of jobs will not be sustainable.	Yes	Technical Appendix A13.2: Outline Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan **[EN010162/APP/6.4.13.2]** will seek to prioritise local recruitment, training, and employment - which go beyond just the construction phase but also are there for the life time of the Development.
GNR_OFF_072, GNR2_OFF_133	Respondent expressed all jobs created will be for those off-site	No	Technical Appendix A13.2: Outline Skills, Supply Chain and

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	and would not benefit community at all.		Employment Plan **[EN010162/APP/6.4.13.2]** will seek to prioritise local recruitment, training, and employment.
GNR2_EF_004	One respondent enquired about the creation of jobs for maintaining the ecological enhancements.	Yes	Technical Appendix A13.2: Outline Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan **[EN010162/APP/6.4.13.2]** explores a variety of operational jobs needed as well as ecological ones e.g. beehive keeper etc.
GNR2_FF_0035	One respondent expressed scepticism that EG courses, training and employment courses are enough to undertake these sorts of jobs as they are a couple of one-hour courses.	Yes	The EG Academy is only one intervention out of many training and employment initiatives. It is a powerful start to introduce entrants into the solar industry. Apprenticeships will also be used and have more detailed, on the job training. There are 6 initial online EG Academy courses that involve independent learning and assessment and are CPD accredited. They cannot be completed in one hour.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_EF_031, GNR2_EF_036, GNR2_L_014, GNR2_L_015, GNR2_L_018, GNR2_L_019, GNR2_OFF_028, GNR2_OFF_065, GNR2_OFF_073, GNR2_OFF_101, GNR2_OFF_029, GNR2_OFF_031, GNR2_OFF_036, GNR2_OFF_041, GNR2_OFF_043, GNR2_OFF_061, GNR2_OFF_066, GNR2_OFF_083, GNR2_OFF_003, GNR2_OFF_096, GNR2_EF_040, GNR2_EF_044, GNR2_EF_052	Respondents expressed concern for off road access to horse-riding, cycling and walking routes. Some respondents specified Bathley and Kelham.	Yes	Routes will be diverted to attain new off-road routes to enhance the recreational amenity and safety of the network. Impacts on roads from construction, operation, and decommissioning traffic are assessed fully within ES Chapter 14, Traffic and Transport **[EN010162/APP/6.2.14].** All recreational routes, including bridleways, will be managed throughout construction to ensure the safety of users. For those which are directly impacted by construction activities, diversions and temporary closures will be put in place to ensure this. Within Chapter 14, Traffic and Transport, of the ES **[EN010162/APP/6.2.14]** horse riders are considered as non-motorised users within the

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			assessment – which includes delay, user amenity, and fear and intimidation. The ES chapter notes the presence of stables, liveries, and grazing areas, particularly near Caunton and Bathley, and Averham Park Farm.
GNR2_EF_031, GNR2_L_014, GNR2_L_015, GNR2_L_018, GNR2_L_019, GNR2_OFF_028, GNR2_OFF_101, GNR2_OFF_029, GNR2_OFF_031, GNR2_OFF_036, GNR2_OFF_041, GNR2_OFF_043, GNR2_OFF_061, GNR2_OFF_065, GNR2_OFF_066, GNR2_OFF_083, GNR2_OFF_003, GNR2_OFF_096, GNR2_EF_040, GNR2_EF_044, GNR2_EF_052	Respondents expressed concern for the proposed bridleways between Little Carlton and Kelham crossing the A616, posing RTA risk.	Yes	No proposed bridleways will cross the A616.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_FF_0040, GNR2_L_013, GNR2_OFF_078	Respondent expressed that the current circular route around Norwell not be disturbed.	No	There are no proposals in place to divert or close any routes around Norwell. The planned GNR LDCR would run along NT|Norwell|FP1, NT|Norwell|FP2, and along the main village road.
GNR2_FF_0040, GNR2_L_013, GNR2_OFF_078	Respondents expressed opposition to the proposed footpath to the rear of the property on field DB053 that traverses the Taylor Family field.	Yes	There are no longer panels at DB053 and no proposals for new walkways or bridleways on Taylor-owned fields.
GNR2_OFF_077, GNR2_OFF_084	Respondents expressed particular concern about possible lack of community access to the Ossington Airfield perimeter track for leisure purposes.	No	There are no existing rights of way around the Ossington Airfield, however, the new permissive path 13 would link the airfield into the GNR LDCR, ensuring community access to the site.
GNR2_OFF_121, GNR2_OFF_123	Respondents suggested new bridleways for safety or riders at Millhouse Stables in Bathley.	Yes	There are no longer solar panels in the vicinity of Bathey. 6 new permissive bridleways have been proposed. Attention has been paid to accessibility, safety, and connectivity.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_FF_0004	One respondent expressed concern for the cycle track proposed not benefiting those who reside in Sutton on Trent due to being on the other side of the railway.	Yes	There are no longer cycle tracks proposed across the Development.
GNR2_EF_037	One respondent express concern for Fig.18.3 PRoW marked 'railway crossing', due to the railway being used for high-speed trains and traffic.	No	A number of footpaths currently cross the railway: NT|North Muskham|FP1, NT|Bathley|FP8, NT|Cromwell|PF3. No new permissive paths or diversions are proposed over the railway.
GNR2_EF_031	One respondent suggests the retention of existing bridleway routes which run north out towards Muskham Woodhouse Farm and others from Cheveral Wood to Park Leys.	Yes	All existing bridleways have been retained; 6 new permissive bridleways have been created.
GNR2_FF_0028	One respondent objects to the removal of footpaths in field DB015 as it is a historic route.	Yes	Footpath rerouting in field DB015 has been proposed to reduce the effect of having solar panels on both sides of the path for users.
GNR2_L_011	One respondent suggested closing the bridleway temporarily, southwest from Weston over the	No	NT|Weston|BW8 is the only PRoW to be temporarily closed during part of the construction

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	A1 will have a detrimental effect on our physical and mental health.		phase and part of the decommissioning phase. This is because the route is proposed to be used for construction traffic access to that part of the Development site, and it is not safe for recreational users on the route. It will only be closed for the period during which construction or decommissioning vehicle access is required along that route (i.e., less than the whole construction or decommissioning phase), but will otherwise remain open.
GNR2_L_011	One respondent suggested numerous walkers and dog walkers often use both the Hagg Lane bridleway and Moorhouse/Weston Roads both summer and winter. Impact mitigation measures have not included walking on these roads.	No	NT|Egmanton|BW5 falls within the recreational study area and is assessed with ES Chapter 18, Recreation **[EN010162/APP/6.2.18]**. Moorhouse and Weston Road fall outside of the recreational study area. They are over 250 m from the Order Limits are not expected

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			to be impacted by the development.
GNR2_L_014	One respondent expressed that the Kelham Hills fields access point needs to be within the order area from Broadgate Lane because the field access gate on Ollerton Road is unsafe for rider use.	Yes	All bridleways have been designed with safety at the forefront of decision-making.
GNR2_OFF_024	One respondent expressed that there should be bridleway provision for Milhouse stables.	Yes	Bridleway provision has been considered around Millhouse stables
GNR2_EF_051	One respondent expressed concern for the removal of the footpath on field DB015.	No	NT|Eakring|FP13 is diverted to avoid work no. 1, solar PV. NT|Eakring|FP13 would be entirely closed and replaced with 420 m of footpath which would follow the edges of the solar PV area. The route would be more direct and continue to provide a connection between footpath NT|Eakring|FP13 and NT|Eakring|FP16.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_L_023	One respondent expressed that footpaths should remain on DS015, DB016 and DR017.	No	NT|Eakring|FP13 is diverted to avoid work no. 1, solar PV. NT|Eakring|FP13 would be entirely closed and replaced with 420 m of footpath which would follow the edges of the solar PV area. The route would be more direct and continue to provide a connection between footpath NT|Eakring|FP13 and NT|Eakring|FP16. NT|Eakring|FP13 is diverted to avoid work no. 1, solar PV. 170 m of the 750 m NT|Eakring|FP13 would be closed, and replaced with 220 m of footpath which would follows the edge of the solar PV area. The route would still provide access between Newark Road and the unnamed road at grid reference 468385E 362326N.
GNR2_OFF_077	One respondent questioned why proposals include a new track in Ossington Airfield which would	Yes	There are no proposals for new quarried stone doubling up

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	require quarrying new stone, when a track already exists.		against existing tracks at Ossington Airfield
GNR2_OFF_118	One respondent suggested an extra permissive section of footpath would be helpful on the existing farm track from SK 68373 62235 to SK 68358 61861 this would link two existing rights of way.	Yes	As detailed in Chapter 18: Recreation, of the ES **[EN010162/APP/6.2.18]**, recreational features proposed as part of the Development are shown on the Masterplan, in Figure 5.2 **[EN010162/APP/6.3.5.2]**, including changes to PRoWs and permissive routes (closures, diversions and new route creation) as well as proposed planting. New permissive routes have been proposed to increase the connectivity of the network during the operational phase, including 21 new permissive footpaths, and 6 new permissive bridleways, creating 32.6 km of new permissive route, as described in Table 18.7 in Chapter 18:

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			Recreation, of the ES **[EN010162/APP/6.2.18]**. A circular recreational route would be created around the Order Limits, covering 50.6 km, including 12.5 km of new permissive path.
GNR2_OFF_125	One respondent expressed opposition for any vehicular, bike or horse access to the circular permissive route	Yes	There are 21 permissive paths proposed, with 6 permissive bridleways. Safety has been a key consideration and at the forefront of how horse riding interacts with walking. Cycle routes did not attract the demand from the public that bridleways and footpaths did and hence have not been proposed.
GNR2_OFF_132	One respondent expressed the pavement footpath from Carlton on Trent to the solar park ends at the railway. There is no path from the railway to join any point on the planned footpath round the site.	Yes	The pavement footpath runs from the village up to the railway. So users would need to walk on the road to access NT|Carlton-on-trent|F10 diversion and New Permissive Route 1. The section of the road is heavily wooded on

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			the southern side making it problematic to join up.
GNR2_OFF_133	One respondent expressed concern that local sugar beet factory would be threatened, 'stealing their growing capacity'.	No	ES Chapter 13, Socio-Economics and Tourism **[EN010162/APP/6.2.13]** fully assesses impact on agricultural production loss.
GNR2_EF_055	One respondent requested an 'in field' extension of the proposed PR3 permissive route eastward from its termination on Norwell Lane close to the ECML crossing at SK 7914 6160 to SK 7972 6167 where an existing safe footpath exists.	Yes	As detailed in Table 18.7: Recreation Receptors Assessment, in Chapter 18: Recreation, of the ES **[EN010162/APP/6.2.18]**, Permissive Footpath 4 is a standalone footpath which is accessible from Cromwell via Norwell Lane, The route would allow walkers from Cromwell access to green space without the need to cross the railway line. The route would add 3.1 km of new pathway and further contribute to the connectively of the existing network.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_EF_055	One respondent requested project check on the status of the PROW at the point marked "Rail Crossing?" at the top of the map, since proposed PR2 path depends on it if it is to be used – Network Rail are keen to raise the ECML line speed to 140 mph and I doubt the crossing would survive that.	No	PRoW NT|Cromwell|FP3 is currently in place across the railway and is expected to be throughout the development life.
GNR2_EF_055	One respondent expressed that PR3 proposal is positive on balance however, at the point marked "Fast Road" on the map - there are no pavements along the roadside on both sides of the ECML crossing which is, I can testify, sometimes hazardous with fast traffic speeding in both directions.	Yes	This comment is noted, and it is envisaged users would continue to exercise the same caution as at present when using the new route
GNR2_EF_055	One respondent expressed project should find a way of providing a secure path on each side of the ECML crossing along the same lines as that found at the point marked "Preferred" which was put	Yes	The Applicant notes this comment. The Development would also deliver benefits to the local community via an enhanced green infrastructure network including a better-connected

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	in place as NM FP1/BT FP 8, recently.		footpath and bridleway network. New permissive routes have been proposed to increase the connectivity of the network during the operational phase, including 21 new permissive footpaths, and 6 new permissive bridleways, creating 32.6 km of new permissive route, as described in Table 18.7 in Chapter 18: Recreation, of the ES **[EN010162/APP/6.2.18]**. A circular recreational route would be created around the Order Limits, covering 50.6 km, including 12.5 km of new permissive path.
GNR2_EF_056	One respondent expressed that the proposed Bridleway (in purple in the attached plan we produced) From B along the short Southern edge of Hagley's Plantation to join up with the Robin Hood Way in Mansey Common would be a little easier. Currently, in the attached, a	Yes	Mansey Common does not form part of the Order Limits of the Development and is not within the land control of the Applicant.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	landowner (Mr. Parkhouse) wants to not join up with the Footpath from Maplebeck to Eakring across Gregor's land but more seriously Mr. Parkhouse wants to go up through Hagley's Plantation (Thoresby/Gregor's ownership) and make a new Bridleway across Thoresby's open fields. Back in 2020 Mr. Parkhouse also wanted to extend the bridleway, the route of the proposed purple Bridleway from B on our annotated plan to the Robin Hood Way at Mansey Common, therefore this would be a win win.		
GNR2_EF_058	One respondent expressed concern that as the effects of the proposed Bridleway (BW) from point B (Maplebeck Estate) on the plan North up our Western boundary then fall outside of the permitted development area and the entire problem the proposed BW will give sits as a problem to	Yes	Permissive bridleways are a popular request from local residents and a benefit of the Development. Their locations have been selected sensitively in line with the overall footpath strategy

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	deal with, which is completely unfair.		
GNR2_EF_065	One respondent expressed that the bridleway adjacent to Hagley's plantation should end at the southern corner of Hagley's plantation and continue on the proposed purple dashed bridleway, as horses and bikes will cause issues for landowners and walkers don't want to walk on deep soft ground.	Yes	Permissive bridleways are a popular request from local residents and a benefit of the Development. Their locations have been selected sensitively in line with the overall footpath strategy
GNR2_EF_065	One respondent expressed it makes sense to have the proposed dashed purple bridleway from point B, adjacent to Hagley's plantation west across to Mansey Common as people already try and ride this route currently.	No	Mansey Common does not form part of the Order Limits of the Development and is not within the land control of the Applicant
GNR2_EF_065	One respondent expressed general support for the proposed bridleway along the Northern boundary to the village of Maplebeck.	No	Noted.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_EF_065	One respondent expressed that bridleway and cycle route adjacent to Duke's Wood should either link up with the road to and from Winkburn/Maplebeck or meet with the cycle route on the Eakring to Caunton Road so that riders can directly use visitor centre and picnic area.	No	Duke's Wood sits outside the Order limits and is not within the land control of the Applicant
Topic Area: Traffic and Transport			
GNR2_EF_007, GNR2_EF_013, GNR2_L_003, GNR2_L_005, GNR2_L_009, GNR2_L_010, GNR2_EF_026, GNR2_EF_032, GNR2_EF_025, GNR2_EF_034, GNR2_FF_0023, GNR2_FF_0025, GNR2_FF_0028, GNR2_FF_0040, GNR2_FF_0041, GNR2_EF_042, GNR2_EF_043, GNR2_PDFF_0003, GNR2_L_002, GNR2_L_005, GNR2_L_010, GNR2_L_011, GNR2_L_012, GNR2_L_016, GNR2_L_017, GNR2_L_020, GNR2_L_023, GNR2_FF_0028, GNR2_FF_0040,	Respondents express concern that the single track, narrow roads around the area are not made for the volume of traffic the Development could create and negative effects on road access. One respondent expressed concern that traffic disruption will be particularly bad at harvest time. One respondent expressed particular concern that emergency vehicles will be delayed or disrupted because of access	No	Passing places are proposed along the routes being used for construction where the road widths do not currently comfortably accept HGV traffic and these are shown on Figure 14.5 of ES Chapter 14, Traffic and Transport [**EN010162/APP/6.2.14**]. This will ease two-way traffic flows. In addition, measures contained within Technical Appendix A5.2: Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_FF_0041, GNR2_EF_045, GNR2_EF_048, GNR2_OFF_003, GNR2_OFF_012, GNR2_OFF_015, GNR2_OFF_016, GNR2_OFF_020, GNR2_OFF_030, GNR2_OFF_033, GNR2_EF_050, GNR2_OFF_037, GNR2_OFF_043, GNR2_OFF_045, GNR2_OFF_048, GNR2_OFF_049, GNR2_OFF_053, GNR2_EF_051, GNR2_OFF_171, GNF2_OFF_163, GNR2_OFF_150, GNR2_OFF_058, GNR2_OFF_059, GNR2_OFF_060, GNR2_OFF_063, GNR2_OFF_064, GNR2_OFF_068, GNR2_OFF_072, GNR2_OFF_076, GNR2_OFF_078,	issues. Some respondents expressed that traffic is already high in volume to and from the British Sugar Factory.		**[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.2]** that seek to minimise negative effects, with measures such as deliveries avoiding peak periods on the roads. The Fire Service is a statutory consultee and their consultation feedback on the proposals has been considered.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_OFF_080, GNR2_OFF_088, GNR2_OFF_089, GNR2_OFF_094, GNR2_OFF_096, GNR2_OFF_099, GNR2_OFF_105, GNR2_OFF_114, GNR2_OFF_126, GNR2_OFF_127, GNR2_OFF_128, GNR2_OFF_132, GNR2_OFF_143, GNR2_OFF_144, GNR2_EF_060			
GNR2_L_003, GNR2_L_011, GNR2_L_012, GNR2_L_013, GNR2_L_016, GNR2_EF_042, GNR2_FF_0040, GNR2_OFF_048, GNR2_OFF_053, GNR2_OFF_078, GNR2_OFF_080, GNR2_OFF_084, GNR2_OFF_088, GNR2_OFF_099,	Respondents expressed concern for the damage to roads, bridges by large construction vehicles and construction activity. Some respondents specified Tug Bridge Farm.	No	Technical Appendix A5.2: Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.2]** confirms that prior to construction works commencing roads to be used for construction, a condition survey will be undertaken and remedial measures needed to facilitate the works agreed with the local highway authority and completed. Further interim

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_OFF_114, GNR2_OFF_128, GNR2_OFF_132			surveys and post-completion condition surveys will also be conducted and any agreed corrective measures undertaken.
GNR2_L_011, GNR2_L_012, GNR2_EF_045, GNR2_OFF_053, GNR2_OFF_084, GNR2_OFF_094	Respondents expressed passing places proposals are inadequate. Some respondents specified along Moorehouse Road, Egmanton.	Yes	Additional passing places are now proposed along Moorhouse Road, Egmanton. These are shown on Figure 14.5 of ES Chapter 14, Traffic and Transport **[EN010162/APP/6.2.14].**
GNR2_FF_0040, GNR2_L_013, GNR2_OFF_078	Respondents requested to know who will be liable for damage to property if large construction vehicles cause damage.	No	If large construction vehicles cause any potential damage (and it is proven not to be pre-existing, etc.) then the party responsible for that vehicle would be liable.
GNR2_FF_0035, GNR2_OFF_104	Respondents expressed concern that dualling work for the A46 could happen at the same time as project construction, impacting businesses and people.	No	Measures to reduce the number of vehicles travelling to and from the solar park site are included in the Technical Appendix A14.2: Outline Travel Plan **[EN010162/APP/6.4.14.2]** and Technical Appendix A5.2: Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [**EN010162/APP/6.4.5.2].** Prior to the start of construction,

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			final versions of these documents will take into account any cumulative development construction activity in the area that could overlap with Development traffic.
GNR2_L_003, GNR2_OFF_053	Respondents expressed they had no information to the window of construction traffic disruption schedule.	No	A construction programme is included Technical Appendix A5.2: Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.2]** and sets out the expected duration of activities in each phase.
GNR2_EF_016	Respondent expressed concern for the potential of new roads being installed for the Development.	No	There are relatively few new roads other than access and haul roads to Development areas in the proposals. The Applicant will also enhance existing damaged roads to make good for construction.
GNR2_FF_0025	Respondent expressed concern that at the points of installation there seems to have been no consideration for parking for maintenance/construction workers.	No	Technical Appendix A14.2: Outline Travel Plan **[EN010162/APP/6.4.14.2]** sets out measures to reduce car trips and the need for parking.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			Notwithstanding, Technical Appendix A5.2: Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.2]** outlines that appropriate car parking provision will be made within the Order Limits for the works and that parking on the public highway not permitted. Maintenance vehicles will be limited to the occasional visit and appropriate space provided to allow parking off the public roads.
GNR2_L_011	Respondent suggested a full traffic and transport impact assessment be carried out.	No	Technical Appendix A14.1: Transport Statement **[EN010162/APP/6.4.14.1]** has been produced to consider construction traffic impact.
GNR2_L_011	Respondent suggested bridge condition assessment should be carried out before alternative traffic routes are allocated.	No	Technical Appendix A52: Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.2]** confirms that prior to construction works commencing roads to be used for construction, a condition survey will be undertaken and

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			remedial measures needed to facilitate the works agreed with the local highway authority and completed. Further interim surveys and post-completion condition surveys will also be conducted and any agreed corrective measures undertaken.
GNR2_L_011	Respondent suggested once completed the Framework Travel Plan should be made available to all parishes for information and comment.	No	Technical Appendix A14.2: Outline Travel Plan **[EN010162/APP/6.4.14.2]** is submitted with the application. The final Travel Plan will be agreed in consultation with the local highway authority.
GNR2_FF_0025	Respondent expressed access points are not clearly shown.	No	Figure 14.4, Site Access Locations **[EN010162/APP/6.3.14.4]** presents their location. Further details are provided with Appendix D of the Transport Statement (Technical Appendix A14.1: Transport Statement) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.14.1]**

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_EF_006, GNR2_L_003, GNR2_EF_025	Respondents expressed concern for the use of Ossington/Moorhouse road due to being single track, unsuitable bridge and in poor condition.	Yes	Additional passing places are now proposed along Moorhouse Road, Egmanton. These are shown on Figure 14.5 of ES Chapter 14, Traffic and Transport **[EN010162/APP/6.2.14]**. Also, the access strategy for this area now includes the use of an internal haul road so HGV traffic does not pass through Ossington / Moorhouse
GNR2_FF_0040, GNR2_L_013, GNR2_OFF_078	Respondents expressed concern that paths proposed along DB053 will mean people parking their cars on a blind bend and restricting access.	Yes	This area has now been removed from the Order Limits.
GNR2_FF_0040, GNR2_L_013, GNR2_OFF_078	Respondents expressed overall concern about access impairment to their property at the rear of field DB053.	Yes	This area has now been removed from the Order Limits.
GNR2_FF_0040, GNR2_L_013, GNR2_OFF_078	Respondent requested a new access path be explored near the property at the rear of field DB053, one that goes directly through Mr.	Yes	This area has now been removed from the Order Limits.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	Jackson's field instead of using the track from Norwell Lane		
GNR2_FF_0040, GNR2_L_013, GNR2_OFF_078	Respondents expressed access points near field DB053 are unclear as there are two near them but three on the Development plans.	No	This area has now been removed from the Order Limits.
GNR2_OFF_096, GNR2_OFF_101	Respondents acknowledge that plans had changed and that traffic would not use Bathley Main Street, which they support.	No	Bathley Main Street does not form part of the access strategy.
GNR2_OFF_030, GNR2_OFF_064,	Respondents expressed particular concern about traffic disruption on Broadgate Lane from Kelham to Averham Park.	Yes	ES Chapter 14, Traffic and Transport discusses how traffic will be managed in this area **[EN010162/APP/6.2.14].**
GNR2_OFF_025, GNR2_FF_0047	Respondents expressed it would be preferred if all access to DB062 was made from DB325.	No	Solar arrays are no-longer proposed for DB062. Access to this area for mitigation purposes will be taken via the existing access arrangements.
GNR2_OFF_030, GNR2_OFF_064	Respondent expressed that the majority of the access within the proposed areas around Kelham/Park Leas and Averham Park are based on permission from	No	Preference is for vehicles to avoid interaction with bridlepaths and potential conflict with other users.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	the farmer (Millers) rather than officially documented bridlepaths.		
GNR2_OFF_037	Respondent suggested speed cameras and CCTV be installed on all entrances to Eakring to slow down traffic.	No	Construction traffic will be expected to comply with posted speed limits. Speed cameras and CCTV is not currently proposed.
GNR2_L_002	Respondent expressed concern for the impact on access routes to Caunton Lodge Farm.	No	Access to Caunton Lodge Farm will not be impacted.
GNR2_FF_0023	Respondent expressed concern that there is no passing point along Norwell Lane, as traffic will back up because of the ECML level crossing.	Yes	Solar in this area has now been removed from the Order Limits and so Norwell Lane will not be used by construction traffic.
GNR2_EF_044	Respondent support not using Bathley Main Street for construction vehicles.	No	Bathley Main Street is not proposed to be used.
GNR2_L_003	Respondent expressed they would like to see Ladywood Farm and Weston Hall Farm access routes be utilised for the northern arrays.	No	These routes have been considered in detail but have not been pursued due to their unsuitability.
GNR2_OFF_155	Respondent expressed concern for the widening of Vicarage Lane between the A1 and the rail	Yes	Solar in this area has now been removed from the Order Limits and so Vicarage Lane will not be used by construction traffic.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	crossing impacting the length of adjacent driveways.		
GNR2_L_023	Respondent expressed Newark Road into Eakring has ditches that are used for drainage, and enquires if these will be repaired to cope with increase in traffic.	No	Technical Appendix A5.2: Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.2]** confirms that prior to construction works commencing roads to be used for construction, a condition survey will be undertaken and remedial measures needed to facilitate the works agreed with the local highway authority and completed. Further interim surveys and post-completion condition surveys will also be conducted and any agreed corrective measures undertaken.
GNR2_OFF_053	Respondent expressed that the initial traffic summary note provided by Systra for Ossington lacks proper detail.	No	The initial traffic summary note contained information that was available at the time. A more detailed consideration is now included in ES Chapter 14, Traffic and Transport **[EN010162/APP/6.2.14]** and Technical Appendix A14.1:

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			Transport Statement **[EN010162/APP/6.4.14.1].**
GNR2_L_010	Respondent suggested a diversion of the circular path just 10 more metres would save paths from coming into contact with electric fencing and horse paddocks.	Yes	Recreational features proposed as part of the Development are shown on the Masterplan, in Figure 5.2 **[EN010162/APP/6.3.5.2]**, including changes to PRoWs and permissive routes (closures, diversions and new route creation) as well as proposed planting. As detailed in Chapter 18: Recreation, of the ES **[EN010162/APP/6.2.18]**, the Circular Recreational Route, a proposed 50.6 km circular long distance route around the Order Limits, which would link existing PRoW with 12.5 km of new permissive route. Picnic areas, benches, and information boards would be implemented throughout the route. Long distance routes

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			are assessed as being of more than local use or importance, and hence this is assessed as a significant beneficial effect.
GNR2_FF_0028	Respondent expressed particular concern about the bridge at Tug Bridge Farm being too narrow, dangerous and often only suitable for one car to pass through at a time.	No	Concern is noted. A review of the road safety record for this location is included in Technical Appendix A14.1: Transport Statement **[EN010162/APP/6.4.14.1]** and does not identify concerns. Vehicles will continue to negotiate this location as current arrangements.
GNR2_L_010	Respondent expressed that the gate for the path off the A616, by the Gables Farm, should be a proper footpath stock gate (a pedestrian kissing gate) thus removing the need for chains and removing trip hazards.	No	Gates and means of access will be set out in the final RRMP, in accordance with the outline that is provided in Technical Appendix A18.1 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.18.1]**, which will be submitted for approval to NSDC in consultation with Nottinghamshire County Council.
GNR2_L_010	Respondent proposed there should not be any access from Little Carlton to A616 as it is too	Yes	Solar in this area has now been removed from the Order Limits

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	dangerous for dogwalkers and horse riders.		and so will not be used by construction traffic.
GNR2_L_010	Respondent expressed concern that project traffic will be impacted/exacerbated by the A46 upgrade works in the coming years.	No	Measures to reduce the number of vehicles travelling to and from the solar park site are included in the Technical Appendix A4.2: Outline Travel Plan **[EN010162/APP/6.4.14.2]** and Technical Appendix A5.2: Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.2]**. Prior to the start of construction, final versions of these documents will take into account any cumulative development construction activity in the area that could overlap with Development traffic.
GNR2_L_011	Respondent expressed concern that no mitigation measures were explored for Moorhouse Road Egmanton	Yes	Additional passing places are now proposed along Moorhouse Road, Egmanton. These are shown on Figure 14.5 of ES Chapter 14, Traffic and Transport **[EN010162/APP/6.2.14]**.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_EF_045	Respondent expressed concern for the road to Kneesall from Ossington being in extremely poor condition and is therefore not suitable for construction traffic.	No	Technical Appendix A5.2: Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.2]** confirms that prior to construction works commencing roads to be used for construction, a condition survey will be undertaken and remedial measures needed to facilitate the works agreed with the local highway authority and completed. Further interim surveys and post-completion condition surveys will also be conducted and any agreed corrective measures undertaken.
GNR2_OFF_130	Respondent expressed particular concern about the construction access route in Weston Village. The route leading to DB034 is already hazardous as traffic travels at national speed limit in both directions and visibility is poor. Speed and other safety limitations will need to be made.	Yes	The access strategy has now been changed, and vehicles will not turn off the B1164 at Ladywood Lane or Weston Hall Farm. A review of collision history data is considered in Technical Appendix A14.1: Transport Statement **[EN010162/APP/6.4.14.1]** and

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			did not identify this road as a concern.
GNR2_L_012	Respondent expressed that narrow road joining Eakring and Caunton to A616 is unsuitable for heavy construction traffic.	No	Passing places are proposed along this route to facilitate the increased number of HGV movements on this road. These are shown on Figure 14.5 **[EN010162/APP/6.3.14.5]** of ES Chapter 14, Traffic and Transport **[EN010162/APP/6.2.14].**
GNR2_L_011	Respondent suggested post-construction, the Moorhouse Road site entrance gap be closed completely and moved further away.	No	The site access will be retained for operational use. This access will only be occasionally used post-construction.
GNR2_OFF_005	Respondent expressed that project will make safety issues at Crow Lane Crossing worse.	No	Solar from this area has been removed from the Order Limits. Technical Appendix A5.2: Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.2]** outlines that HGV construction deliveries will be scheduled to occur outside of the peak periods.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_OFF_012	Respondent expressed particular concern about traffic disruption on the A1 slip road to the north end of North Muskham.	No	Solar from this area has been removed and this route no-longer forms part of the access strategy for the Development.
GNR2_OFF_048,	Respondent expressed particular concern about heavy traffic loads on Moorhouse Beck bridge shaking houses nearby.	Yes	The access strategy has now been changed, and heavy traffic will not route over the Moorhouse Beck bridge and will instead use an internal haul road.
GNR2_OFF_163	Respondent expressed concern for the access to utilities for their property because of Solar Work Areas 36, 39, 49, 50, 51, 52 and 53	No	Continued access to utilities will be retained throughout the construction and operational period.
GNR2_L_010	Respondent suggested a bridleway path from the large field off Crow lane that turns to Moor House / Downside Cottage.	Yes	As detailed in Chapter 18: Recreation, of the ES **[EN010162/APP/6.2.18]**, recreational features proposed as part of the Development are shown on the Masterplan, in Figure 5.2 **[EN010162/APP/6.3.5.2]**, including changes to PRoWs and permissive routes (closures, diversions and new route

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			creation) as well as proposed planting. New permissive routes have been proposed to increase the connectivity of the network during the operational phase, including 21 new permissive footpaths, and 6 new permissive bridleways, creating 32.6 km of new permissive route, as described in Table 18.7 in Chapter 18: Recreation, of the ES **[EN010162/APP/6.2.18]**. A circular recreational route would be created around the Order Limits, covering 50.6 km, including 12.5 km of new permissive path.
GNR2_L_010	Respondent suggested an off route to Bathley for equestrian riders.	Yes	As detailed in Chapter 18: Recreation, of the ES **[EN010162/APP/6.2.18]**, 21 permissive footpaths and six permissive bridleways are proposed within the Order Limits

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			where they would provide improved access by way of connecting disjointed areas of the network of PRoW; reduce the need to walk along roads without pavements or through areas where there may be difficulties in managing the different requirements of recreation and livestock; and/or provide improved options for circular walks.
GNR2_EF_022	Respondent expressed general concern for the impacts on access routes in Bathley.	Yes	This area has now been removed from the Order Limits. Construction traffic will not pass through Bathley.
GNR2_OFF_084	Respondent expressed concern about traffic in Ossington village in particular, as surveys had been done of the access route to the airfield past Moorhouse Road.	Yes	The access strategy for this area now includes the use of an internal haul road so general HGV traffic does not pass through Ossington / Moorhouse. The route to the Airfield is however identified for abnormal load movements. Technical Appendix A5.2: Outline Construction Traffic

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			Management Plan **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.2]** sets out AIL movements and measures to reduce construction traffic impact.
GNR2_OFF_128	Respondent expressed concern that South Muskham and Little Carlton have a disproportionate number of site access points.	Yes	Solar in this area has now been removed from the Order Limits.
GNR2_L_014, GNR2_L_015, GNR2_L_018, GNR2_L_019, GNR2_OFF_028, GNR2_OFF_101, GNR2_OFF_029, GNR2_OFF_031, GNR2_OFF_036, GNR2_OFF_041, GNR2_OFF_043, GNR2_OFF_061, GNR2_OFF_065, GNR2_OFF_066, GNR2_OFF_083, GNR2_OFF_003, GNR2_OFF_096, GNR2_EF_040, GNR2_EF_044, GNR2_EF_052	Respondents expressed that the Bathley Circular Route does not have multi-access route along Main Street and is therefore hazardous.	Yes	Solar in this area has now been removed from the Order Limits.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_EF_026, GNR2_EF_031, GNR2_EF_036, GNR2_EF_042, GNR2_OFF_037, GNR2_OFF_060, GNR2_OFF_072, GNR2_OFF_080, GNR2_FF_0028, GNR2_OFF_081, GNR2_OFF_088, GNR2_OFF_096, GNR2_OFF_121, GNR2_OFF_122, GNR2_OFF_126	Respondents express concern for the safety of horse riders/pedestrians/cyclists who use local roads. Some respondents specified Bathley. Some respondents specified Eakring.	No	Non-motorised users are considered in the ES Chapter 14, Traffic and Transport **[EN010162/APP/6.2.14]** and measures are identified in Technical Appendix A5.2: Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.2]** in areas with an increased likelihood of interaction.
GNR2_EF_031	Respondent expressed concern for Ollerton Road and Trent Lane in Kelham presenting potential risk for horse riders.	Yes	Solar in this area has been removed from the Order Limits.
GNR2_EF_037	Respondent expressed concern for Fig.18.3 area marked 'fast road' causing increased traffic from construction and posing a safety risk.	Yes	Figure 18.3 **[EN010162/APP/6.3.18.3]** has been updated and now shows a new looped Permissive Footpath 4 on the eastern side of the ECML as an alternative to using the crossing.
GNR2_FF_0028	Respondent accepts that new proposed passing routes could eliminate risk to pedestrians.	No	Pedestrians already walk along the side of narrow roads carrying two-way traffic. The passing

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			places will contribute to providing safer routes.
GNR2_L_010,	Respondent expressed that the pink bridleway line in project documents crossing the A616 is way too dangerous to work.	No	This link across the A616 is an existing Public Footpath and no new crossings on the A616 are proposed by the Development. The link does however form part of the overall circular recreational route.
GNR2_OFF_049	Respondent expressed concern that construction traffic will not pull over in cases of traffic accidents on the A616.	Yes	Construction traffic will be expected to adhere to legal requirements. Technical Appendix A5.2: Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.2]** outlines that HGV deliveries will be paused when an 'abnormal incident' has occurred on the network.
Topic Area: Consultation and Engagement			
GNR2_EF_048, GNR2_OFF_139, GNR2_FF_0006, GNR2_FF_0034	Respondents expressed appreciation for the communication of the Development and the consultation events or praised	No	Noted.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	consultation events for being adequate.		
GNR2_EF_009, GNR2_EF_012, GNR2_EF_001	Respondents expressed concern for the consultation process being a tick box exercise.	No	The Applicant is confident that it carried out a professional, thorough, and compliant consultation process at all stages. This process ensured the local community received accurate information about the proposed Development and had ample opportunities to share feedback through various channels. The feedback form **[EN010162/APP/5.1.6]** provided various open-ended questions for respondents to expand on their views. The Consultation Report **[EN10162/APP/5.1]** outlines the Applicants robust engagement and consultation processes.
GNR2_EF_012, GNR2_OFF_0167	Respondents felt the consultation maps lacked detail of visual impacts.	Yes	Consultation materials including maps contained preliminary information, sufficient to allow views to be expressed by those who were consulted and to give

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			the opportunity for the Applicant to respond effectively to those views.
GNR2_FF_0041, GNR2_L_010	Respondents expressed that they did not feel listened to at the consultation events.	No	The Applicant acknowledges this comment and remains confident in the level of consultation undertaken, information presented and overall community engagement. The Applicant held two rounds of community consultation during which a significant volume of feedback was received.
GNR2_L_010, GNR2_L_011	Respondent expressed disappointment that design suggestions were not followed up on and taken on board from the last round of consultation.	Yes	The design approach was reached by considering the extensive consultation feedback received during the first phase of community consultations alongside a range of factors as part of the design refinement process of the Scheme. The Applicant notes that these factors included the advancement of the technical design for the Development, and the results of a

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			range of environmental assessments.
GNR2_FF_0037	One respondent felt consultation material was misleading. Include references to leading questions, misleading figures and claims.	No	The Applicant makes note of this comment and appreciates that a significant volume of technical information was published for consultation. The Development free-to-use communications channels were open throughout the consultation period and beyond to provide assistance to consultees where issues of misunderstanding arose.
GNR2_EF_011	One respondent expressed difficulty accessing/downloading the PIER technical appendices due to the file being too large.	No	The Applicant uploaded the PEIR via google drive. Due to the PIER being a large document, the Applicant took it upon themselves to separate the PEIR volumes and chapters into individual files to decrease the size of each document, making it more accessible to download.
GNR2_EF_002	One respondent expressed concern for their email not being answered.	No	Noted.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR2_FF_0037	One respondent expressed that local knowledge is way ahead of what project has produced in documents, and that project team have not been engaging with the right people.	No	The Applicant makes note of this comment, however the Applicant has been in active liaison with the relevant host authorities throughout the pre-application period, had easily reachable phonelines, freepost and email access for all stakeholders to make representations both during and in between consultations as well as engaging directly with the local community at consultation events.
GNR2_L_008	One respondent expressed concern that local political stakeholders such as councillors were not aiding the consultation process.	Yes	The Development is to be considered under the Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIP) regime, in line with the 2008 Planning Act. The NSIP process takes account of local views, and the position of local authorities, in the decision-making process.
GNR2_OFF_025	One respondent expressed they could not make out access points in project material.	Yes	If it relates to site accesses, these are now more fully designed in the illustrative project design.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			If the comment relates to Community Access Points, two weeks prior and during the consultation period, Community Access Points were advertised for local community members to access consultation materials. The venues were listed in the Statement of Community Consultation, launch of consultation communications, advertisements hosted in local news outlets and on the website. The publication of Community Access Points is located within the Consultation Report **[EN010162/APP/5.1].**
GNR2_L_011	One respondent expressed PEIR contained instances of error where material would not load, making engagement with it harder.	Yes	The Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) and Non-Technical Summary (NTS) were made available to read online, in hard copy at Community Access Points, information events, and available

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			by request for a reasonable charge. To support accessibility chapter by chapter versions of the PEIR were provided upon request through communication channels.
GNR2_OFF_088	One respondent expressed that grid references are incorrect re: the masterplan Ref DB062 GNR PEIR; Construction traffic routes and site access points A14.1.7.; A616 and Bathley Lane.	Yes	The Applicant acknowledges this comment. Figure 5.2: Masterplan **[EN010162/APP/6.3.5.2]** presents the updated Development design following the Phase Two Consultation. In addition, Technical Appendix A14.1: Transport Statement **[EN010162/APP/6.4.14.1]** has been submitted as part of the Environmental Statement to support the assessment of transport-related matters. Bathley no longer houses solar panels following design changes to avoid flood risk zones 2 and 3.
GNR2_OFF_125	One respondent expressed that project material holds inaccurate terms of the route of public	No	The Applicant provided materials that were adequate and informative, to the best of the

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	footpaths, stating that Elements Green is consulting on out-of-date materials.		Applicant's knowledge these were up to date.
GNR2_EF_012, GNR2_FF_0033, GNR2_FF_0034, GNR2_FF_0040, GNR2_FF_0041, GNR2_L_013, GNR2_OFF_078	Respondents mentioned their attendance at a consultation event.	No	Noted.
GNR2_FF_0033, GNR2_L_023, GNR2_OFF_089, GNR2_OFF_104	Respondents expressed concern about lack of team knowledge and lack of experts at events.	Yes	The Applicant acknowledges that not every team member will be knowledgeable about all areas of the Development at consultation events. All comments and questions received during public consultations on the proposed Development are recorded and responded to by the appropriate discipline.
GNR2_OFF_104	One respondent expressed frustration that at initial consultation events they were told deer fencing and security cameras would not be a part of the plans, but they now are.	Yes	Noted. In between consultations the layout and design of the Development evolved in response to important environmental and logistical constraints. Further information regarding wildlife movement can be located in the ES Chapter 8, Ecology and

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]** and the use of security technology in Chapter 5, Development Description **[EN010162/APP/6.2.5].**

2 SECTION 47 FEEDBACK FROM NOTABLE ORGANISATIONS

Table 2: Section 47 Feedback from Notable Organisations

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Topic Area: Agricultural Land			
Joint Parish Action Group (JPAG)	Further anomalies also arise with no clear justification. For example, in terms of Agricultural Land Classification (ALC), ALC Grade 1 only identified as 'best avoided', with ALC Grade 2 only identified as 'not preferred' with nothing listed for ALC Grade 3a. This doesn't reflect the fact that Grades 1, 2 and 3a all collectively comprise the best and most versatile land. The Design Approach Document appears to have been written in retrospect to try and justify the proposal already devised.	No	The weighting used reflects National Planning Policy priorities. Site selection was based on factors for which mapping is available. The difference between Grade 3a and 3b land can only be established via survey (i.e. after site selection). The Design Approach has been iterative but based on key outline principles established at the outset of the development.
Joint Parish Action Group (JPAG)	West of the River Trent almost all the land falls into the moderate or high likelihood of BMV. East of	Yes	There is a low prevalence of Grade 2 land in the proposals, and the majority of the site comprises Grades 3a and 3b. The DCO will

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	the River Trent the pattern is more mixed. The PEIR identifies that land classification has not been completed but socioeconomic effects section of the PEIR says 52.4% of the site is estimated to be Grade 3a best and most versatile land. The Provisional Agricultural Land Classification Figure 17.1 in the PEIR shows significant areas of solar PV proposed for Grade 2 agricultural land, notably around Eakring, Maplebeck, Weston, Cromwell, North Muskham and Kelham. It is unclear as to how the site selection process has had proper regard to avoiding BMV land as the National Policy Statement and the WMS requires.		detail the work carried out on the agricultural land. Where it makes no sense to remove Grade 2 land (such as it being in half of a field where there are lower land grades in the same field, making it difficult to farm if removed from the scheme) they have not been removed. EN3 allows for flexibility and reasonable approaches to the issue of agricultural land, recognising crucially that there is no great battle between food and energy security, the biggest threat to food security being climate change.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Joint Parish Action Group (JPAG)	For the GNR project it is hoped that the applicant's soil consultants will liaise with the actual tenant farmers who farm the land, as local knowledge on soil quality is invaluable. We understand that some of the land has been farmed for decades by tenant farmers. Consideration as to what the ALC is on alternative land not chosen should be given in line with the findings in the court case of Lullington Solar Park Ltd v Secretary of State for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities & Anor [2024].	Yes	Our soil consultants have engaged with the farmers of the land. It should be noted that many of the farmers are not tenant farmers on this scheme but farm their own land. It is not expected in the case of GNR Solar and Biodiversity Park that there are many parallels with the Lullington Solar Park case. We have largely avoided the areas of land where higher ALC grades are found. In addition, we have proposed sheep grazing on the land, having signed a deal with a local grazier to continue the agricultural use.
Joint Parish Action Group (JPAG)	Consequently, at the very least the option of reducing the size of the GNR proposal to exclude all land impacting on the BMV agricultural land should have been considered as a	Yes	BMV agricultural land temporary use (not loss), is one of the many factors to consider in site selection. Proximity to grid connection is important in site selection. Also, the soil structure improvements created by not intensively tilling the land for

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	reasonable alternative. Perhaps as two alternatives one excluding all land in Grade 2 and another excluding all land in Grades 2 and 3a; although the JPAG notes that national policy does not treat Grades 1, 2 and 3a differently, so they should not really be treated differently in site selection. There is no evidence to demonstrate that such an option or options has/have been duly considered.		a 40-year period, mean higher quality soils after the period of temporary use. In terms of considering options to remove land grades in their entirety, this has been considered and rejected for several reasons, one of which is on the basis that it becomes hard to farm areas when they have parts of fields removed. It is also not really accurate to state that the BMV land should all be treated as one. A more sensible site selection approach is to protect the very highest grades where possible and differentiation is of course the best thing to do where possible. If you have Grade 1 and Grade 3a to choose from, you choose Grade 3a.
Joint Parish Action Group (JPAG)	The claim that agricultural use of the land will continue to occur ignores the basic aspect that land currently used for arable will become used for grazing. That is a fundamental change in land	Yes	This % increase is incorrect. The sheep grazing will become localised at the Development site, as opposed to currently taking place all over Nottinghamshire. Our grazier will be able to bring his flocks into one place. This will allow fields

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	use that cumulatively has implications for food security. Defra statistics show that in 2022 Nottinghamshire had 310 sheep flocks totalling 47,677 sheep so the project would increase sheep numbers by 11.5%. Sheep grazing is not a common agricultural use for higher quality land that currently sustains arable production.		previously used for grazing for any purpose (such as agriculture). The sheep grazing the land has multiple benefits, from reducing the costs of mowing, to continuing the agricultural use of the land, to fertilizing the soil over the temporary period of 40 years. Climate change is accepted as the biggest threat to food security.
Joint Parish Action Group (JPAG)	The average East Midlands Farm size in 2023 according to Defra was 103ha, the third largest of the England regions. So, a loss of 2,900 ha would equate to the equivalent loss of 28 average farms. No information has actually been provided on the actual number of farms lost in total or lost in part, as such it is	Yes	The number of farms affected, and the impacts on those farms, is fully assessed in the ES Chapter 17, Agricultural land **[EN010162/APP/6.2.17]**, with farm reports included as Technical Appendix A17.3: Farm Reports **[EN010162/APP/6.4.17.3]**. No farms will be lost, and all impacts have been assessed and described.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	difficult to quantify the actual impact.		
Joint Parish Action Group (JPAG)	Across the East Midlands, Defra statistics show that arable was 70% of farmed area, with permanent pasture being 21% of farmed area. Defra statistics also show that 33% of farmed area is rented in the East Midlands, highlighting the important role played by tenant farmers. The statistics also show that 70% of farms are cereal or cropping with only 14% of farms grazing livestock. As such moving such a large amount of land to grazing in an area dominated by arable fails to recognise the role that farmland in this area should perform. There are large amounts of low-quality agricultural land such as upland across England	No	There is no evidence to suggest that arable farmland should play a role, any more or less than sheep grazing would. Land use changes over time and across history, this is a temporary change that would not necessarily be out of kilter with past use, this was once Sherwood Forest after all. It would also assist in the longer-term viability of the area for arable farming as the soil substructures will rejuvenate over the 40 years without tilling the land.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	where sheep grazing can be the most appropriate use of the land.		
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	Invariably with DCO or TCPA applications for solar plants, the issue of the loss of BMV land raises its head.	Yes	Noted and assessed in the ES Chapter 17, Agricultural Land **[EN010162/APP/6.2.17].**
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	It is highly regrettable that the results of the ALC testing are not included in the PEIR. Given how long this project has been in the planning, it is difficult to understand why this testing is not complete.	Yes	All ALC surveys have now been completed and are reported in the ES Chapter 17, Agricultural land **[EN010162/APP/6.2.17]** and Technical Appendix A17.1: Outline Soil Management Plan **[EN010162/APP/6.4.17.1].**
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The inevitable consequence of this is to stifle consultation on this important subject area until the ES is published. Understandably, the ExA would normally be reluctant to accept design changes at that stage. The Council's view is that in this particular case, that reluctance should be	Yes	All ALC surveys have now been completed and are reported in the ES Chapter 17, Agricultural Land **[EN010162/APP/6.2.17]** and Technical Appendix A17.1: Outline Soil Management Plan **[EN010162/APP/6.4.17.1].**

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	relaxed with regard to this specific issue.		
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The provision of BMV likelihood figures is of some assistance. For instance, it is possible to identify several areas where the Applicant seeks to develop on Grade 2 land. Whether these areas will be confirmed as Grade 2 by the Applicant's own soil analysts remains to be seen	Yes	All ALC surveys have now been completed and are reported in the ES Chapter 17, Agricultural Land **[EN010162/APP/6.2.17]** and Technical Appendix A17.1: Outline Soil Management Plan **[EN010162/APP/6.4.17.1].**
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The Applicant does provide some advance notice of their early results	No	All ALC surveys have now been completed and are reported in the ES Chapter 17, Agricultural Land **[EN010162/APP/6.2.17]** and Technical Appendix A17.1: Outline Soil Management Plan **[EN010162/APP/6.4.17.1].**
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	Certainly in the case of the light blue areas of Figure 5, the Council are aware of views of local farmers that this area is very good agricultural land. It would be	Yes	All ALC surveys have now been completed and are reported in the ES Chapter 17, Agricultural Land **[EN010162/APP/6.2.17]** and Technical Appendix A17.1: Outline Soil Management Plan **[EN010162/APP/6.4.17.1].**

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	of concern if any ALC report bumps this area down to 3b.		
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The Council have been made aware that at another solar farm project nearby, the land is 'sandland'. It was assessed as a mixture of Grades 3a and3b. What the landowner did not mention to the planning authority was that this land was heavily irrigated to the extent they grew vegetables there, bringing the effective classification to Grades 1 and 2.	No	All ALC surveys have now been completed and are reported in the ES Chapter 17, Agricultural Land **[EN010162/APP/6.2.17]** and Technical Appendix A17.1: Outline Soil Management Plan **[EN010162/APP/6.4.17.1].**
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	Some previous solar plant application enquiries and hearings have witnessed a divergence between local people who know the land and the crop history well, and the reported findings of an applicant's paid soil consultants. An example is the Appeal Washford,	No	The ALC has been done in accordance with the approved MAFF Methodology (MAFF, 1988) and is reported in the ES and Technical Appendix A17.1: Outline Soil Management Plan **[EN010162/APP/6.4.17.1]** where it can be scrutinised.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	West Somerset (PINs ref APP/E3335/W/24/3337226). There, the applicant's soil consultants disagreed with the actual tenant farmers who farmed the land. It is noted that the GNR soil consultants will also be reporting on soil, farmed for decades by tenant farmers.		
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	2024 saw a national consultation over proposed changes to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). One of the suggested changes was for independent soil consultants to be appointed by, and report to the competent authority. It is regrettable that this was not adopted.	No	Noted. The suggestion was not for Applicants to get two surveys done.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	Given that one does not have any ALC report to scrutinise, one could be forgiven for thinking that no conclusions on soil grades can be reached at this moment in time. Given that the fields selected for panelling were chosen prior to the ALC results, the Applicants still decided to put panels on fields that the best information at the time suggested would be Grade 2.	Yes	Environmental studies of all kinds follow an iterative process, from desktop to field-based surveys, where more knowledge is gathered as further study takes place, allowing for a quality of survey effort and for land selection to evolve. All ALC surveys have now been completed and are reported in the ES Chapter 17, Agricultural Land **[EN010162/APP/6.2.17**] and Technical Appendix A17.1: Outline Soil Management Plan **[EN010162/APP/6.4.17.1].**
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	Figure 5 of the Technical Appendix A4, correctly identifies this likely Grade 2 land but the Applicant took the view, incorrectly in the view of the Council. that there was a significant difference between Grade 2 and Grade 1 land. It saw Grade 1 land as an area to be avoided whereas Grade	Yes	The Applicant wanted to remove the very highest grade of land (Grade 1), where alternatives were available. All ALC surveys have now been completed and are reported in the ES Chapter 17, Agricultural Land **[EN010162/APP/6.2.17]** and Technical Appendix A17.1: Outline Soil Management Plan **[EN010162/APP/6.4.17.1].**

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	2 was not preferable. This area is not the only area where the Applicant made a conscious decision to select likely Grade 2 land for development.		
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The Applicant at paragraph 18 of Chapter 17 downgrades the sensitivity of the highest two grades, thereby putting Grade 1 land on the same footing as Grade 3a. This is not a semantic point.	No	The reasons for this are described in the ES Chapter 17, Agricultural Land **[EN010162/APP/6.2.17].**
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	Had a fifth sensitivity grade – Very High, been retained as per the IEMA guidelines, then in all likelihood a medium magnitude of change to Grade 2 land would still attract a major significance and a low magnitude would attract a moderate one.	No	The methodology is as described in the ES Chapter 17, Agricultural Land **[EN010162/APP/6.2.17].**

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	At 3.6.9 of their Scoping Opinion, PINs suggest that the Applicant should consider including mapping sourced from Natural England's new Provisional ALC data as opposed to MAFF historical data. The Council have not found any imagery from the new data. The PEIR does include a figure for Likelihood of BMV land, reliant on the historical MAFF data though it would be fair to say it is not particularly user friendly. It is not known whether the new Natural England's mapping was considered. It does appear there is an absence of any graphics sourced from the new mapping.	No	The imagery being referred to is believed to be a digitised version of the old provisional maps, and hence more accessible but no more reliable than the printed 1:250,000 series ALC maps from which they have been taken.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	Of course, impartial provisional ALC mapping will not be the determining factor in considering the significance of the actual loss of BMV land brought about by this development. It will be the results eventually provided by the Applicant's own consultants.	No	All ALC surveys have now been completed and are reported in the ES Chapter 17, Agricultural Land **[EN010162/APP/6.2.17]** and Technical Appendix A17.1: Outline Soil Management Plan **[EN010162/APP/6.4.17.1].**
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The Natural England and MAFF data serve 2 purposes. The first is to inform developers where the likely BMV land is in order to avoid it where possible. The second is to compare the impartial data to the results of the Applicant's soil surveys to confirm that there are no glaring discrepancies.	Yes	All ALC surveys have now been completed and are reported in the ES Chapter 17, Agricultural Land **[EN010162/APP/6.2.17]** and Technical Appendix A17.1: Outline Soil Management Plan **[EN010162/APP/6.4.17.1].**
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	PINs make the point that the new Natural England mapping could differentiate on the split between Grade 3a and 3b land.	Yes	All ALC surveys have now been completed and are reported in the ES Chapter 17, Agricultural land **[EN010162/APP/6.2.17]** and Technical Appendix A17.1: Outline

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	Unfortunately it does not. The Council made reference earlier in this document to the east and south east of order limits. Figure 7 below is drawn from the Natural England's 2024 mapping for provisional ALC. The light blue areas are indicative of Grade 2 land with the green being undifferentiated Grade 3. However there would be a high expectation the green areas immediately surrounding the Grade 2 land would be Grade 3a. The following fields, in the area above and earmarked for panels, are likely to be Grade 2. They are referenced by the field numbers from the PEIR Figure 05.1: Fields numbered 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 20, 21, 206, 207, 208, 230, 278, 280,		Soil Management Plan **[EN010162/APP/6.4.17.1].**

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	281, and 371 plus field 22 is likely to be Grade 3a. 19 fields of likely Grade 2 land.		
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The above area constitutes the most number of Grade 2 fields lost but other areas are also targeted. Panels on Grade 2 land are planned at Kelham, Weston, a large area east of Eakring and large area west of Maplebeck.	Yes	All ALC surveys have now been completed and are reported in the ES Chapter 17, Agricultural Land **[EN010162/APP/6.2.17]** and Technical Appendix A17.1: Outline Soil Management Plan **[EN010162/APP/6.4.17.1].**
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The Council feel that in the ES, this above assertion needs revisiting. The comparison between east and west of the River Trent is correct. However, the last sentence of paragraph 37 requires further scrutiny.	Yes	All ALC surveys have now been completed and are reported in the ES Chapter 17, Agricultural Land **[EN010162/APP/6.2.17]** and Technical Appendix A17.1: Outline Soil Management Plan **[EN010162/APP/6.4.17.1].**
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	There is planned panelling on the eastern side of the Grade 2 area east of Eakring and substantial panelling around Maplebeck,	Yes	The area east of Norwell and Bathley no longer forms part of the scheme, due to avoiding flood risk zones 2 and 3. North of Kelham the

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	a smaller area near Weston, a large part of the Grade 2 area east of Norwell and Bathley and also down at Kelham. Some of the intervening areas are highly likely to be Grade 3a.		panels have been removed for the same reason. All ALC surveys have now been completed and are reported in the ES Chapter 17, Agricultural Land **[EN010162/APP/6.2.17]** and Technical Appendix A17.1: Outline Soil Management Plan **[EN010162/APP/6.4.17.1].**
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The test the Applicant will have to pass is that it was impossible to avoid using BMV land, even if that land was east of the River Trent. There is a difference between 'impossible' and 'not preferred due to the impact on future profits'. That level of evidence is not present in the PEIR. This may have to be done on a field by field basis. The Council is of the view that this may prove an uphill struggle for the Applicant.	Yes	The planning policy of relevance is set out in the ES Chapter 17, Agricultural Land **[EN010162/APP/6.2.17]**, and the assessment is made against that policy.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	Field 98 is expected to be Grade 3a and the occupant has photographs of the healthy crops there. He farmed this area for years.	Yes	All ALC surveys have now been completed and are reported in the ES Chapter 17, Agricultural Land **[EN010162/APP/6.2.17]** and Technical Appendix A17.1: Outline Soil Management Plan **[EN010162/APP/6.4.17.1].**
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	Chapter 17 confirms that sugar beet is grown in fields in the south of the order limits. It is believed at this time there are three main uses for this crop. The obvious one is the nearby sugar factory. But sugar beet is also used for biomass energy production and the production of bioethanol and biogas. Other crops are also used for this. The Council believe that an assessment is required for the loss of all crops (including wheat and maize) due to this development which are, or	Yes	The impacts on crop production and the wider agricultural economy and food production are set out in the ES Chapter 17, Agricultural Land **[EN010162/APP/6.2.17].** On a national and regional basis, the implications of the use of BMV in this case for solar PV arrays and potential sheep production, rather than for arable crop production, is negligible. Assuming that solar deployment needs to take place on agricultural land, the incremental difference is less than 2,000 tonnes.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	are likely to be used to create renewable energy.		
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The Council would wish there to be either an undertaking or a DCO requirement to mandate reported soil chemical checks throughout the project lifetime, to detect any hazardous chemical leachates. This would be to ensure that firstly, there was no contamination that could reach any watercourse, and secondly that the soil would be suitable for an eventual safe return to food production. These checks should be in addition to the hydrochemical checks described at paragraph 51 of Appendix A05.3.	No	Details of plans to handle soils are found in Technical Appendix A17.2: Outline Soil Management Plan **[EN010162/APP/6.4.17.2].**

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The PEIR states that they could be up to 30m. That may be necessary in some places. Certainly where the intended cables are medium voltage destined for the next substation these will be significant projects.	Yes	Cable areas require a working width either side for maintenance purposes, hence the 30m. The actual cable trenches are narrower, as specified in the Work Plans **[EN010162/APP/2.3].**
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	Applicant's staff have stated verbally that many will be 8 - 10 metres wide, with presumably narrower trenches within the arrays.	Yes	Cable areas require a working width either side for maintenance purposes, hence the 30m. The actual cable trenches are narrower, as specified in the Work Plans **[EN010162/APP/2.3].** The trenches within the arrays are also narrower.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	It is not known how wide the trench running alongside the Beck in the Figure 18 will be. For the sake of discussion, a width of 10m will be assumed. Depth will be conservatively assumed at 1m below ground level. This is informed by paragraph 68 of Chapter 5 which assumes	Yes	Cable crossing methodology can be found in the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.3]**

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	cabling burial depth of 0.6m to 1.5m. The 3 phase cables will need to rest on top of, and be covered by thermal sand which is required to dissipate heat away. Then the trench will be back filled.		
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The stretch of trenching required alongside the Beck here is approximately 254m long. This equates to something in the region of 2,000m3 of soil to be excavated near to the Beck, using heavy plant machinery. The approximate weight of that clay rich soil would be 3,200 tonnes. Added to that groundwork is further excavation.	Yes	The solar panels alongside the Beck have now been removed from the Development following environmental studies.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The Applicant states the site will be grazed by sheep as part of the land management plan (Paragraph 77 Chapter 17). This argument is made nowadays in virtually all	Yes	Sheep grazing is common under solar farms. The trends in sheep production nationally are not assessed but there is no reason to assume that sheep will not be part

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	solar plant applications. But never is any evidence provided that there is demand for extra grazing land locally.		of the UK agricultural sector long-term. In the case of GNR Solar and Biodiversity Park, there is demand for the local grazing, hence the partnership the Applicant has reached with a local shepherd
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	DEFRA produce annual figures each June for livestock volumes for the UK. According to those figures, the number of sheep in the UK declined by 1.8% in the year to June 2022. The following twelve months saw a further drop of 4.1% and the twelve months to June 2024 saw yet another reduction of 4.3%. In other words, in the last 3 years there has been a drop in sheep numbers of 10%. The number of sheep in the UK is at its lowest since 2011 and is projected in modelling	Yes	Sheep grazing is common under solar farms. The trends in sheep production nationally are not assessed but there is no reason to assume that sheep will not be part of the UK agricultural sector long-term. Details in ES Chapter 13, Socio-Economics and Tourism **[EN010162/APP/6.2.13].**

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	by AHDB to continue to fall up to 2030. They also state that "The predicted size of the lamb crop for the 2024 – 25 season (March - March), now sits at 15.9m head. This is a decline of 185,000 head from the previous season, representing a fall of 1.2% ".		
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The demand for UK grazing land is actually falling and that trend will continue.	Yes	Sheep grazing is common under solar farms. The trends in sheep production nationally are not assessed but there is no reason to assume that sheep will not be part of the UK agricultural sector long-term. Details in ES Chapter 13, Socio-Economics and Tourism **[EN010162/APP/6.2.13].** For the GNR Solar and Biodiversity Park, a local shepherd wants the land and has formed a partnership with the Applicant.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	There were several flocks of sheep seen grazing in open fields whilst travelling between the sites. In the case of Forest Lane, they were actually grazing in an open field next to the solar plant. All six had included the promise of grazing in their planning applications to the Newark and Sherwood District Council Planning Committee. Not one of them had sheep in them.	Yes	Sheep grazing is common under solar farms. The trends in sheep production nationally are not assessed but there is no reason to assume that sheep will not be part of the UK agricultural sector long-term. Details in ES Chapter 13, Socio-Economics and Tourism **[EN010162/APP/6.2.13].** Sheep are often in low stocking densities in solar farms, as proposed by the Applicant and are difficult to see from the roadside, enjoying as they do, the shade underneath panels (a key reason that solar is good for sheep health and welfare). The Applicant offered two days of Solar Farm educational tours of Egmanton Solar Farm in Newark and Sherwood district in summer 2024. Sheep were present onsite many years into the operational phase of the Development.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	It is highly unlikely there are enough sheep locally to populate all the current and planned solar plants and with sheep numbers dropping each year, that gap will become even more pronounced.	Yes	Sheep grazing is common under solar farms. The trends in sheep production nationally are not assessed but there is no reason to assume that sheep will not be part of the UK agricultural sector long-term. Details in ES Chapter 13, Socio-Economics and Tourism **[EN010162/APP/6.2.13].** For the GNR Solar and Biodiversity Park, a local shepherd wants the land and has formed a partnership with the Applicant.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	Given all the above, the Council believe that the ES should contain firm and reliable evidence that there is a major planned and achievable increase in the local flocks during the operational phase. Alternatively, the Applicant could demonstrate that, whereas nationally the trend in sheep numbers is down,	Yes	The shepherd engaged by the Applicant has described how he has sheep dispersed across Nottinghamshire and spends much of his time in his vehicle moving sheep many miles from one place to another. The plan is to congregate the sheep into a more manageable area. The sheep will breed and the stock will grow over the Development lifetime. Details in ES

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	there has been a substantial year on year increase in sheep numbers in the Newark and Sherwood area, meaning that they have outgrown available grazing land. Without such evidence, the credibility of the promise of 10 FTE jobs and the use of sheep as a land management mechanism is severely weakened.		Chapter 13, Socio-Economics and Tourism **[EN010162/APP/6.2.13].**
Topic Area: Climate Change			
Joint Parish Action Group (JPAG)	JPAG notes the technical calculations undertaken by Norwell & Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council in relation to the overestimation of the potential electricity generation and the consequential number of properties that could be provided with electricity.	Yes	The scheme, according to Ofgem's calculations of power needs per household (Ofgem are the correct body to refer to in terms of electricity consumption numbers), will power 400,000 homes. This is the core message from the Statutory Consultation, and it is the accepted methodology for calculation.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	Together with the overestimation of the carbon avoidance in the calculations. JPAG share the concern that these anomalies seek to significantly overstate the perceived benefits arising from the project which are misleading and again impact on the adequacy of consultation.		
Joint Parish Action Group (JPAG)	The calculations suggest a substantial carbon avoidance from the BESS element of the scheme, it is not clear how this is calculated because the BESS will not in itself produce electricity. If it stores electricity produced from renewable sources then that carbon avoidance will have already been accounted for in its initial production and care is	Yes	The purpose of the BESS is to ensure that excess electricity can be used at times when it is needed. Gas is used to generate electricity only in times of peak demand, when other sources (renewables, nuclear, import from abroad) are insufficient. Electricity from the BESS would be supplied in preference to turning on/up the gas fired power stations, helping keep prices down and minimising climate change effects. The BESS would not draw supply from the grid at times of peak

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	needed to avoid double counting. If the BESS stores electricity from that produced from non-renewable sources, then JPAG would query whether the scope 3 emissions of that non-renewable electricity from fossil fuels has been fully accounted for.		demand (actually the opposite). As well as being charged from excess electricity generated by the Development's solar PV, the BESS would also be charged from the grid when there is excess, cheap electricity available on the grid, i.e., not from gas. So, export from the BESS directly replaces export from gas-fired generation.
Joint Parish Action Group (JPAG)	The project links to the Staythorpe grid connection and consequentially to the Staythorpe Power Station. That is a gas power station and as such the consideration of scope 3 emissions being considered as indirect environmental effects that must be included in an EIA, as prescribed in the Supreme Court case of R (on the application of Finch on behalf of the Weald Action Group) v Surrey County Council [2024].	No	The Development does not connect to Staythorpe Power Station either physically or consequentially. Both the Development and the Power Station export power into the National Grid through separate grid connections. There is no connection between GNR Solar and Biodiversity Park and the Staythorpe Power Station.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	Chapter 6 of Volume 2 comprehensively explains the requirements to move towards net zero and the Council recognises this need.	No	Noted.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	At a meeting of our Council on 28th November 2024, senior representatives from the Applicant were asked by a member of the public how they arrived at the 400,000 figure. They were not able to answer but later promised an email reply.	No	The Applicant provided a written response by email on 12th December 2024. ES Chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15]** details this further.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The reply was eventually received stating the figure "is based on annual project generation estimates of 1,125,600MWh" which would be enough for 400,000 homes. To achieve that generation, the Applicant would need to use a capacity factor of 16%. However, on page 3 of the	No	The 10% is a reasonable worst-case assumption for individual panels (i.e., when comparing DC generation with theoretical maximum DC generation (1120 MWp)). However, for the scheme overall, the factor of 16% is correct, when comparing exported electricity (AC) with the theoretical maximum (800 MW (AC)). The number of homes calculation is based on

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	Technical Appendix A15.1, the Applicant assumes "a conservative 10% capacity factor for 40-year operational life".		average household electricity consumption figures from OFGEM of 2,700 kWh per annum.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	This and other publications are predicting increased cloud cover. There does appear to be an absence of peer reviewed research which could support an expectation of an increased capacity factor this far north due to climate change. There is published research that predicts an increase in the South West but increases decline as one goes north such that parts of Scotland will see a decrease.	Yes	The cloud cover predictions outlined within Section 15.3.2.2 are based on the latest UK Climate Projections (UKCP18), using RCP8.5 and the 25 km Grid Cell centred at 487500E 362500N, which is representative of the Order Limits. The data predicts that cloud cover is predicted to reduce by 3.5% by 2078.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	Buying power from the National Grid is cheapest at night. The shortage of power generation is during daytime and teatime hours, with the	No	The purpose of the BESS is to ensure that excess electricity can be used at times when it is needed. Gas is used to generate electricity only in times of peak demand, when

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	Country having to import electricity from the likes of France and Norway. Some overnight generation passing through this substation is achieved using local wind turbines. Buying this just diverts renewable energy away from the grid, only to put it back later. It does not attract a carbon avoidance or assist with net zero targets, just financial ones.		other sources (renewables, nuclear, import from abroad) are insufficient. Electricity from the BESS would be supplied in preference to turning on/up the gas fired power stations, helping keep prices down and minimising climate change effects. The BESS would not draw supply from the grid at times of peak demand (actually the opposite). As well as being charged from excess electricity generated by the Development's solar PV, the BESS would also be charged from the grid when there is excess, cheap electricity available on the grid, i.e., not from gas. So export from the BESS directly replaces export from gas-fired generation
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The BESS could be recharged from the gas powered Staythorpe Power Station. But again, though this arbitrage might be financially rewarding, it does nothing towards net zero.	Yes	the proposed Development does not connect into Staythorpe gas Powerstation. See the Grid Connection Statement **[EN010162/APP/7.15]**

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			The purpose of the BESS is to ensure that excess electricity can be used at times when it is needed. Gas is used to generate electricity only in times of peak demand, when other sources (renewables, nuclear, import from abroad) are insufficient. Electricity from the BESS would be supplied in preference to turning on/up the gas fired power stations, helping keep prices down and minimising climate change effects. The BESS would not draw supply from the grid at times of peak demand (actually the opposite). As well as being charged from excess electricity generated by the Development's solar PV, the BESS would also be charged from the grid when there is excess, cheap electricity available on the grid, i.e., not from gas. So export from the BESS directly replaces export from gas-fired generation

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	Staff working for the Applicant stated that the two BESS will be able to be recharged from Staythorpe Power Station when overall demand for electricity on the grid is low. This of course will not be 'green' energy.	Yes	It is likely the Applicant staff stated Staythorpe Substation rather than the gas powerstation, as the proposed Development does not connect into Staythorpe gas Powerstation. See the Grid Connection Statement **[EN010162/APP/7.15]** The purpose of the BESS is to ensure that excess electricity can be used at times when it is needed. Gas is used to generate electricity only in times of peak demand, when other sources (renewables, nuclear, import from abroad) are insufficient. Electricity from the BESS would be supplied in preference to turning on/up the gas fired power stations, helping keep prices down and minimising climate change effects. The BESS would not draw supply from the grid at times of peak demand (actually the opposite). As well as being charged from excess electricity generated by the

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			Development's solar PV, the BESS would also be charged from the grid when there is excess, cheap electricity available on the grid, i.e., not from gas. So export from the BESS directly replaces export from gas-fired generation.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The BESS avoidance is shown as 3,246,690 teCO2e. This saving cannot be achieved by overnight recharging from the gas powered Staythorpe as there is no figure in the Emissions Produced table above it, covering the burning of gas. And clearly, it would not be renewable energy. It cannot relate to recharging from wind as that greenhouse gas saving is already credited to those wind turbines.	Yes	The purpose of the BESS is to ensure that excess electricity can be used at times when it is needed. Gas is used to generate electricity only in times of peak demand, when other sources (renewables, nuclear, import from abroad) are insufficient. Electricity from the BESS would be supplied in preference to turning on/up the gas fired power stations, helping keep prices down and minimising climate change effects. The BESS would not draw supply from the grid at times of peak demand (actually the opposite). As well as being charged from excess electricity generated by the Development's solar PV, the BESS would also be charged from the grid

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			when there is excess, cheap electricity available on the grid, i.e., not from gas. So export from the BESS directly replaces export from gas-fired generation. A correct analysis of the greenhouse gas savings from wind turbines would apply a similar approach to the analysis of savings from the solar PV applied in ES chapter 15, namely that the generation replaces the "grid mix" of electricity sources, not the peak topping-up generation provided from gas. Adding a battery means that the wind (or other) electricity can be stored until periods of peak demand, at which point it is used to avoid having to generate electricity from gas. So there should be no double-counting.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	It therefore follows if the figures are to be believed, that the energy produced by the arrays is capable of saving 4,176,957teCO2e.	No	The solar arrays will produce energy when they receive light. This is not necessarily always at peak times, so does not necessarily displace electricity generation from gas fired

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	But the Applicant has produced greenhouse gas saving figures just for the panels and arrived at 930,266teCO2e.		power stations - the generation from solar displaces grid emissions generally, which are forecast to drop off in the 2030s. The BESS, on the other hand, is assumed always to displace gas generation (at peak times), hence leads to a higher saving.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	In Year 4, it states the 800MW solar panels will produce 1,107698MWh in that year. The Council would wish to know how an 800MW array in Nottinghamshire (excluding a BESS top-up) can produce that much energy when the Council's own figures suggest annual output would at best be nearer 770,880MWh.	Yes	The annual energy production is calculated by multiplying the phase capacity by the yield and by the annual degradation. For year 4, this includes the following: Phase 3 capacity x yield x assumed annual degradation. 1120 x 1005 x ((1-0.4)*4) = 1,107,698 MWh.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The Council estimate of carbon avoidance would be circa 682,560 tonnes over 40 years, not 930,266 tonnes.	No	This is not correct, because the capacity factor used is too low. A 10% factor is a reasonable worst-case assumption for individual panels (i.e., when comparing DC

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			generation with theoretical maximum DC generation (1120 MWp)). However, for the scheme overall, the factor of 16% is correct, when comparing exported electricity (AC) with the theoretical maximum (800 MW (AC)). Solar PV sites typically employ a strategy referred to as 'oversizing,' where more capacity is deployed relative to the grid connection size. This allows the system to more efficiently use the grid capacity available to it, which is often the primary constraint for development. It is beneficial for the Development and beneficial for consumers, who get more energy without higher network investments being required.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	Taking year 5, using the Applicant's figures (for now), they predict that that year's PV energy production would be 1,103,267 MWh (which earns a carbon avoidance of	Yes	This issue was noted during the statutory consultation period and an amended calculation is presented in ES Chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15].**

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	93,778 tonnes). In the same year, they predict to export to the BESS 249,177MWh of which 225,073MWh will be later discharged to the grid, earning another carbon avoidance of 82,151 tonnes. But of course, that is double counting the 225,073MWh. That double counting occurs every year. The BESS is being recharged with electricity that already been credited with carbon avoidance. This was pointed out to the Applicant's staff during face to face consultation and they have now accepted that error.		
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The resultant new 40 year total is 702,152 tonnes carbon avoidance from the panel fields and the BESS avoidance total remains at 3,246,690.	Yes	This issue was noted during the statutory consultation period and an amended calculation is presented in ES Chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15].**

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	This then brings one back to the overestimation of annual MWh generation, given the size of the arrays. The Council maintain that annual MWh production is 800MW times hours in a year multiplied by the capacity factor. So one could expect that by year 3, given the Applicant's figures, the virtually new panels would be all installed and at their most efficient. Whereas the Council would expect the arrays to be producing 770,880MWh per annum, the Applicant predicts 1,112,146MWh. This represents an overestimation of 44 per cent and is unexplained.	No	This is not correct, because the capacity factor used is too low. A 10% factor is a reasonable worst-case assumption for individual panels (i.e., when comparing DC generation with theoretical maximum DC generation (1120 MWp)). However, for the scheme overall, the factor of 16% is correct, when comparing exported electricity (AC) with the theoretical maximum (800 MW (AC)). Solar PV sites typically employ a strategy referred to as 'oversizing,' where more capacity is deployed relative to the grid connection size. This allows the system to more efficiently use the grid capacity available to it, which is often the primary constraint for development. It is beneficial for the Development and beneficial for consumers, who get more energy without higher network investments being required.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	Recalculating without the overestimate and adopting a constant rate of overestimation, it is the Council's position that the actual carbon avoidance for the panels direct to the grid is not 930,266 tonnes but 417,904 tonnes.	Yes	An amended calculation is presented in the ES Chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15].**
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	This reduces the total net emissions reduction for the 40 years from 1,594,744 to 1,082,382 tonnes. If the Council's calculations are correct, this means that the generating benefits have been overestimated by 47%. This recalculated figure will be even lower given some missing infrastructure from the tables.	Yes	An amended calculation is presented in the ES Chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15].**
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The Council would welcome any further clarity on the Applicant's figures which assisted them in arriving at their totals.	Yes	In addition to these consultation comment responses, further detail is provided in ES Chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15]** and Technical Appendix A15.1:

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			Lifecycle Greenhouse Gas Evaluation **[EN010162/APP/6.4.15.1].**
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	Following this assessment and the quantification of any resultant lost carbon avoidance, it is believed that the carbon avoidance overall total as shown in Chapter 15 should be adjusted accordingly.	Yes	An amended calculation is presented in the ES Chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15].**
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The following helpful explanation (with our emphasis) is drawn from a footnote on page 14 of EN-3:- "10 Case law, beginning with R v Rochdale MBC Ex p. Tew [2000] Env.L.R.1 establishes that while it is not necessary or possible in every case to specify the precise details of development, the information contained in the	No	Yes, this is correct.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	ES should be sufficient to fully assess the project's impact on the environment and establish clearly defined worst case parameters for the assessment. This is sometimes known as 'the Rochdale Envelope." It appears the Applicant has done that in the PEIR with regard to the projected CO2 emissions resulting from steel manufacturing.		
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	In addition to the above infrastructure item, the Applicant lists just under 5,500 tonnes of other infrastructure items to be made of steel. The implication of the CO2 transportation emissions associated with these items implies that some will also be imported from China. It is hoped that this can be clarified in the ES.	No	It has been assumed within ES Chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15]**, that the Development components, e.g. solar PV modules, PV framework, and BESS cells, will be produced in China and delivered via sea from China, to ensure a worst-case scenario is presented. As outlined within section 15.5, only the PV mounting framework has the potential to be produced in the UK, but the potential emissions savings

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			have not been included in the assessment as the mitigation cannot be committed to at this stage.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	This has probably been included to hint at a possible reduction in steel transport CO2 emissions.	No	It has been assumed within ES Chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15]**, that the Development components, e.g. solar PV modules, PV framework, and BESS cells, will be produced in China and delivered via sea from China, to ensure a worst-case scenario is presented. As outlined within section 15.5, only the PV mounting framework has the potential to be produced in the UK, but the potential emissions savings have not been included in the assessment as the mitigation cannot be committed to at this stage.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	If the imported steel slabs come from China, this could actually increase the transportation CO2 emissions as the steel will have to travel to Wales first before coming to Nottinghamshire.	No	It has been assumed within ES Chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15]**, that the Development components, e.g. solar PV modules, PV framework, and BESS cells, will be produced in China and delivered via sea from China, to ensure a worst-case scenario is presented. As outlined within section 15.5, only the PV mounting framework has the potential to be produced in the UK, but the potential emissions savings have not been included in the assessment as the mitigation cannot be committed to at this stage.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The Applicant has produced calculations for the CO2 emissions associated with the materials required for this project and the CO2 cost of transporting them. At this early stage of development, the Council	No	Noted.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	accept this is a rough guide only.		
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	In the transport emissions table, an incorrect figure of 150 tonnes is provided for Fencing and Gates. Clearly the lowest it can be is 163.5 tonnes but that figure does not include the deer fencing gate frames or other required fencing materials.	Yes	These figures have been reviewed, along with changes to the design parameters, and a revised analysis is provided in the ES Chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15].**
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	What it also does not include is the 6km of security fencing required for the substations and BESS. The example chosen by the Applicant is using the products from a company called FirstFence. Their example is a 3m length of fence. The Applicant will require 2000 of these units to complete its 6km of	Yes	These figures have been reviewed, along with changes to the design parameters, and a revised analysis is provided in the ES Chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15].**

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	fencing plus a similar number of galvanised steel poles. According to that company, the weight of the fencing alone would be 50 tonnes. 2000 poles would weigh circa 13 tonnes.		
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	In table 5.5 of Chapter5, the Applicant confirms that galvanised steel will be used for this security fencing. At the top of page 5 of A15.1, the Applicant has multiplied the 6km of security fencing by the emission factor of 12400kg per kilometre The source is given as Inventory of Carbon and Energy (ICE) Version 3. Their conclusion is that it would lead to 74 tonnes of CO2. The Council only has access to the newer Version 4 of this database. There, the embodied carbon for electro galvanised steel is 2.71	Yes	The PEIR document was drafted before the release of ICE V4. This version has been incorporated into ES Chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15].** These figures have been reviewed, along with changes to the design parameters, and a revised analysis is provided in ES Chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15].**

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	kgCO2e per kilogramme of steel. For the sheet or coil production of the galvanised steel needed for the fencing, the embodied carbon for the 63 tonnes would be 171kgCO2e, not 74. 6.2.6		
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	But the emissions will be even higher than that as cutting, shaping and welding of the steel will be required before paint is applied. Solvent based paint has a high embodied carbon footprint.	Yes	This has been reviewed and solvent based paint for security fencing has now been considered within the analysis provided in ES Chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15].**
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	ICE V4's embodied carbon figure to create this is 2710kgCO2e per tonne of metal, before additional work such as tube rolling and welding is completed. That would bring the tCO2e emissions for this part of the infrastructure, excluding machining, to 121,408 tonnes of CO2, not 69,440.	Yes	This comment has been addressed in ES Chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15]** through an analysis of the data presented in Technical Appendix A15.1: Lifecycle Greenhouse Gas Evaluation **[EN010162/APP/6.4.15.1].**

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	It is accepted that Chapter 15 states that attempts will be made to use steel sourced from electrical arc-furnaces which will reduce the emissions though these furnaces may not be in the UK.		
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The Applicant estimates that 23,520 tonnes of aluminium will be required for the frames. ICE V4 does not produce figures for anodised aluminium or magnelis. V4 does produce figures for aluminium production in China, with a built in use of 31% recycled metal. The embodied carbon factor for China is 14600kgCO2e for every tonne of aluminium, bringing its associated CO2 emissions to 343,392 tonnes as opposed to 156,878.	Yes	This comment has been addressed in ES Chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15]** through an analysis of the data presented in Technical Appendix A15.1: Lifecycle Greenhouse Gas Evaluation **[EN010162/APP/6.4.15.1].**
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	If however this metal was sourced from Europe, the	No	Aluminium has been assumed to be sourced in China, as a worst case,

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	figures come down dramatically with a European factor of 6670kgCO2e (with a recycling input of 31%). The CO2 emissions would then be 156,878- the same as the Applicant's figure. This firstly confirms the Applicant's methodology of using the ICE headline factors as opposed to the end of life ones. The problem with the lower figure though is that on page 12 of Appendix A15.1 the Applicant puts the journey distance for the aluminium by sea as 19,600km. A voyage distance assessment shows that that distance is consistent with the aluminium travelling from one of the southern ports in China. Certainly not Europe.		so the embodied carbon for this has been revised for the updated design and ICE v4 figures, taking into account this comment in ES Chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15]** through an analysis of the data presented in Technical Appendix A15.1: Lifecycle Greenhouse Gas Evaluation **[EN010162/APP/6.4.15.1].**

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	This represents a significant reduction in the public benefit. If just these 3 CO2 corrections were applied to the Council's adjusted total carbon avoidance figures, then the total shrinks to 843,803 tonnes. Panel sourcing is often not decided predetermination. However as stated above, the Applicant must establish the worst case scenarios for assessment. Sourcing the aluminium from China is the worst case scenario here. One cannot use the European figures for Chinese aluminium.	Yes	Aluminium has been assumed to be sourced in China, as a worst case, so the embodied carbon for this has been revised for the updated design and ICE v4 figures, taking into account this comment in ES Chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15]** through an analysis of the data presented in Technical Appendix A15.1: Lifecycle Greenhouse Gas Evaluation **[EN010162/APP/6.4.15.1].**
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	Following a stage 2 consultation public event, there is now some doubt as to whether aluminium will be used in the framework. If it is not and it is replaced with more UK sourced steel, then	Yes	Aluminium has been assumed to be sourced in China, as a worst case, so the embodied carbon for this has been revised for the updated design and ICE v4 figures, taking into account this comment in ES Chapter 15, Climate Change

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	that is a substantial CO2 saving. However, until there is documentary evidence over the choice and sourcing of the metals, the aluminium figure has to remain in.		**[EN010162/APP/6.2.15]** through an analysis of the data presented in Technical Appendix A15.1: Lifecycle Greenhouse Gas Evaluation **[EN010162/APP/6.4.15.1].**
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	There is another infrastructure item that appears not to have made the CO2 calculations. Deer fencing requires deer fencing poles which will no doubt be pile driven into the ground. Paragraph 75 of Appendix A04.1 confirms that the poles will support galvanised wire mesh with the likely pole height of at least circa 2.5m. As previously stated, where exact specifications are not known, then the Applicant should adopt the worst case scenarios. The IEMA Guidelines advising on	Yes	This has been reviewed, and deer fencing has now been considered within the analysis provided in ES Chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15]**. Deer fencing poles are assumed to be wooden, as is typical.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	assessing greenhouse gas emissions allows the exclusion of certain CO2 emitters where their emissions are less than 1% of total emissions. In those instances, it must be clearly stated that that has been done. Certain CO2 production has been excluded in this report and where it has, this is mentioned. The Deer fence poles are not a major contributor but there is no mention of their exclusion.		
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	Page 7 of Appendix A15.1 attempts to calculate the CO2 emissions for the deer fencing. The Applicant states that the emission factor is 1689.5kg per kilometre to arrive at 253 tonnes. As previously stated, the Council do not have Version 3 of ICE but the	Yes	This has been reviewed, and deer fencing has now been considered within the analysis provided in ES Chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15]**. Deer fencing poles are assumed to be wooden, as is typical.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	newer version 4 (V4). It would be surprising if version 3 gave figures per kilometre as opposed to per tonne. Deer fencing can vary in height. The weight of the deer fencing proposed would be circa 163 tonnes of galvanised steel. The V4 embodied carbon figure to create this is 2710kgCO2e per tonne of metal, resulting in a minimum CO2 emission of 443 tonnes, not 253. This brings the expected CO2 saving down to 843,613 tonnes.		
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	As for the wooden poles, the worst case scenario would be for 3m treated wooden poles. For 1.8m high fencing, manufacturers suggest a gap between poles of 3m. For the 150km of predicted deer fencing, this would need 50,000	Yes	This has been reviewed, and deer fencing has now been considered within the analysis provided in ES Chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15]**. Deer fencing poles are assumed to be wooden, as is typical.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	poles. Weight calculations vary according to pole circumference. A reasonable figure, based on manufacturers' specifications, would be 18kg per 3m pole. The projected weight of the poles would therefore be 900 tonnes.		
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	ICE V4 cannot assist with the CO2 cost with machining these poles. It would not be insignificant. The nearest V4 category is Timber-Closed Panel timber frame system with an embodied carbon coefficient of 0.452kg per kg of wood. This would result in a further 406 tonnes of CO2 in pole manufacture. Clearly, these 900 tonnes of wood had also not been included in the CO2 transport emissions for Fencing and Gates (150 tonnes). The	Yes	This has been reviewed, and deer fencing has now been considered within the analysis provided in ES Chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15]**. Deer fencing poles are assumed to be wooden, as is typical.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	Applicants assign 240km as the mean round trip travel distance for fencing. Adding the 900 tonnes of wood to the 163 tonnes of wire mesh and the 63 tonnes of security fencing results in a minimum transport CO2 cost for fencing of 65 tonnes, not 9.		
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The sub-total at 6.2.13 can now be reduced further following the conclusions at 6.20-6.21, resulting in a new sub-total of 843,151 tonnes of carbon avoidance.	Yes	This has been reviewed and deer fencing has now been considered within the analysis provided in ES Chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15]**. Deer fencing poles are assumed to be wooden, as is typical.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The Applicant uses a CO2 factor of 1550kg per tonne of steel, supposedly drawn from ICE V3. ICE V4 does not include this figure for any steel grade. Steel containers are either made of corten steel, galvanised steel or a mixture of both. The most	Yes	The CO2 factor for steel was sourced from the ICE V3.0 'Steel, Section', with a factor of 1.55 kg/CO2e. This has been updated to 'finished cold-rolled coil steel', as the best estimate of kg CO2e from the ICE database, with an emissions factor of 2.57 kg/CO2e.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	appropriate ICE category appears to be organic coated steel sheets which attracts an emission factor of 2.88kg CO2 per kilogramme of steel, meaning the containers produce 230 tonnes of CO2 as opposed to the Applicant's 124 tonnes.		
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The Applicant states that containers will have heat exchangers but it very unclear where the production emissions for these 371 pieces of the infrastructure have been included.	No	The heat exchangers are an in-built section of the BESS and are considered within its embodied carbon calculation.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The illustrative design parameters (Table 5.9 Chapter 5) put the number of BESS storage containers as 371. Adopting this figure and the applicant's assumption that each container will weigh 2	Yes	These figures have been reviewed, along with changes to the design parameters, and a revised analysis is provided in the ES Chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15].**

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	tonnes, then that is a total of 742 tonnes of steel which will either be corten steel, galvanised steel or a mixture of both. Applying the same emissions factor as above from V4 for their manufacture, that provides an estimate of 2137 tonnes of CO2 as opposed to 682 from the Applicant.		
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	There is a further miscalculation with regard to the transportation emissions for the substations. On page 14 in table A15.1, the total weight of all the substations is given as 2.8 tonnes. However, one is told on page 6 that 2800 tonnes of steel are required for these builds. The associated emissions are therefore not 0.1 tonnes of CO2 but 162 tonnes, according to ICE V4.	Yes	These figures have been reviewed, along with changes to the design parameters, and a revised analysis is provided in the ES Chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15].**

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	there is an adjustment needed for the CO2 embodied in the replacement panel supports. The Applicant's figures are shown at Table A15.1.2.6 in TA A15.1. The Applicant totals the combined steel and aluminium panel support production emissions at 226,318 tonnes whereas that figure has now been shown that it would be 464,800 tonnes if the correct V4 emission factor is used.	Yes	This comment is addressed in the ES Chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15]** through an analysis of the data presented in Technical Appendix A15.1: Lifecycle Greenhouse Gas Evaluation **[EN010162/APP/6.4.15.1].**
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The Applicant then provides too high a figure for the original framework transportation emissions in this table, the correct one being 178,014, not 182,161. Adjusting the combined production emissions figure and using the correct transport figure brings about	Yes	These figures have been reviewed, along with changes to the design parameters, and a revised analysis is provided in the ES Chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15].**

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	a net increase of 23,433 tonnes of CO2.		
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	Transformers have been included in the steel total. It is recognised that these pieces of equipment contain other materials, some of which would attract a higher emissions factor.	Yes	These figures have been reviewed, along with changes to the design parameters, and a revised analysis is provided in the ES Chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15].**
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	Transformer production emissions are based by the Applicant on 510 tonnes of steel. When it comes to transporting them, 1020 tonnes of transformers travel by sea but then only 500 leave the port for the site. It is not intended to correct this error as it is not known which of the 3 figures is right.	Yes	These figures have been reviewed, along with changes to the design parameters, and a revised analysis is provided in the ES Chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15].**

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The weight figures for the transformers are confusing and it is not clear whether the oil is included in any of the figures. If it not, then calculated separately for a distance of 150km, this would cause a further 9 tonnes of CO2 emissions.	Yes	These figures have been reviewed, along with changes to the design parameters, and a revised analysis is provided in the ES Chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15].**
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The verbal confirmation that mineral oil will be relied upon. This oil a distillate obtained during fuel refinement and distillates have an associated emissions factor of 3.226 tonnes of CO2 per tonne, leading to a total of 823 tCO2e.	Yes	The oil type used within the transformers is not yet confirmed, but mineral oil has been presented as a worst case within ES Chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15].**
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	For some reason, the 239 tonnes of copper and 900 tonnes of wood have not been included. However, the related CO2 decommissioning emissions for these two materials are	Yes	This has been reviewed, with wood from fencing and copper now considered within the analysis provided in ES Chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15]** deer fencing poles are assumed to be wooden, as is typical.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	also not large enough to be hugely significant. The same applies to the CO2 linked to the stakes for 50,000 trees/shrubs and tree guards.		
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	With the guards likely to be made from HDPE and the stakes softwood, the probable total CO2 emissions linked to these items is under 100 tonnes. And of course there is a carbon capture element for the trees.	Yes	These figures have been reviewed, along with changes to the design parameters, and a revised analysis is provided in ES Chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15]**. Forestry is a renewable business (ie new trees will be grown in place of the felled ones - and in any scenario the felled ones would ultimately have died and decomposed somehow, and been replaced by new trees), and so the relevant carbon associated with the wood is only the carbon for working, treating and transporting it.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	Not all the errors are damaging to the carbon avoidance figures. In Table A15.1.2.7, page 25 of Appendix A15.1 the	Yes	These figures have been reviewed, along with changes to the design parameters, and a revised analysis is provided in the ES Chapter 15,

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	Applicant states the mass of the batteries to be decommissioned is 1,760,000 tonnes. This obviously is incorrect. The actual weight would be 38,218, including the replacement batteries. This error is repeated on page 27.		Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15].**
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The decommissioning of the batteries is reduced to 813 tonnes (not 37477) and decommissioning transportation CO2 is reduced to 1834 tonnes (not 84,480). This is the largest miscalculation and changes the carbon avoidance up to 931495 tonnes.	Yes	These figures have been reviewed, along with changes to the design parameters, and a revised analysis is provided in the ES Chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15].**
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	There is another positive error in that recycling the aggregate has been counted twice – in operational waste and decommissioning waste. The correction leads	Yes	These figures have been reviewed, along with changes to the design parameters, and a revised analysis is provided in the ES Chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15].**

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	to an increase in carbon avoidance of 468 tCO2e.		
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The embodied carbon for that sand will be 1792 tonnes. Using the same transportation distance the Applicant adopted for aggregate, that equates to 24,000,000 tonnes.km which has a carbon emissions factor of 5,760 tonnes of CO2. It should be quite easy for the Applicant to come up with a different figure as they have all the technical specifications. However, our rough calculations would not have been necessary had the Applicant included thermal sand and ducting in their calculations from the outset.	Yes	These figures have been reviewed, along with changes to the design parameters, and a revised commentary is provided in the ES Chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15].**

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	Methane is the second most important greenhouse gas contributor to climate change following carbon dioxide. In fact, methane's ability to trap heat in the atmosphere is stronger than that of carbon dioxide. Nitrous Oxide is the third greenhouse gas measurable using the aforementioned conversion factors. The presentation of their impact is by showing the CO2 equivalence. The UK Government's GHG Conversion factors require companies to report emissions for all the three gasses.	Yes	Noted.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	By mass, CO2 is by far the most significant harmful emission. However, the burning of fossil fuels in transportation also releases methane (CH4) and nitrous	Yes	Noted.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	oxide (N2O) which are both greenhouse gasses.		
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The Council have completed a series of calculations for the on site fuel consuming machinery and the transportation elements of this development. Using the aforementioned conversion factors, it has been possible to total the consumption in tonnes of petrol, diesel and marine diesel. From there, the total CO2 equivalent emissions of CH4 and N2O can be calculated. The final total is 6673 tonnes of CO2 equivalence.	No	Fuel consumption for plant, machinery, and generators is assessed for construction and decommissioning within Technical Appendix A15.1: Lifecycle Greenhouse Gas Evaluation **[EN010162/APP/6.4.15.1].** The emissions factor in kg of CO2e represents all emissions including CH4 and N20.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The combined effects of the revision of CO2 avoidance through aggregate power generation, and this review of the CO2 emissions that are a consequence of deploying the materials required for the	Yes	Noted. Amendments to the analysis have been made in response to consultation comments as well as to changes to the design parameters, as set out in ES Chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15].**

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	development, is that the recalculated projected carbon avoidance over 40 years is 905,762 tonnes, not 1,594,744. This represents a 76% over-inflation of the benefits. Appendix C shows that all the recalculations correct wrong conversion factors, omitted infrastructure or incorrect data, or mathematical errors - not exclusions following the 1% IEMA guidelines.		
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	No CO2 emissions resulting from painting, machining, factory welding, pressure treating the 50,000 wooden poles, cable ducting, metal fastenings and the use of chemicals for the wood have been included.	Yes	Noted. Amendments to the analysis have been made in response to consultation comments as well as to changes to the design parameters, as set out in ES Chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15].**

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	There is also a large Scope 3 CO2 emission caused by the freight depot and container port handling machinery, and the quay cranes loading and unloading the shipping containers in port.	Yes	Amendments to the analysis have been made in response to consultation comments as well as to changes to the design parameters, as set out in ES Chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15].**
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The Applicant to their credit has included an assessment on pollution for the operational phase. No criticism can be levied at the scope of this assessment as it was not required.	No	Noted.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	Consequences of damage to short term generation capacity of the project, the reduced revenue and the repair costs for the owner, then they are not significant impacts for the environment.	No	Noted.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	An asserted national advantage is its contribution to energy security for the UK.	No	This is correct.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	Internationally, the Applicant predicts a positive impact on climate change (section 15.4 of Chapter 15) which is an international benefit.	Yes	Updated predictions are made in ES Chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15].**
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The development as a whole will contribute to the decarbonisation of energy supply infrastructure.	No	Noted.
Topic Area: Community Benefits			
Joint Parish Action Group (JPAG)	The consultation has not made it sufficiently clear that the financial community benefit through NG+ cannot be guaranteed or secured through the DCO process. The same is applicable to the suggested EG Education and ED Academy initiatives. Consultation boards such as that on the Rooftop PV Grant Scheme in fact appear to mislead attendees that this is an integral part of the project.	No	The NG+ scheme sits outside the DCO process, but it is correct to request feedback from the public on how to shape the community benefit fund associated with the Development. In terms of the EG Academy, it is both guaranteed and already a great success, with the first 6 free CPD accredited courses have already been released to the public and the official launch of the programme took place in June 2025, 113 students have enrolled, and 142 courses have been completed. The Applicant

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			encourages all local residents to take part or encourage others to do so at www.egacademy.co.uk. Details can also be viewed in ES Chapter 13 **[EN010162/APP/6.2.13].** The Applicant sees no evidence of the rooftop PV grant scheme appearing to mislead attendees that the scheme is an integral part of the Development, it has always been presented as part of NG+ and benefitting from NG+ funding. The scheme has so far had over 150 enrolments with surveys having taken place at properties seeking energy efficiency and renewable energy measures.
Joint Parish Action Group (JPAG)	The same is the case for the consultation board on flood prevention schemes where NG+ funding for Sustainable Drainage (SuDs) again appears to mislead attendees that these are part of the overall project. Similar	No	In terms of delivery, the Applicant has already spent significant time and resource on the NG+ flood alleviation programmes, it has begun issuing a newsletter on them and intends to begin delivery of the schemes before the Solar and Biodiversity Park is due to come

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	references to NG+ initiatives were also contained on other consultation boards.		online. There is no evidence given here around how the NG+ matters have misled or have appeared to mislead.
Joint Parish Action Group (JPAG)	The NG+ map identifying some 39 initiatives superimposed on a map showing the NSIP project area is considered to be particularly misleading and incorrectly appears to suggest that these initiatives are part of the overall NSIP scheme.	No	The Applicant would refute the claim that the map appears to suggest that NG+ initiatives are part of the overall NSIP scheme. If the wider issue here is a mistrust around delivery of NG+, the initiatives that have already begun with our NG+ co-ordinator hopefully provide some initial comfort around intent. The scheme will be managed by Nottinghamshire Community Fund (NCF), an independent charity. There will be an independent board to provide oversight.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	This is important is that no doubt in the ES, there will be proposals for the chosen compensation fields.	Yes	Fields chosen for Biodiversity improvement were indeed those areas that are most suited to such measures. In Technical Appendix A5.1: Outline Landscape and Ecological management Plan (oLEMP) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]** it can be observed that areas abut

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			SSSIs for maximum benefit, or flood areas. ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**, deals with these matters more broadly.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	If one knows the individual field sizes requiring compensation, then one can calculate of provisional habitat loss totals for areas within the order limits.	No	The detailed assessment around habitat loss and gain is calculated in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity [**EN010162/APP/6.2.8**]. The Solar and Biodiversity Park will bring a significant Biodiversity Net Gain of 60% for habitats, 26% for hedgerows and 11% for watercourses, with the Development creating 64,500 new trees and over 1,000 acres of ecological enhancement area.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	It is the use of the word 'community' which may end up a sticking point.	No	The Community engagement for GNR Solar and Biodiversity Park has been extensive across the pre-application stage of the Development. Benefits to local communities include: • The NG+ package offers £1m per annum in Community Benefit

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			across the 40 year life of the Development. • The extensive new access to the countryside through 28 new permissive routes. • Biodiversity Net Gain of 60% for habitats, 26% for hedgerows and 11% for watercourses, with the Development creating 64,500 new trees and over 1,000 acres of ecological enhancement area. • The innovative EG Academy programme which has helped 113 local students gain renewable qualifications. • The substantial business rates the Development will pay to the local councils to improve local services. • The meaningful and well-paid job creation both in construction and permanent roles.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	Such benefits could then include energy security and a tiny contribution to reducing climate change worldwide.	No	Yes, 800MW of clean power generation will indeed assist in terms of Energy Security in a volatile world. It will also create the benefit of cheaper, green energy for 400,000 UK homes. Benefits for both the local area and the UK, as well as the stated worldwide contributions.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The Applicant might be tempted to mention NG+ - a community benefit scheme, set up and funded by the Applicant.	No	The NG+ scheme has been set up and shall be funded by the Development, it will benefit from an independent oversight board and be managed by a charity, the Nottingham Community Fund (NCF).
Topic Area: Cultural Heritage			
Joint Parish Action Group (JPAG)	The setting of only 13 designated heritage assets were identified as being potentially sensitive receptors to the Development and have been scoped into the PEIR chapter for further	No	The rationale behind scoping in or out is contained in Technical Appendix A11.2: Heritage Settings Assessment Scoping **[EN010162/APP/6.4.11.2]** where all assets within the study area are assessed.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	assessment. This is a much lower list than the 267 designated assets identified within the 2km inner study area, no clear explanation as to why this is the case has been provided. The PEIR identifies that the Order Limits go into the Caunton Conservation Area and no reasoning/rationale as to why that designated heritage asset has been scoped out is provided.		
Joint Parish Action Group (JPAG)	Reference to properties which are listed buildings should include the current used names, not just the name on the statutory list to aid public understanding. Over the time period since which some of the listed buildings were first listed, actually property names have been changed. Also, as the area is so extensive	No	The asset name and identification number as given on the national heritage list, coupled with the mapping which supports the assessment is considered sufficient to allow understanding of the asset location.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	the settlement location should also be used in addition to any property name throughout the documentation to avoid any misunderstanding between properties of the same name in different settlements.		
Joint Parish Action Group (JPAG)	We have further inconsistency between what is said in the Design Approach Document and what has actually occurred. The document for example says Conservation Areas and historic parks and gardens are not suitable for development but the Order Limits includes land within the Conservation Areas at Caunton, Maplebeck and Kelham according to the PEIR.	Yes	Design development since PEIR removed the overlap between the Order Limits and the Conservation Area boundaries at Caunton and Kelham. The impacts on Maplebeck Conservation Area from Access (Works No.8) and Mitigation (Works No.3) are assessed in the ES Chapter 11, Cultural Heritage and Archaeology **[EN010162/APP/6.2.11].**
Topic Area: Decommissioning and Construction			

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	There is some doubt that the planned electric arc furnaces at Port Talbot or Teesside will be operational by the time of the start of the construction phase. However, the Applicant's framework manufacturing sub-contractor does believe that Port Talbot will be operational. Time will tell.	No	It is the intention to use the Electric Arc Furnace at the Port Talbot site if it is up and running but the assessments of effects across the ES have been based on the worst-case scenario of importing from blast furnaces in China.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	For the purposes of decommissioning, the lower figure will be used. This totals 46,434 tonnes of steel and using the Applicant's emission factor, it would attract 46 tonnes of decommissioning CO2 emissions The decommissioning transportation CO2 impact would no longer be 184 tonnes but 2228. Total steel decommissioning would	Yes	These figures have been reviewed, along with the changes to design parameters, and a revised analysis is provided in ES Chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15].**

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	then be 2274 tonnes of CO2.		
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	Production emissions are included for 255 tonnes of oil for the transformers. This oil does not appear in the transportation CO2 calculations.	Yes	These figures have been reviewed, along with the changes to design parameters, and a revised analysis is provided in ES Chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15].**
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	Transformer oil does not appear in the decommissioning calculations either. Clearly, this material will be disposed of in a different way to the transformer metals.	Yes	The oil type used within the transformers is yet to be confirmed, but mineral oil has been presented as a worst case within ES Chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15].**
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	Staff working for the Applicant have however helpfully verbally confirmed at a public consultation that it will most likely use mineral oil. Mineral oil is not listed separately in ICE V4. However, all the liquid refined hydrocarbon fuels that it does list have an emissions factor around 3	Yes	The oil type used within the transformers is yet to be confirmed, but mineral oil has been presented as a worst case within ES Chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15].**

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	tonnes of CO2 per tonne of oil refined.		
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The Applicant states that on page 8 of A15.1 that the construction compounds will need 36,000 tonnes of aggregate. The decommissioning phase assumes a removal of the same amount.	Yes	These figures have been reviewed, along with the changes to design parameters, and a revised analysis is provided in ES Chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15].**
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The transport to site shows 40,050 tonnes. This is assumed to be the total weight of the aggregate for the construction compounds plus the 4050 tonnes of grit for the access tracks.	Yes	These figures have been reviewed, along with the changes to design parameters, and a revised analysis is provided in ES Chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15].**
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The Council feel that the total aggregate needs to be reviewed. It will not just be required for the construction compounds and access tracks. However, it is possible that the compound access	Yes	These figures have been reviewed, along with the changes to design parameters, and a revised analysis is provided in ES Chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15].**

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	tracks have been included in 1125 tonnes of aggregate required for each compound.		
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	Presumably though more aggregate will be required as a base for the new asphalt substation roads. And it might be considered prudent to include the asphalt and road building embodied carbon.	Yes	These figures have been reviewed, along with the changes to design parameters, and a revised analysis is provided in ES Chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15].**
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The decommissioning of the deer fence poles is not included but this was to be expected as they did not appear in any of the other calculations. Disposal should be achievable within a 50km radius so a mean round trip distance should be 100km. The conversion closed loop factor for wood is 6.41061kgCO2e per tonne. Assuming they would not be going to landfill, this	Yes	These figures have been reviewed, along with the changes to design parameters, and a revised analysis is provided in ES Chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15].**

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	results in an emission total of 6 tonnes with a transport CO2 emission total of 21 tonnes.		
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	Page 18 of the Appendix A15.1 introduces a figure for waste transport of 2,002,800 tonnes.km with a 50km average transporting distance. This means the Applicant is estimating 40,056 tonnes of waste. Therefore this waste tonnage is virtually all aggregate along with 5 tonnes of wood.	Yes	These figures have been reviewed, along with the changes to design parameters, and a revised analysis is provided in ES Chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15].**
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The Applicant rules out any waste framework metal on page 39 of Chapter 16. This does not seem credible as it assumes that all the machining for the framework on-site creates no wasted metal in cutting to length. However this Applicant's assertion is contradicted in	Yes	This comment on page 39 of ES Chapter 16, Miscellaneous Issues **[EN010162/APP/6.2.16]** has been amended to state that the waste is principally from the packaging rather than solely.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	Appendix A05 (paragraph 144) where it confirms that there will be waste metals from the construction of the framework.		
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	Chapter 16 also assumes no wasted copper, or tin for the cabling when it is cut to length. This is also contradicted in the same paragraph 144. Virtually all the 40,056 tonnes seem to consist of recycled aggregate (page 16). However, on page 39 of Chapter 16, the Applicant confirms they are expecting waste in paper, cardboard, wood, packaging, metals, chemicals, fuels, oil and welfare facility waste.	Yes	The Section 16.7, Waste, of ES Chapter 16, Miscellaneous **[EN010162/APP/6.2.16]** is consistent with the assumptions made in the revised greenhouse gas calculations provided in ES Technical Appendix A15.1 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.15.1]**. This was not the case in the PEIR, as noted by the consultee.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	Waste collection and disposal quantification is not assisted by Chapter 14 (Traffic) or Appendix 14	Yes	The Section 16.7, Waste, of ES Chapter 16, Miscellaneous **[EN010162/APP/6.2.16]** includes quantities of the principal waste streams expected from the

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	(transport) as there are no associated trip attractions.		Development during construction, operation, and decommissioning.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The expected workforce assumed numbers – 400 workers on average for 500 days. With the only calculated waste for site removal being aggregate, there is an inbuilt assumption that these 200,000 person days create no waste.	Yes	As outlined in Technical Appendix A5.3: Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.3]**, sewage generated during construction would be dealt with via 'Porta-a-loo' type facilities. As the Development is not a routinely manned facility, the waste generated during operation is minimal. The disposal of sewage / waste during operation is considered in Section 9.6.2.3 of ES Chapter 9, Water Recourses **[EN010162/APP/6.2.9]**.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	Research has been completed from a wide variety of sources. A fair total daily waste production figure per capita is judged to be 0.9kg of which 0.5kg is human waste. Of the remaining 400g, it is estimated that half will be	Yes	As outlined in the Technical Appendix A5.3: Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.3]**, sewage generated during construction would be dealt with via 'Porta-a-loo' type facilities. As the Development is not a routinely manned facility, the waste

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	capable of recycling. Human waste would be produced anyway so that is not an additional cost of the project. However, transporting off site for disposal is, as is transporting the bodily waste.		generated during operation is minimal. The disposal of sewage / waste during operation is considered in Section 9.6.2.3 of ES Chapter 9, Water Resources **[EN010162/APP/6.2.9].**
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	Given that arriving at accurate waste estimates is not reliable, the CO2 cost relating to 180 tonnes of worker related waste is likely to be less than 50 tonnes of CO2.	Yes	As outlined in Technical Appendix A5.3: Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.3]**, sewage generated during construction would be dealt with via 'Porta-a-loo' type facilities. As the Development is not a routinely manned facility, the waste generated during operation is minimal. The disposal of sewage / waste during operation is considered in Section 9.6.2.3 of ES Chapter 9, Water Resources **[EN010162/APP/6.2.9].**

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The Council believe that more detail is required in the ES. This will probably have to be a worst case assessment as opposed to no assessment, as in the PEIR.	No	Section 9.6.2.3 of ES Chapter 9, Water resources **[EN010162/APP/6.2.9]** gives an assessment of the significance of human waste effects for the Development in terms of the EIA regulations.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The Applicant states they intend to install 417 tonnes of cabling which will require removal upon decommissioning. However, the cabling does not figure in that data set. That said, the decommissioning CO2 costs for the cabling only comes to 22 tCO2e	Yes	Waste cables at decommissioning are included in the revised calculations provided in ES Technical Appendix A15.1 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.15.1]**.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The final transportation emissions relate to those on the Chinese mainland. Such emissions are classed as Scope 3 emissions in the UK Government's GHG Conversion Factors. The most likely source of the panels is the Xinjiang	No	Worst case scenario transport emissions are used for the assessment methodologies for ES Chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15]**. Usage of Chinese modules assumes the worst-case assessment for the benefit of the ES.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	province and this was confirmed by staff working for the Applicant on 31st January 2025.		
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The final material not included in the Applicant's estimates is thermal sand. This will be required to encase the underground cables, in order to dissipate the heat more efficiently. The Applicant has helpfully provided their calculations for total cable distance - 15km of 33kV, 30km of 132kV cabling and 1km of 400kV cabling.	Yes	Thermal sand is included in the revised calculations provided in ES Technical Appendix A15.1 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.15.1]**.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The Applicant states that trenches can be as wide as 30m. However, the Applicant's staff have been spoken to and they have stated that 8m to 10m would be the most common for the 3 phase medium voltage runs. Trenching in the array	No	As set out in ES Chapter 5, Development Description **[EN010162/APP/6.2.5]**, the maximum width of land expected to be required for cable trenches is 30 m, this comprising a maximum trench width of 12 m with a 9 m working corridor either side.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	compounds will be less wide but staff have explained that some higher voltage trenches could easily be 15-20m wide. For calculations, a conservative average trench width of 5m will be used for 33kv cabling, 10m for the 132kv and 8m for the 400kv. If more details are provided about trench width, then this issue will be revisited.		
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	For every metre length of sand encased cabling, the assumption will be made that 0.4m3 of sand by volume will be required. This provides a rough total volume of sand required as circa 15,000m3, weighing 240,000 tonnes	Yes	Thermal sand is included in the revised calculations provided in ES Technical Appendix A15.1 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.15.1]**.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	Whether a requirement could be attached that operations are not allowed to commence until the right amount of mitigation planting has been completed is a matter for the ExA. This seems unlikely as it seems that the development will go operational in phases.	No	There would be an element of planting during the construction phase as detailed in Technical Appendix A5.1: Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1].**
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The greatest ecological disruption surrounding the Beck will be during the construction phase. Some of this appears inevitable given the plans to horizontally drill underneath this watercourse. It would not be practicable to achieve this without temporary close proximity to this water course.	Yes	The area around the Beck, between Norwell and Cromwell has been removed from the Development design following more detailed environmental study and design changes to remove PV fields from areas of flood risk zones 2 and 3.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The Applicant here appears to have shifted from their earlier position in that it now intends the pile driving of deer fence posts within 10m of the Beck. How close is not admitted though if the mapping is at all accurate, certainly seemingly very close, especially towards the northern border of field 206.	Yes	Field 206 between Norwell and Cromwell has been removed from the Development design following more detailed environmental study and design changes to remove PV fields from areas of flood risk zones 2 and 3.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	It is the Council's view that, save for horizontal drilling under the Beck, the mitigation measures required by Brindle and Green should also be adopted for this proposal.	Yes	Field 206 between Norwell and Cromwell has been removed from the Development design following more detailed environmental study and design changes to remove PV fields from areas of flood risk zones 2 and 3.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The second table deals with the PV Module construction. It is planned that the construction of the mounting frames will be completed on site, cutting and rolling from metal coil. However there is no plant included in this	No	The machinery used to perform the onsite mounting frame manufacture remains within shipping containers where the measuring and cutting takes place.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	table which could achieve this manufacturing process.		
Topic Area: Ecology and Biodiversity			
Joint Parish Action Group (JPAG)	In the various documents published there is a lack of clarity over whether measures such as planting constitute mitigation or enhancement. The applicant in different documents refers for example to the planting of 50,000 trees as being mitigation whilst in others it refers to the planting of 50,000 trees as being enhancement.	No	Some planting can be both mitigation and enhancement. For example, trees may be planted to provide visual screening (i.e., mitigation) or to provide new biodiversity features and contribute to Biodiversity Net Gain and attenuation of water to reduce run-off and flooding (i.e., enhancements). There are now 64,500 trees proposed across the Development.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The Royal Horticultural Society advise (on their website) that planting should not take place if the ground is too wet or frozen. It is clear that there are going to be a lot of potential planting days lost, especially during the Winter.	No	Noted. Technical Appendix A5.1: Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]** specifies the timing of planting.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The timescale set allows for 12 months of planting. This tree planting is in addition to new or replacement hedgerow planting. That is an average of over 4,100 trees each Autumn and Winter month.	No	Technical Appendix A5.1: Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]** specifies the timing of planting which varies depending on the habitat feature. Habitat creation and enhancements, including tree planting, may start before consultation and last until the start of operation, a period of more than two years.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	In terms of who is to do this planting, it is planned to use local volunteers and members of the public. The Council welcomes the involvement of the Sherwood Forest Trust whose expertise will be valuable.	No	We note the support of Sherwood Forest Trust's involvement. Planting is likely to be undertaken by both contractors and volunteers. The details will be determined post-consent.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The Council also support the use of volunteers. However, in the case of there being slippage in tree planting progress, there should be a contingency plan, probably	No	Technical Appendix A5.1: Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]** specifies the timing of planting and includes provision for delays and seasonal

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	involving paying a professional organisation to assist.		constraints, which will also be reflected in suppliers' contracts and agreements.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The Council would be very interested to learn from the ES how many members of the public, by the time of its publication, had indicated a willingness to assist in the planting. Or whether any local research has been completed to gauge support.	No	The ES does not include an estimate of how many members of the public have indicated a willingness to assist in the planting. It is anticipated that public engagement in planting will be considered post-consent.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	it would be useful to learn from the ES exactly what are the details of the inputs from Sherwood Forest Trust. Is it intended that they would be 'boots on the ground'?	No	The details of Sherwood Forest Trust's partnership and involvement are confidential, but they are providing advice about the landscape design and oLEMP (Technical Appendix A5.1: Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]**) and are expected to be involved in the supply chain for tree planting and woodland creation.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	It is clear that a significant amount of work has been completed to reach an ecological baseline against which the impacts of the development can be assessed. It is recognised that the full baseline picture is not presented in Appendices A08.4 and A08.5 as there will have been further analyses and surveying, post publication.	No	Further surveys and analyses are presented in Technical Appendices A8.3 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.8.3]** to A8.12 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.8.12].**
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	What however is clear from the picture so far is the scale of proposed habitat loss, especially for red listed ground nesting birds. Such birds, such as skylarks avoid field boundaries, areas of regular human interference and tall structures, be they natural such as trees, or man made such as utility pylons.	No	A range of baseline studies (Technical Appendices A8.3 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.8.3]** to A8.12 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.8.12]**) has been undertaken to establish the status and distribution of breeding birds, including red-listed ground-nesting species.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	Development proposals smaller than this one, which if granted, would lead to habitat loss for ground nesting protected species, invariably describe the individual fields to be lost by occupation and acreage. This assists the scrutiny of any proposed mitigation/compensation proposals. This is regarded as good practice.	Yes	Individual fields are shown on Figures A8.4.1 and A8.4.2 (Technical Appendix A8.4: Breeding Birds Baseline **[EN010162/APP/6.4.8.4]**) in relation to the territories of breeding birds.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	It is also confirmed that lapwing and skylark plots will need to be created prior to construction on the fields for which they are meant to compensate.	No	Some mitigation for ground-nesting birds will be in place before the start of construction and thereafter will be phased in line with the construction programme.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	In terms of the suitability of potential receptor fields for lapwing(nesting)and skylark plots, the Council would like to be confident that the Applicant will have regard to	No	Defra guidance has informed the mitigation proposals set out in Technical Appendix A5.1: Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]** and ES

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	the guidance from DEFRA and Natural England.		Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8].**
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The Applicant states in Appendix A05 page 21 that DEFRA Guidance AB5 on lapwing plots will be followed. In the actions, it fails to mention the constraining factors in AB5 regarding wind turbines or level ground. It does not take into account the further guidance contained in AB5 (as at 9.1.12 above) or the guidance from DEFRA at 9.1.11.	No	Defra guidance has informed the mitigation proposals set out in Technical Appendix A5.1: Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]** and ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**. It should be noted, however, that the aim of the Sustainable Farming Incentive (SFI) grants (e.g., AB5) is to target funds to the most cost-effective interventions, whereas the Development may seek potentially less cost-effective or sub-optimal, but nonetheless worthwhile, interventions.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The Applicant omits the constraint that skylark plots should avoid "fields that are bordered by trees or next to woods as this increases the risks of predator attack." (Source AB4).	No	Defra guidance has informed the mitigation proposals set out in Technical Appendix A5.1: Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]**) and ES

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8].**
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	As a bio-diversity park, no doubt that the Applicant would want to adopt best practices. If the partnership arrangement with the RSBP produces new field selection guidance for suitable receptor fields, it is wished that this be submitted separately by the RSBP so that it can be circulated nationally as their new guidance. If this does not happen, the Council would wish the Applicant to adopt all the location and design constraints listed above at 9.1.11 -9.1.16.	No	The recommendations in sections 9.1.11-9.1.16 of the comment are addressed by Defra guidance which itself has informed the mitigation proposals set out in the Technical Appendix A5.1: Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]** and ES Chapter 8 Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8].**
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The Council notes that the Appendix A08 is not the definitive and final baseline for GCNs and that work is potentially ongoing. This presumably is the reason	No	The Development is not in a Natural England great crested newt Risk Zone or Strategic Opportunities Area. As part of our consultation, Natural England has confirmed that there are no plans for the area

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	why at this stage, there is no information yet as to whether the development is in a risk zone for GCN or if any assessment has been made of strategic opportunity areas .		encompassed by the Order Limits to be included in such areas.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	It is clearly in the best interests of all parties for there to be an as complete baseline picture as possible. The Applicant identified 137 potential ponds that could be populated by GCNs. Of the 137, 45 were not accessed (33%). In some cases, the reason provided was the lack of safe access. Paragraph 25 of the Appendix states that all ponds not accessed were outside the order limits. The fact that all ponds within the limits have been surveyed is to be welcomed.	No	The number of ponds within the Great Crested Newt Study Area is 108, of which 86 (79%) have been accessed. All of the ponds within the Order Limits have been surveyed.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The 45 ponds for which there are no findings are still within the study area. A principal reason given for non assessment is that no access permission was obtained from the relevant landowner. This might be because these individuals were not inclined to assist Elements Green with this project because of their feelings about the proposed development. This Council's representative has had the opportunity to discuss the absent data with the Applicant's ecological consultant. It was stated that no approach has yet been made to any parish council to do this. This Council would be willing to so assist but clearly cannot speak for the other parish councils. However, it is possible this	No	Letters were sent, on two separate occasions, to off-site landowners in early 2024 requesting access to their land to carry out great crested newt surveys. Further surveys will be undertaken post-consent / pre-construction to provide an up to date-baseline on which to base mitigation and possible licensing. The support of the Council in facilitating these surveys is welcome and will be sought at the appropriate time.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	might be discussed at a joint forum.		
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	Fencing will keep human receptors at a distance from most of this plant. But mammal gates will hopefully allow free passage for smaller mammals, reptiles and amphibians. Birds and bats can also clearly roam freely within the development.	No	Details of the mammal passes incorporated into the fencing are provided in ES Chapter 5, Development Description **[EN010162/APP/6.2.5]**
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	Now that the Applicant has the majority of baseline data for wildlife populations, there is a requirement to examine the potential effects on these populations of the emitted frequencies. This wildlife will have existed in an area normally free from industrial noise. The installation of new industrial sound may have the effect of dispersing wildlife from the area, with a	No	The effects of noise on animal species is assessed in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8].**

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	consequential net bio-diversity loss.		
Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (NWT)	The masterplan highlights areas where wildlife habitat will be delivered to provide mitigation for loss of habitat elsewhere within the DCO and to achieve Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG). The Development is committed to delivering a gain in Biodiversity Units across habitats, hedgerows and watercourses, and over 400 ha of land has been allocated to mitigation and enhancement. Table 8.9: Relationships between Masterplan and LEMP Habitat Features provides the extents of habitat creation. For example, Proposed Grassland (PV areas) – species diverse will deliver 1587.1 ha of modified grassland. For the	No	Technical Appendix A5.1: Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]** provides details about proposed habitat enhancement and creation.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	proposed ponds and scrapes, the number and location of those features is yet to be determined. Other proposed habitat features are less well developed at this stage: Proposed Wildlife Site (38.2ha); Proposed Green Corridor (2.7ha) and Proposed Riparian Corridor (55.4ha). Details of the specific habitats to be created within these areas aren't provided but we anticipate that agreement will be reached on those habitats during forthcoming steering group meetings of which NWT will be part of. Similarly, we are confident the number of ponds and scrapes will be agreed by the time the DCO is submitted.		

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (NWT)	We think consideration should be given to simplifying the key on the Masterplan. There are several terms for areas subject to ecological enhancement and the colour codes appear indistinct. For example, the target Areas for Ecological Enhancement and the Proposed Wildlife Sites could be amalgamated. We suggest that the term Wildlife Site is changes because it could cause confusion with the term Local Wildlife Site (LWS) that applies to sites of at least county value for wildlife (see below) and replaced with Areas for Ecological Enhancement or Ecological Focus Areas. Similarly, the Proposed Riparian Corridor and Proposed Green Corridor	Yes	The key has been simplified to help provide consistency with the UKHab baseline, the BNG assessment, and with priority habitats.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	could be amalgamated too. As a guide, the following are considered priority habitats within the Order Limits: Semi-Improved Grassland; Coastal and Floodplain Grazing Marsh; Wood pasture and Parkland; and Deciduous Woodland.		
Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (NWT)	Areas of Ancient and Semi-natural Woodland and Ancient Replanted Woodland are present around the boundary of the Order Limits (none within) and all are designated as LWS. We strongly support the intention to create and enhance 72 ha of habitats (including potential floodplain meadow and a possible wildlife site) around The Beck, c. 500 m downstream of Eakring and Maplebeck Meadows SSSI that will improve landscape	No	These proposals remain part of the Development and are described in more detail in the Technical Appendix A5.1: Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1].**

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	connectivity and help to reduce disturbance. Combined with Eakring Meadows LWS, Hunt's Meadow LWS and Kersall Grassland LWS, which are situated between the SSSI a larger and better-connected network of wildlife sites will be created in line with Lawton's principles of bigger, better, more joined up. In turn, this may increase the resilience of the SSSI to external factors (such as climate change) and support its notified features by providing additional resources (e.g. for foraging birds). Crucially, it is stated that these beneficial effects will be permanent and may be significant at the Local level.		

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (NWT)	We note that valuable hedgerows (e.g., species-rich or 'important' under the Hedgerow Regulations) may be translocated to a new location. The success of that approach is uncertain and so translocation of hedges should be a last resort.	No	Proposals for hedgerow mitigation, including translocation, are provided in the Technical Appendix A5.3: Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.3** and Technical Appendix A8.12: Arboricultural Impact Assessment 9AIA) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.8.12]**.
Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (NWT)	Table 8.10 Mitigation for the Open Farmland Bird Community provides information on features and their extents. For example, 178 ha of enhanced arable land is proposed. However, the extent of the following interventions is still to be decided: Skylark plots, lapwing Plots, headlands, beetle banks, wild bird feed crop. We look forward to assessing that information at a later stage.	No	The extent of interventions is now presented in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**. However, the precise number of some, such as skylark plots, will depend on the prevailing crop rotation because they will not be created in fallow land.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (NWT)	Supplementary bird feed is to be provided during construction only. The Sustainable Farming Incentive (SFI) provides an option for arable land: AHW2: Supplementary winter bird food whereby landowners can be paid £732 per tonne per year for the duration of three years. We encourage you and the tenant farmers to consider this option.	No	The draft oLEMP (Technical Appendix A5.1: Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]**) includes supplementary bird feed during construction. The inclusion of overwinter stubbles, beetle banks, and wild bird seed crop will provide overwinter resources during operation.
Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (NWT)	Converting areas of arable land to grassland will result in the cessation of nitrate and phosphate applications to the land, which is carried out periodically due to current land use. This cessation may lead to less run-off from the land and improve water quality in ditches and water courses. The cessation of nitrate and	Yes	Some application may continue in retained arable land. Clarification is provided in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]** and the oLEMP (Technical Appendix A5.1: Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]**).

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	phosphate applications is to be welcomed due to a positive impact on water quality, but we would like clarification on whether such applications will continue to be applied on the retained agricultural land within the DCO.		
Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (NWT)	We note that the phasing of the LEMP will allow compensatory habitat for farmland birds to be created before construction activities begin. We support that approach because it will provide higher quality habitat into which birds can be displaced and provide conditions to improve the productivity of the unaffected birds.	No	Noted. The phasing of the oLEMP (Technical Appendix A5.1: Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]**) during construction will be developed post-consent based on the construction programme.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (NWT)	The Trent and Belvoir Vales National Character Area should be used as a guide for woodland types. Native species, preferably of local provenance stock for all new plantings should be used that are characteristic of the National character Area (NCA). Most hedges in the area are dominated by common hawthorn. To increase the value of the hedges to wildlife, existing and new hedges should be enhanced by the introduction of other shrub species. Variation can be achieved by altering the proportions of species used and future management of the hedges.	Yes	These factors have been considered in the development of the Technical Appendix A5.1: Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]** and additional, local expertise has been provided by the Sherwood Forest Trust.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (NWT)	Many hedges in the solar and biodiversity park are species-poor, gappy and maintained short and narrow. There is an opportunity therefore, to improve the biodiversity value of existing hedges through gapping up with additional species and allowing hedges to grow taller and wider. New hedges would be of value where they improve connectivity between wooded areas.	No	Hedgerow enhancement and creation are key elements of the Development, which will create a net gain in BNG units for this habitat. Further details are included in the Technical Appendix A5.1: Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1].**
Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (NWT)	The Species of Conservation Concern with the highest number of territories within the Order Limits were skylark (n = 346), yellowhammer (n = 221), dunnock (n = 211) and whitethroat (n = 135). The density of skylark territories is approximately 0.13 per	No	Noted. The Breeding Birds Baseline (Technical Appendix 8.4 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.8.4]**) provides a comprehensive account of these species. Potential effects on breeding birds are assessed in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	hectare in the areas surveyed. 66 Schedule-1 (of the WCA) breeding species included red kite, barn owl, kingfisher, hobby and peregrine. Red kite, kingfisher and peregrine are also Annex-I listed species. The breeding bird survey revealed S41 priority species: yellowhammer, skylark, corn bunting, yellow wagtail, house sparrow and linnet. Publishing the list is a legal duty under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act. The list is for: • Public bodies- to help them meet their 'biodiversity duty' to be aware of biodiversity conservation in their policy or decision making• Landowners- to inform their nature recovery planning, action and funding		

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	applications. All the species are also on the Red List of Birds of Conservation Concern. The species highlighted above require urgent conservation action and so appropriate mitigation is justifiable. The proposed green space may provide foraging opportunities for yellowhammer, house sparrow and linnet but will not provide habitat for ground nesting birds of arable fields (corn bunting, skylark, and yellow wagtail).		
Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (NWT)	We understand from discussions with the applicant's ecologist that measures to mitigate for the displacement effects on skylark, yellow wagtail and lapwing from the array sites are being explored. These are likely to consist of	Yes	These measures have been incorporated into mitigation proposals in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**, which are in turn reflected in the Technical Appendix A5.1: Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]**.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	implementing management practices on suitable land which have the aim of increasing the carrying capacity to 'absorb' a significant proportion of territories from the site. The following measures are particularly effective. Include spring cereals or a spring break crop (other than oilseed rape, which grows too quickly) in the rotation, where viable. This will provide ideal nesting habitat. Create Skylark plots (small undrilled patches or patches which are sprayed out after crop establishment) in winter cereals to boost nesting success. Weedy overwinter stubbles are the most beneficial winter-feeding habitat for Skylarks on arable farms. The best stubbles are cereal stubbles		

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	which receive no pre-harvest glyphosate and no post-harvest herbicides throughout the winter. Can the cultivation of stubbles be delayed going into a spring crop until February or March. Use beetle banks to provide over-wintering habitat for beneficial insects. Beetle banks are two- meter grass strips through the middle of arable fields. Such fields can be managed as one unit, as the headland is still cropped. By implementing such measures, in conjunction with enhanced foraging habitat within the solar arrays, residual effects on these species could be reduced.		

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (NWT)	A resident of Ossington contacted NWT to highlight the value of the former Ossington Airfield for nesting skylark and lapwing. Former airfields that are not subject to intensive farming can be attractive to ground nesting bird species. A good example is the former airfield at Newton. We acknowledge that thorough bird surveys have been undertaken, and that suitable mitigation is being proposed for ground nesting birds including skylark within the DCO, but we request that further consideration is given to the deployment of solar panels on the former airfield. That will ensure that an area of notable value for skylark and lapwing is not lost under solar panels. I have provided the note that I	No	A range of baseline studies has been undertaken to establish the status and distribution of ecological features in this area. The potential effects on them are assessed in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	was sent for your consideration.		
Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (NWT)	Halting grazing in spring (April – June) will favour early flowering plants, whereas summer (July – September) will favour summer flowering plants. Ceasing grazing April – September will provide the greatest biodiversity benefits. A combination of a low stocking density and breaks in grazing should lead to a high diversity of wildflowers and invertebrates as well as benefitting small mammals and foraging birds. A qualified ecologist should assist with the development of a conservation grazing regime that is suited to the	Yes	The grazing regime will vary across the site to balance localised ground conditions, vegetation management and biodiversity benefits. Details are provided in the Technical Appendix A5.1: Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]**.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	site's characteristics and management objectives. The agreed regime should be incorporated into the Biodiversity Management Plan (BMP)/Landscape & Ecological Management Plan (LEMP).		
Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (NWT)	We expect details of cable routes, their installation method, and a full assessment of impacts to be provided. A Cable Route Search Area (CRSA) should be identified that forms the scope of the ecological desk study for the cable route, within which ecological records (notable species and habitats and designated sites) will be searched for. The final location of the cable route elements should be refined by the desk study, supported by ecological survey and consideration of	No	The cable route is wholly within the Order Limits and its effects, including on LWS, are assessed in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	responses to statutory consultation, prior to submission of the DCO application. We are concerned about potential adverse impacts on Local Wildlife Sites (LWS).		
Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (NWT)	All the main built infrastructure (Work Nos. 1, 4, 5, 6, and 7) has been separated by minimum of 15 m from LWS. Consequently, the only Work Areas that border or include LWS are Work No. 2: Cables; Work No. 3: Mitigation/Enhancement; and Work No. 8: Access Works. Cable and access works involve construction activities, the most likely effects of which include habitat loss and disturbance and direct harm to ecological features, including components of the LWS. All	No	Noted. Further details are provided in Technical Appendix A5.1: Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]**.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	works associated with Work No. 3 will be complementary to the nearest LWS. It is stated that upon completion of construction works associated with Work No. 2: Cables, these areas will be reinstated to their former condition or otherwise used for mitigation and enhancement in line with the specifications for Work No. 3: Mitigation/Enhancement. This mitigation and enhancement will be complementary to the relevant LWS, but it may also target other features (e.g., ground-nesting bird mitigation) or serve other purposes (e.g., contributing to BNG).		

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (NWT)	We also note that the CEMP, CEcMP, LEMP and AIA will provide mitigation for most of the likely effects. However, there are five LWS through which cables may need to be routed and so, in the absence of additional mitigation, there is potential for permanent and temporary habitat loss, and harm to their constituent species. Depending on the extent of works and the sensitivity of the features of the LWS, this would be a low to high magnitude adverse effect and significant at the County scale	No	Noted. Assessment of potential effects on LWS is provided in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**.
Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (NWT)	We note that most access tracks have been designed to make use of existing gaps in hedgerows and watercourse crossing points. In addition, Horizontal	No	A range of methods will be used to avoid and mitigate potential adverse effects on hedgerows. HDD may not be suitable in some locations (e.g., due to ground conditions) and so alternative solutions would be

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	Directional Drilling (HDD) may be used to avoid sensitive habitats, notably woodlands and watercourses. Hedgerows that may need to be crossed by underground cables will be surveyed to determine their potential to qualify as 'important' under the Hedgerow Regulations, and any 'important hedgerows' will be crossed using HDD.		sought. Hedgerow losses from cabling will be reinstated by replanting or translocation.
Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (NWT)	Currently the identified cable corridors are broad swathes of land, but it isn't clear what the required working width will be. An example is Maplebeck Viewpoint Verges, a LWS designated for its notable flora. The verges, 600m in length, are to be subjected to Work No. 2: Cables crossing the LWS and a 350 m stretch of Work No. 8: Access Works wholly	No	ES Chapter 5, Development Description **[EN010162/APP/6.2.5]** provides the specification of cable and access works. No access works are proposed in Maplebeck Viewpoint Verges LWS. The cable route will pass under the LWS via Horizontal Directional Drilling. Effects on Maplebeck Viewpoint Verges LWS are assessed in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	covers the remainder. Mitigation and restoration are proposed but the extent of the damage and loss to LWS is not clear and we therefore request further information about the cabling process and the LWS that are to be effected.		
Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (NWT)	Local Wildlife Sites (LWS) are a local, non-statutory designation, below (but complements) the national suite of designated Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs). They are of substantive value for the conservation of biodiversity and are home to rare and scarce species or represent the best surviving examples of habitats that were once widespread and typical of the Nottinghamshire landscape. Collectively, these sites form an essential	No	Potential effects on LWS are assessed in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	ecological network and act as wildlife corridors and steppingstones, allowing species to migrate and disperse between sites. The continued existence of these sites is vital to safeguard wildlife from the pressures of development, intensive agriculture, and climate change. The LWS network is comprehensive (meaning that every site which qualifies as a LWS is designated as one), whereas SSSIs are representative of the best sites in an area, such that that not all sites which meet the SSSI selection criteria have been, or will be, designated as a SSSI. Because of this, several LWS would potentially qualify as SSSIs, meaning that LWS are best described		

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	as sites that are of at least county-level importance for their flora and/or fauna. Every effort should be made, therefore, to ensure that LWS are protected and buffered from development, and this is recognised in Local Planning Policies. The NPPF also specifically cites the need for the protection of irreplaceable habitats		
Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (NWT)	Measures to minimise construction impacts may include:• Appointment of an ecological clerk of works (ECoW) to provide training and toolbox talks, oversee any activities that could potentially impact biodiversity, be responsible for monitoring and reporting on compliance with planning consents, environmental permits, legislation and mitigation	No	An EnvCoW and ECoW are proposed in Technical Appendix A5.1: Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]**.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (NWT)	Construction compounds should be in areas of the least nature conservation value.	No	Construction compounds will be in place for no more than 2 years, and soils will not have deteriorated as they will be stored as set out in the outline Soil Management Plan (oSMP) (Technical Appendix A17.2 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.17.2**]). Illustrative construction compounds are shown in the illustrative construction design Figure 5.5 Illustrative Construction Layout **[EN010162/APP/6.3.5.5]**.
Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (NWT)	Reasonable Avoidance Measures (RAMs) such as covering excavations overnight and ensuring all hazardous materials are correctly stored according to Control of Substances Hazardous to health (COSSH) legislation	No	These measures are specified in Technical Appendix A5.3: Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.3]**.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (NWT)	The Scoping Report states that the site will be protected with a deer fence. The ES should include information on mitigation measures (such as the use of mammal gates) to avoid significant effects from restricting the movement of species during construction and operation of the proposed development. Consideration should be given to restricting access by mammals to areas that are designed for ground nesting birds	No	Details of the mammal passes incorporated into the fencing are provided in ES Chapter 5, Development Description **[EN010162/APP/6.2.5]**. Predator-proofing some areas of ground-nesting bird mitigation may adversely affect other wildlife and so is not proposed but may be considered as part of long-term adaptive management.
Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (NWT)	The EcIA should identify where monitoring is required for mitigation, compensation, and enhancement measures. It should set out the methods to be used, the criteria for determining success/failure, appropriate timing, mechanisms for implementation, frequency	No	Monitoring and remedial actions are described in Technical Appendix A5.1: Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]**, which will be secured as a Requirement of the DCO.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	and duration of monitoring, and frequency of reporting. Monitoring may be used to determine:• whether the measures have been implemented as agreed • the success/effectiveness of the measures• early warning of proposed measures which are not proving effective • how to remedy the situation should any of the implemented measures fail e.g., due to lack of management. Monitoring should be secured through a planning condition or obligation built into legal agreements.		
Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (NWT)	Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects are currently exempt from mandatory Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) until an anticipated date of November 2025, and there	No	Noted. A BNG assessment is provided in Technical Appendix A8.13: Biodiversity Net Gain [BNG] Assessment **[EN010162/APP/6.4.8.13]**.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	is not yet any guidance about how statutory BNG will apply to such projects. It is positive to note that in the absence of guidance, and subject to further consultation, a BNG assessment will be reported in the ES using the prevailing Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra) metric. It is positive to hear that the development is committed to delivering a gain in Biodiversity Units across habitats, hedgerows and watercourses, and over 400 ha of land has been allocated to mitigation and enhancement. This ambitious project represents an opportunity to deliver habitat creation and enhancement at a significant		The calculation offers 60% BNG for habitats, 26% for hedgerows and 11% for watercourses.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	level and set a benchmark for other solar schemes.		
Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (NWT)	Reflecting the principles and definitions of the Environment Act 2021, we encourage the applicant to deliver a minimum of 10% net gain in biodiversity so that the biodiversity value of the development exceeds the pre-development on site habitat value by at least 10% but ideally aiming for more. Habitats should be secured for at least the life of the scheme. The mitigation hierarchy still applies of avoidance, mitigation and compensation for biodiversity loss. Appropriate site-specific recommendations will be required for providing enhancements specific for Nottinghamshire BAP species and Section 41	No	Noted. A BNG assessment is provided in Technical Appendix A8.13: Biodiversity Net Gain [BNG] Assessment **[EN010162/APP/6.4.8.13]**. The calculation offers 60% BNG for habitats, 26% for hedgerows and 11% for watercourses.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	Species and habitats of Principal Importance (NERC Act 2006).		
Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (NWT)	The particular conditions of the airfield create a rare habitat that cannot be replicated anywhere in the vicinity and certainly not within the site area of the GNRSP. The developers now call the scheme a Solar and Biodiversity Park and have worked hard at creating an overall scheme where biodiversity is an important element, but it appears that the airfield has been completely overlooked as an amazing habitat both in its own right and due to its position within the zones of impact on the extensive and important Laxton SSSI and next to Ancient Woodland.	No	A range of baseline studies has been undertaken to establish the status and distribution of ecological features in this area. The potential effects on them, and to Laxton Sykes SSSI, are assessed in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**.
Topic Area: General Comments			

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Joint Parish Action Group (JPAG)	The applicant (Elements Green Trent Ltd) has chosen to change the project name to Great North Road Solar and Biodiversity Park. This is purely a branding and marketing strategy and in no way changes the basic element that the project is a Solar Farm which is within the definition of being a Nationally Strategic Infrastructure Project (NSIP), thereby requiring a Development Consent Order (DCO). A Biodiversity Park is not within the statutory definition of being an NSIP project.	No	The change of description of the Development doesn't centre around marketing and branding. The Applicant is proposing landscape-scale biodiversity enhancement, the Development carries the endorsement of the RSPB, Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust, Sherwood Forest Trust, and Trent Rivers Trust. These organisations are involved in the design of the landscape and ecology masterplans for the Development and would not be sitting behind a branding exercise. The Biodiversity Net Gain calculation for the Development offers 60% BNG for habitats, 26% for hedgerows and 11% for watercourses. There would be 64,500 trees being planted, 50km of new hedgerow and over 1,000 acres of enhancement land for biodiversity.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Joint Parish Action Group (JPAG)	The circular nature of the GNR project represents an unusual and potentially unique set of circumstances where impacts can be felt on local communities in all directions. As such JPAG considers the traditional approach of identifying zones of influence in the PEIR for the consideration of potential impacts fails to fully consider the encircling effect of the development.	Yes	The scope of each assessment provided within the ES has considered the design of the development and its effects. The Development is no longer designed in a circular fashion, following the removal of areas of land for environmental constraints.
Joint Parish Action Group (JPAG)	As such, in the PEIR and the subsequent Environmental Statement we consider that the zones of influence used for assessing impacts should include all of the 18,119.8 hectares over which the Development extends across, with the buffer then applying to the outer edge of the circle formed by the Order Limits.	Yes	The scope of each assessment provided within the ES has considered the design of the development. The Development is no longer designed in this circular fashion.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	It is acknowledged that this would increase the area to be investigated for the various topics. However, the applicant has chosen to extend the Development over such a massive area; therefore, the burden and cost of undertaking adequate investigations is of their own making.		
Joint Parish Action Group (JPAG)	As such there appears to have been no consideration of reasonable alternatives to the potential generation of electricity.	No	Alternatives are considered in the Design Approach Document (Technical Appendix A5.6: Outline Decommissioning and Restoration Plan **[EN010162/APP/5.6]**).
Notts Area Ramblers	Ramblers acknowledge positive responses to some of our previous suggestions, and welcome further dialogue before final application submission, and, if the Application is approved, during construction and lifetime to	Yes	Ramblers engaged with the Applicant and had input into the footpath strategy.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	resolve any issues that arise.		
Notts Area Ramblers	We are willing to engage with developers at an early stage but will make decisions on what we believe to be the best for users of the countryside. Mitigation, where offered, is welcomed but will not influence any decision. In our responses, we will consider any other green energy nearby developments and the total hectares involved.	No	Noted.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The Council accept that design details will still be being progressed and it is understandable that final specifications may not be available, even at the time of ES submission. This is catered for by applying the Rochdale Envelope process.	No	The Applicant agrees with this comment. Final specifications of certain elements of the Development will be subject to detailed design post consent.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	It could of course also mean that, given what has happened to Tata's Port Talbot blast furnaces, discussions may be with Tata Steel Netherlands. Clearly if the framework could be manufactured in the Netherlands, that would reduce the CO2 transport emissions significantly. This is recognised in paragraph 77 of Chapter 15. However, this paragraph mentioners sourcing steel from UK suppliers, not manufacturers.	No	The Applicant intends to source the steel and its delivery in the UK and manufacture the framework onsite, so there would be two entities involved. The steel producer and the frame manufacturer. The Applicant intends to use UK steel if this is possible and welcome the comments around the possibility of European steel given that there are many steel producing regions. The worst-case emissions scenario has been considered of sourcing from China, in Chapter 15, Climate Change 15.3.2.2 **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15]**.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	Furthermore, they are part of one of the Applicant' sub group's- Fencing and Gates, which requires a full assessment.	Yes	Fencing and gates have been assessed accordingly in the ES.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	Whilst it accepted that Anglesey is more likely to experience worse storm effects than Nottinghamshire, the Anglesey development was new and suffered damage very quickly in its lifetime (after two years of operation). It would be a brave assertion to assume no similar or worse storm will hit this county in the next 40 years.	No	The effects of predicted future wind speeds are assessed in ES Chapter 15, Climate Change at Chapter 15.3.2.2 **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15]**.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The Applicant seeks to rely on commentary made by the Solar Energy Industries Association. This organisation is the trade body for solar generators in the USA and is largely funded by them. One of its key stated aims is to promote the growth of solar power. It states it is the voice of the solar industry.	No	The Applicant does not believe it's surprising that an industry trade body is funded by the relevant industry. This is standard. The Applicant is a member of Solar Energy UK (SEUK).

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The Applicant is currently not under any obligation to assess this type of impact as it has been scoped out by the Planning Inspectorate.	No	The Applicant has assessed matters scoped in by the planning inspectorate PINs.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	To the Applicant's credit, they do address the threat of wind damage in Table 15.9 of Chapter 15. Their mitigation measure (which was a requirement in the PINs scoping opinion) to prevent the sort of damage as above is to design the PV modules to withstand modelled maximum forces.	No	Noted.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The Anglesey development was designed by Lightsource BP- a company with experience of building solar farms. It would be very surprising if they had not also attempted the same exercise. This Applicant, whilst rightly asserting that the likelihood of an increase	Yes	Yes, the effects of predicted future wind speeds on the solar PV are assessed in the ES Chapter 15, 15.3.2.2 **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15]**.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	in storm intensity and frequency will increase throughout this century, judges the consequences of wind damage to the panels as 'minimal'.		
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	Given this potential threat, the Council hope the Applicant would include an assessment for potential eco-toxicity as one factor affecting panel choice.	No	Given that solar cells are solid, this also renders any contamination event caused in the case of a storm dislodging panels highly improbable.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	It is hoped that Section A5.5.2.5 of Appendix TA A05 entitled 'Provision for Storm Events' can include a contingency plan to deal with a worst case wind event. At the moment, it just addresses rainfall.	Yes	The effects of predicted future wind speeds on the solar PV are assessed in the ES Chapter 15, Climate Change at 15.3.2.2 **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15]**.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	This proposed development differs from the majority of solar plant designs in that it is not one area of contiguous fields, but a number of islands of land	No	The solar park has a disaggregated design which is not unique, and the description islands of land connected by fields used for underground cabling is a fair one. The Design Approach Document

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	connected by fields which will be used for underground cabling.		(DaD) contained in ES Chapter 4, Site Selection and Design **[EN010162/APP/6.2.4]** gives commentary on the evolution of the design.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The Council would wish some clarification that where plots will be sited on cable fields, then are those cables going to be buried prior to construction on the fields currently supporting the birds?	No	Cables will indeed be buried during the construction phases and effects of construction on birds and other wildlife are assessed in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The Council would wish that the ES contains a table similar to table A8.5.2 in Appendix A8.5 but where the first column is entitled 'Field Number' referencing the numbers contained in Appendix A08.5A8.5.1.5. Further columns should be provided, indicating acreage and whether each field is a cable or panel field. It almost goes without	No	The designs are broken up into Work Areas, showing which kind of development, whether PV, Cable, Substation BESS, is contained within them. Work Areas are detailed on the Development website under Figures section.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	saying that the Applicant should also provide field numbers for the planned compensation fields.		
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The Council note the submission of the Outline Fire Safety Management Plan.	No	Noted.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	This consultation response is not the appropriate vehicle to discuss the full arguments for and against a BESS. That will no doubt come in due course.	No	Noted.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	A significant amount of recent media commentary, coupled with large street protests by farmers may be viewed by some as farmers being 'resilient' ie fighting their corner. Others may well see it as genuine concern for the future of the industry.	No	Noted.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	One such disadvantage could be the furtherance and support of modern slavery internationally.	No	The Applicant has a Modern Slavery Statement and is a signatory of SEUKs declaration on this matter as detailed in ES Chapter 13, Socio-Economics and Tourism **[EN010162/APP/6.2.13]**.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	Fortunately, Elements Green Ltd state they are one such company. They have stated publicly that they have a current Modern Slavery Statement.	Yes	The Applicant has a Modern Slavery Statement and is a signatory of SEUKs declaration on this matter as detailed in ES Chapter 13, Socio-Economics and Tourism **[EN010162/APP/6.2.13]**.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The Applicant, having verbally stated that they will probably source the PV panels from Xinjiang in China, is invited on a voluntary basis to include in the DCO a requirement that the panels for this development will not be bought from any company listed in Section 2(d)(2)9(B)(i) or 2(d)(2)9(B)(ii) of the UFLPA Entity List, or	Yes	The Applicant has a Modern Slavery Statement and is a signatory of SEUKs declaration on this matter as detailed in ES Chapter 13, Socio-Economics and Tourism [**EN010162/APP/6.2.13]**.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	any equivalent succeeding list. By doing so, they would affirm their commitments as at 16.33 above.		
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	Because the PEIR by its nature is provisional and some work streams are incomplete, it was to be expected that there was going to be significantly less detail than will probably accompany the ES.	No	This is correct and noted.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	There are significant gaps in the information supplied which make developing an evidenced based argument in favour of a plan change very difficult. For that reason, some of the Council's observations have not been included in this document. It is anticipated they will have to be advanced during the examination stage.	No	There is no evidence of a significant gap in the information about the proposals having been supplied. The consultation process is detailed in ES Chapter 3, Consultation **[EN010162/APP/6.2.3]**.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Topic Area: Glint and Glare			
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	During the operational phase, the Applicant intends to rely on CCTV, movement sensors and lighting as security measures. It is not clear whether the CCTV will be real time monitored or whether it will just be post event recording reviews, in the event of any site incursion. If real time monitoring is planned, it would be useful to learn what the planned response would be to any incursion. It is recognised that, depending on what the answers are to the above questions, any response may need to be submitted as a confidential report.	No	The design of security measures is detailed in Chapter 5, Development Description **[EN010162/APP/6.2.5]**. The design of CCTV and lighting has been undertaken to minimise the frequency and duration use of lighting and the perceived intrusiveness of CCTV and other security measures. No areas of the Development would be continuously lit. Solar areas would have small pole-mounted cameras / infra-red sensors only and no lighting. Elsewhere, it is likely that movement-triggered lighting and passive infra-red sensors would be deployed for security purposes at the Intermediate and main substations and BESS and potentially at other pieces of critical infrastructure and construction compounds. This is set out and secured in the oCEMP (Technical

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			Appendix A5.3 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.3]**). Security matters would remain limited by confidentiality.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The Applicant has submitted a provisional Glint and Glare Assessment (GGA). The range of this assessment was addressed during the scoping process. The Planning Inspectorate took the view that the Applicant was attempting to wrongly limit the GGA to road users, residents, rail users and aviation.	No	All consultation responses relating to glint and glare aspects of the Scoping Report, including those from the Planning Inspectorate, were used to inform the scope of the subsequent assessment.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The Applicant's GGA has taken on board horse riders, agricultural workers, waterway users and receptors at different heights above ground level. However, it has so far decided to ignore PINS on the other receptors.	No	The glint and glare assessment includes consideration of all relevant receptor types. Where required, consideration of discipline-specific receptor types is provided within the respective ES chapter (e.g. Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**).

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	What is also mentioned in the PINs publication is glint and glare should also inform the assessment of effects on landscape and visual impact.	No	Glint and Glare effects have been taken into consideration as part of ES Chapter 7, Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment **[EN010162/APP/6.2.7].**
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The Applicant predicts 18 residences which will be impacted by glint and glare but only one where the impact is significant.	No	Noted. This finding has informed the design of the Development. The PV array has been set further back from the property in question in order to mitigate the predicted effects.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The residential receptor height was set at 2m AGL and therefore did not address impacts to receptors when upstairs.	No	There is no specific guidance in UK planning policy which stipulates particular receptor heights. However, it is common practice to assess effects at or around head height in external / ground floor areas. The ground floor is typically considered the main living space and therefore has a greater sensitivity with respect to residential amenity.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The Council expresses concern there will be no glint and glare assessment for those moving about the	No	Glint and glare are in essence the same phenomenon - glint is simply of a shorter duration. The impact upon moving receptors is purely

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	areas as the experience will be a glint, not a glare.		assessed in terms of glare intensity, and therefore the duration of the effect has no effect on the significance.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	This Council included in its scoping opinion that there should be closer scrutiny of the potential impacts on the East Coast Main Line (ECML) and the A1 northbound carriageway. The point was made that in a number of places, the track and road were raised above ground level. It is not clear from the GGA if the Applicant's software took these factors into account.	No	The 3D glint and glare modelling software takes terrain/elevation changes into account. The final mitigation required to mitigate glint and glare effects is dependent upon many factors, including the location of the PV panels, their height, orientation, type, and tilt, as well as screening in terms of buildings, vegetation, hedgerows etc. As such, there are a virtually infinite number of potential options at this stage. It is therefore a standard approach to assess an indicative layout based on the largest potential array area, with typical parameters for tilt, orientation etc, and the ES will consider potential mitigation options for that design. However, in order to ensure that the final mitigation properly responds to the actual design to be constructed, the

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			detailed mitigation will be designed to match the final PV design. That final mitigation scheme will be designed in consultation with relevant parties including the Council, Network Rail etc, and will be submitted for their approval prior to construction.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	Firstly, in addressing the A1 northbound carriageway, the Applicant adopts a receptor height of 2.5m. This is intended to include the vision height above ground level for HGV drivers on this carriage way.	No	Noted.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	If the vision height above ground level was changed to 2.8m, one could guess that the impact of that would not be great in any revised assessment.	No	By their nature, roads carry a range of traffic of varying types, makes and models. A height therefore needs to be selected which is representative of the range of possible user heights. In their PEIR response, it is of note that Highways England stated than the glint and glare assessment..."covers the expected receptors plus additional

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			receptors and/or additional context considerations identified as part of scoping opinion consultations."
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The A1 in the North Muskham area. The vehicle is over 1m higher than the fields at the side of the road. Depending on which cab that is, the driver's eye height could well be 3.8m above the surrounding fields not 2.5m.	No	The 3D glint and glare modelling software takes terrain/elevation changes into account. Receptor heights are relative to the position of the receptor itself, rather than the surrounding land.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	Moving to the ECML, the Applicant has adopted the receptor vision height for train drivers as 2.7m. The Railway Group Standards state that mainline signalling is set at a height assuming driver vision height of 2.75m above track level.	No	Technical Appendix A16.1: Glint and Glare Assessment **[EN010162/APP/6.4.16.1]** has used the standard drivers eye level height of 2.75m, which is in accordance with Network Rail requirements.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	It is clear that the driver's eye level is far higher than 2.75m AGL. This divergence is aggravated by the fact that sections of the ECML	No	Technical Appendix A16.1: Glint and Glare Assessment **[EN010162/APP/6.4.16.1]** has used the standard drivers eye level height of 2.75m, which is in accordance

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	track in the Cromwell and Muskham area are raised above the level of the fields, in which panels are intended on either side of the track.		with Network Rail requirements. The 3D glint and glare modelling software take terrain/elevation changes into account. That final mitigation scheme will be designed in consultation with relevant parties including Network Rail and will be submitted for their approval prior to construction.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	Given which freight locomotives will be operating at the start of the GNR operational phase, the driver's vision travelling north on the ECML could be over 5m higher than the ground level in the panel fields immediately adjacent to the track and signals.	No	Technical Appendix A16.1: Glint and Glare Assessment **[EN010162/APP/6.4.16.1]** has used the standard train drivers eye level height of 2.75m, which is in accordance with Network Rail requirements.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The Council suggest that there is an argument for a reassessment of glint and glare for the ECML, the Applicant having obtained exact specifications from train operators.	No	The glint and glare assessment **[EN010162/APP/6.4.16.1]** has used the standard drivers eye level height of 2.75m, which is in accordance with Network Rail requirements. The final mitigation scheme will be designed in consultation with

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			relevant parties including Network Rail, and will be submitted for their approval, prior to construction.
Topic Area: Hydrology			
Joint Parish Action Group (JPAG)	These potential flood alleviation schemes for pre-existing issues fund cannot be afforded weight as a material planning consideration by the decision maker. These potential schemes require a separate planning permission which may or may not be granted. Even if GNR were to be permitted, the presence of such a consent could not predetermine the decision-maker on the suggested pre-existing flood alleviation schemes. They are being offered on a voluntary basis and there is no means by which these suggested pre-	No	It is correct that the flood alleviation schemes do not form part of the decision-making process for PINs or the Secretary of State. They also do not form part of the DCO. They are being offered via the NG+ scheme and work on them is underway.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	existing flood alleviation schemes can be guaranteed or secured through the DCO process.		
Joint Parish Action Group (JPAG)	In the Design Approach Document, Flood Zones 2 and 3 only identified as 'areas best avoided', no cogent or substantive explanation is provided for this approach. This is particularly unjustified when the flood risk sequential test needs to be considered as a primary consideration.	Yes	Solar Development has been avoided in flood risk zones 2 and 3 in the final submission.
Joint Parish Action Group (JPAG)	In terms of flood resistance and resilience measures the PEIR identifies that there will be a requirement to raise all electronically sensitive equipment at least 300 mm above the highest modelled flood level for the 1% annual exceedance probability (AEP) event (plus climate change allowance at 23%),	Yes	Solar Development has been avoided in flood risk zones 2 and 3 in the final submission.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	in accordance with the Environment Agency's Accounting for residual uncertainty: an update to the fluvial freeboard guide, where there is confidence in the flood data or 600 mm where flood data has substantial uncertainty or uses old data. However, this in itself doesn't address the sequential or exception tests; neither is it clear whether the need to raise up equipment has been taken into account in the various assessments such as the landscape and visual impact.		
Joint Parish Action Group (JPAG)	The PEIR admits in relation to fluvial flooding that whilst the majority of the proposal (82.27%) is located within Flood Zone 1, there are areas in the north and east of the project classified as	Yes	Solar Development has been avoided in flood risk zones 2 and 3 in the final submission.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	Flood Zone 2 and 3 associated with out of channel flows from the River Trent, The Beck and Moorhouse Beck.		
Joint Parish Action Group (JPAG)	The PEIR acknowledges that the EA Flood Map for Planning shows that the Order Limits 10.19% lies in Flood Zone 2 and 7.54% is in Flood Zone 3. This is almost a fifth of the project area.	No	We must exercise caution when discussing Order limits and development areas. The development areas have different uses to the wider Order limits and as such the effects are different. Solar Development has been avoided in flood risk zones 2 and 3 in the final submission.
Joint Parish Action Group (JPAG)	Somewhat concerningly the Order Limits also impacts on long established Flood Defences, namely Works Areas 2a and 2b cross a flood defence (EA Asset ID 54462) approximately 500 m west of South Muskham, which is classed as Engineered High Ground. Maintaining the integrity of	Yes	Methods to cross this defence would be agreed with the Environment Agency and the integrity of the defence would be protected. Covered in Water Resources, Chapter 9 of the ES **[EN010162/APP/6.2.9]**. Solar Development has been avoided in flood risk zones 2 and 3 in the final submission removing

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	the existing flood defences in the Trent Valley is crucial because of the vast area over which flood water regularly amasses between Kelham, Newark and South Muskham in particular in relation to this specific EA flood defence.		panels from South Muskham and north of Kelham.
Joint Parish Action Group (JPAG)	The FRA sequential test has not demonstrated that it is not possible to locate the development on land identified as having a lower risk of flooding, not including land in Flood Zones 2 and 3. The NPPF in referring to 'essential infrastructure' which includes solar farms doesn't exempt it from needing to pass the sequential test and exception test. National policy in EN1 requires the sequential test to be passed.	Yes	Solar Development has been avoided in flood risk zones 2 and 3 in the final submission. The Sequential test has shown that other sites have been considered and discounted. The Development is essential energy infrastructure and Critical National Priority infrastructure, as recognised by NPS EN-1 and NPS EN-3. The aspects within Work Areas 2, 6 and 7 pertain to the infrastructure required for connecting to the operational National Grid Staythorpe Electricity Substation. Consequently, the positioning of the

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			cable and associated infrastructure has been determined as the optimal route between the Work Area 5a and Work Area 6, with no other 'more suitable' locations available. The urgent need for renewable energy supply and therefore the need to maximise energy generation where there is available grid capacity, there is therefore strong operational reasons for the inclusion of Work Area 2: Cables and Work Areas 6 and 7 in their locations.
Joint Parish Action Group (JPAG)	There is no requirement for a solar farm to be a specific size in terms of output, so at the very least the option of reducing the size of the GNR proposal to exclude all land at risk of flooding should have been considered as a reasonable alternative. There is no evidence to demonstrate	Yes	Solar Development has been avoided in flood risk zones 2 and 3 in the final submission.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	that such an option has been so considered.		
Joint Parish Action Group (JPAG)	The FRA for GNR will need to be updated to take into account the NaFRA, this should then be taken into account into the site selection process by excluding all land at risk of flooding. This should not be interpreted to mean that JPAG supports the inclusion of land not at risk of flooding as the proposal is not acceptable as a whole for a variety of planning reasons.	Yes	The Applicant would differ in terms of the Development not being acceptable for a whole variety of planning reasons. The Development is very well-sited, with few planning constraints. Refer to the updated FRA (Technical Appendix A9.1: Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy **[EN010162/APP/6.4.9.1]**. Solar Development has been avoided in flood risk zones 2 and 3 in the final submission.
Joint Parish Action Group (JPAG)	Surface water flooding is a very important issue for the host communities, many of the villages within the GNR area have been impacted by surface water flooding over recent years. There are legitimate concerns regarding whether leaving	Yes	Communities are inconsistent on this point. The study given to Elements Green by the residents of Moorhouse clearly concludes that solar farm areas should be put down to grass, rather than bare earth, to reduce run-off. This is proposed within our overall design. There are places where adding

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	fields grassed and unploughed for 40 years will lead to increased and/or faster surface water run-off. Farmers who farm land in the area have expressed numerous concerns that surface water run-off from grassed fields would be greater than for arable fields.		grass will retain water and it will be better to let the water flow, which will be factored into the design. However, in general, grass retaining water will be very slightly preferential in flood risk terms. Solar Development has been avoided in flood risk zones 2 and 3 in the final submission Refer to the updated FRA (Technical Appendix A9.1: Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy **[EN010162/APP/6.4.9.1]**.
Joint Parish Action Group (JPAG)	What is known for certain that in recent years flash flooding from surface water has seen surface water run-off from fields flooding highways including the A140. There has also been circumstances where surface water run-off appears to have flowed across fields rather than	No	This is understood and the pre-existing flood alleviation measures we are proposing as part of our NG+ programme hopefully provide some comfort for residents. It is not in any way to suggest that solar farms themselves cause flooding, they do not. EG however have recognised flooding as a key concern for residents and that is why we have proposed the

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	following the drain and dyke networks resulting in settlements flooding such as Carlton on Trent. The watercourses through the area, including The Beck have seen very significant recent flooding events, including in Maplebeck and Caunton. This is rightly an area which is of significant concern to many local residents.		measures which will form part of separate planning application processes to alleviate pre-existing flooding issues for residents. Solar Development has been avoided in flood risk zones 2 and 3 in the final submission.
Joint Parish Action Group (JPAG)	The applicant was asked at a Parish Council meeting to seek to explain the apparent coincidence between flooding of the A1 adjacent to the Egmanton Solar Farm and potential surface water run-off from that solar farm. It was noted by residents that the A1 flooding has only occurred since the solar farm was built. The applicant has to the best of our	No	EG did indeed provide an answer to this query, namely that the flooding at the Egmanton Solar Farm ceased after a couple of years of construction of the site. There were other technical reasons that the solar farm clearly did not cause this flooding, sitting as it does on a ground level below the A1. Solar Development has been avoided in flood risk zones 2 and 3 in the final submission

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	knowledge did not provide an answer to this query.		
Joint Parish Action Group (JPAG)	It is rather worrying that the PEIR identifies that the slopes that are greater than a 6% slope, where surface water run-off is more likely to occur, appear to fall in the natural catchment of The Beck, particularly around Maplebeck. The Beck led to serious surface water flooding in Maplebeck and Caunton as well as further downstream in Norwell and Carlton on Trent recently and as such this could lead to future problems.	Yes	Solar Development has been avoided in flood risk zones 2 and 3 in the final submission Refer to the updated FRA (Technical Appendix A9.1: Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy **[EN010162/APP/6.4.9.1]**.
Joint Parish Action Group (JPAG)	Hydraulic modelling should be undertaken specifically to assess this impact. It is noted that other concentrations of slopes would appear to be in catchment of Moorhouse	No	Pre-existing slopes causing flooding through surface water run-off are not a matter relating to the solar park development.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	Beck which could again increase surface water run-off into that watercourse causing problems in Moorhouse and downstream in Weston and Grassthorpe.		Solar Development has been avoided in flood risk zones 2 and 3 in the final submission Refer to the updated FRA (Technical Appendix A9.1: Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy **[EN010162/APP/6.4.9.1]**.
Joint Parish Action Group (JPAG)	There is a further areas where surface water run-off from slopes could lead to roads such as the road between Ossington and Kneesall. There is also a concentration of slopes to the north of Cheveral Wood which could harm ecology and an ancient woodland.	No	If slopes are harming ecology and ancient woodland, this is not a matter for the solar farm, although we can happily explore further interventions on pre-existing flooding through our NG+ programme.
Notts Area Ramblers	The effect of the development on drainage should be considered as part of the planning process e.g. through a flood risk assessment, so that it doesn't cause flooding on other land. This should	Yes	ES Chapter 9, Water Resources **[EN010162/APP/6.2.9]** includes consideration of drainage and a flood risk assessment. The Development will in some areas maintain current drainage, and in others will improve it. In no areas

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	include any effects on drainage from construction traffic. If there are path drainage problems at the site, such as paths becoming boggy in wet weather, we expect drainage improvements.		will the Development lead to worsening of flooding.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The Council note the contents of the WFD assessment and have previously expressed concern regarding how close proposed ground works will be to the Beck.	Yes	The Beck is proposed to be crossed by HDD for the cable route as set out in the Technical Appendix A5.3: Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.3]** and depicted in A5.3.1, and no direct effects from the Development as predicted. The closest Development infrastructure to the Beck is Work Area 1: Solar PV, approximately 140 m south.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	There appears to be a dilution of the scoping report position which was submitted to PINs and which	No	The 10 m buffer for placement of Solar PV, substations is retained in the ES.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	stipulated a 10m buffer between a watercourse and any ground works.		
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The Council expresses concern for the proximity of the cable trenching near the south east bank of the Beck.	Yes	The Beck is proposed to be crossed by HDD for the cable route as set out in Technical Appendix A5.3: Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.3]** and depicted in A5.3.1, for the cable route and no direct effects from the Development as predicted.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The Council expressed concern the Beck may be in danger of a deterioration in WFD status which is forbidden by The Water Environment (Water Framework Directive) (England and Wales) Regulations 2017.	No	The WFD assessment predicts no deterioration in WFD status of the Beck.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	It is welcomes that the Applicant has chosen to use a panel design with rainwater gaps.	No	Noted.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	It is conceded that PV panels do not per se cause more flooding.	No	Noted.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The Applicant recognises the heterogeneity issue and the implications for panel fields on slopes with gradients east/west or vice versa. It rightly links soil erosion with flow rate and recognises the flow rate effect on infiltration rate.	Yes	As outlined in the Technical Appendix A9.1: Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy (FRA) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.9.1]**, additional measures such as berms and stone filter strips will be considered in Work Area 1 where slopes exceed 6%.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	run off for all soil textures on a flat to 1% gradient creates a very slow runoff rate, the runoff rate for all textures except sands and loamy sands on a 2-6% gradient is medium. For sandy loams, sandy clay loams, loams, clay loams, silt loams, and silty clay loams, a gradient of 6-12% would produce rapid runoff.	Yes	This is stated in Technical Appendix A9.1: Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy (FRA) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.9.1]**.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	Every square metre of a flat open field (save any area in a tree rain shadow) will experience near identical rainfall levels and the same levels of saturation and infiltration. That will not be the case for a field of south facing fixed panels on an east/west slope. Work is underway to identify fields such as these within the proposals, along with soil type. This will also inform on whether these slopes discharge runoff into a level 3 flood zone area.	Yes	As outlined in the FRA Technical Appendix A9.1: Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy (FRA) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.9.1]**, additional measures such as berms and stone filter strips will be considered in Work Area 1 where slopes exceed 6%. Solar Development has been avoided in flood risk zones 2 and 3 in the final submission
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The Applicant acknowledges that a part of the development will be located in level 3 flood zone areas.	Yes	Work Area 1: Solar PV is no longer located within the floodplain of the River Trent, including the 1% AEP plus 39% CC event. Only Work Area 2: Cables, Work Area 3: Mitigation and connections associated with Work Area 6 and Work Area 7 are located within the

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			floodplain, however the works associated are either below ground (cables) or involve the creation of grassland etc which are compatible with the floodplain, will not result in a loss of storage or a perceptible effect on conveyance and will remain operational.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The Applicant then refers to paragraph 169 of the NPPF, stating that it deals with the move from sequential to exception test. Again unfortunately, it does not. However, there is no disagreement with the Applicant's conclusion in the FRA paragraph 130.	No	Technical Appendix A9.1: Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy (FRA) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.9.1]** references the correct paragraphs of the NPPF.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	In terms of whether this proposal passes the sequential test, the Applicant cites the content of section 3 of TA A04.1 as the justification that no other sites of lower flooding risk are available.	No	Work Area 1: Solar PV is no longer located within the floodplain of the River Trent, including the 1% AEP plus 39% CC event. The Development is essential energy infrastructure and Critical National Priority infrastructure, as

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			recognised by NPS EN-1 and NPS EN-3. The aspects within Work Areas 2, 6 and 7 pertain to the infrastructure required for connecting to the operational National Grid Staythorpe Electricity Substation. Consequently, the positioning of the cable and associated infrastructure has been determined as the optimal route between the Work Area 5a and Work Area 6, with no other 'more suitable' locations available. The urgent need for renewable energy supply and therefore the need to maximise energy generation where there is available grid capacity, there is therefore strong operational reasons for the inclusion of Work Area 2: Cables and Work Areas 6 and 7 in their locations. As such, the Sequential test is passed.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	Given the findings as demonstrated in Figure 1 of TA A04.1 which show the combined suitability factors for overall site selection as a heat map, the Applicant may struggle further down the line to pass the sequential test.	No	Work Area 1: Solar PV is no longer located within the floodplain of the River Trent, including the 1% AEP plus 39% CC event. The Development is essential energy infrastructure and Critical National Priority infrastructure, as recognised by NPS EN-1 and NPS EN-3. The aspects within Work Areas 2, 6 and 7 pertain to the infrastructure required for connecting to the operational National Grid Staythorpe Electricity Substation. Consequently, the positioning of the cable and associated infrastructure has been determined as the optimal route between the Work Area 5a and Work Area 6, with no other 'more suitable' locations available. The urgent need for renewable energy supply and therefore the need to maximise energy generation where there is available

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			grid capacity, there is therefore strong operational reasons for the inclusion of Work Area 2: Cables and Work Areas 6 and 7 in their locations. As such, the Sequential test is passed
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	Once more detail is provided regarding the RSuDS, no doubt further analyses will follow. But as matters stand at the moment, the Council are of the mind that the argument in planning policy to develop in flood zones 2 and has not been made.	Yes	Work Area 1: Solar PV has been removed from Flood Zones 2 and 3.
Topic Area: Landscape and Visual			
Joint Parish Action Group (JPAG)	In addition to the overall encircling effect that occurs across the entire GNR project, localised severe encircling impacts arise on individual communities. These communities completely surrounded	No	The overall Development design is no longer circular. When viewing the Proposed Development on plan, the real-life experience will not be of solar panels visible in many directions from a village. There will however be frequent views of the Proposed Development at varied

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	include Staythorpe, Averham Park and Maplebeck. Other communities within the circle including Norwell, Norwell Woodhouse, Ossington, Caunton, Bathley, Kersall, Moorhouse and Little Carlton will not be able to leave their villages without going through the GNR. The nature of the River Trent and the limited crossing points means that settlements like Averham and Kelham will not be able to effectively leave their villages without going through the GNR. Other villages such as South Muskham, North Muskham and Cromwell are effectively surrounded by GNR because of the limited ways in and out.		distances when using the local roads and public rights of way which radiate from and connect the villages - as set out within ES Chapter 7, Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment **[EN010162/APP/6.2.7]**. Reductions in the Development's scale due to environmental study have resulted in Little Carlton, South Muskham, North Muskham and north of Kelham no longer having nearby PV fields.
Joint Parish Action Group (JPAG)	The PEIR and associated Landscape and Visual	No	ES Chapter 7, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.7]**

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	Impact Assessment takes an incorrect starting point to the character of the area by describing existing infrastructure as having an urbanising influence. The A1 and ECML form a broadly similar alignment up the western side of the River Trent valley. The A1 lies to the east of the Order Limits and the ECML largely lies to the east of the Order Limits except for a stetch between North Muskham and Cromwell. As such these two strategic transport routes do not impact on the majority of the 18,199.7ha of land over which the development is located.		quoted by JPAG appears to have been misunderstood. It makes the same point. It states firstly that "The area within and immediately surrounding the Order Limits is rural in character..." before going on to describe "areas to the immediate east and south" as being more subject to urbanising influences.
Joint Parish Action Group (JPAG)	Even if the applicant's contention that existing infrastructure has an urbanising influence was accepted that is not	No	The baseline description provided in the ES Chapter 7, Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment **[EN010162/APP/6.2.7]** is simply description. It is not intended or

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	justification to add such large-scale infrastructure that would have an industrialisation impact on the landscape. Indeed, to the contrary, there is stronger justification to conserve the unspoilt aspects of the landscape. To apply the logic advanced by the applicant, in the Hope Valley in the Peak District National Park just because the large Hope Cement Works exists, that as an urbanising feature would be justification to put a massive solar farm next to it. In that example the contention is non-sensical as it is in our case.		used as justification for the development. Justification is discussed in the needs case for the Development, which is enshrined into the updated NPPF. It should also be noted that the sensitivity of development is quite rightly higher in National Parks, and they have been avoided in the site selection process for this reason.
Joint Parish Action Group (JPAG)	As it is a PEIR that has been produced to date, the applicant has stated that a full Residential Amenity Assessment has not been	No	The level of effect (Major, Major/moderate, etc) is included in the preliminary RVAA (Technical Appendix A7.6: Residential Visual Amenity Assessment

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	provided but that will follow in due course, after consultation. Only then will we know what the significant adverse effects on the wider local population are, including which individual houses are likely to be impacted by a major or major moderate adverse effect.		**[EN010162/APP/6.4.7.6]**) for each home considered. However, as set out in the preliminary RVAA provided in the PEIR, guidance indicates only homes which will experience the highest magnitude of effects require detailed consideration. It is only those homes for which further information is provided in the RVAA accompanying the ES.
Joint Parish Action Group (JPAG)	Consequently, such factors of landscape and visual impact have plainly not been fully considered in the site selection process in the first place.	No	Landscape and visual factors considered in site selection are set out in Design Approach Document **[EN010162/APP/5.6]** on page 17.
Notts Area Ramblers	On Detail Sheet 4, Maplebeck FP7 runs to the SE of DB013. For nearly 500m through "Retained Agricultural Land" the map shows a proposed hedge on the SE of the FP. We would like to know the reason for this proposed	Yes	Hedging to the SE of Maplebeck FP7 has not been included in the design.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	hedging which will reduce views from this elevated ground. The screening to the NW of the FP is understandable as it is screening panels DB013. We reserve the right to object to this length of hedging until we hear your response.		
Notts Area Ramblers	The construction in the countryside of green energy infrastructure, particularly ground-mounted solar and battery storage installations, have the potential to be detrimental to both its beauty and its openness.	No	Visual effects arising from all components of the Proposed Development are considered in ES Chapter 7, Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment **[EN010162/APP/6.2.7]**.
Notts Area Ramblers	Depending on the site, solar panels and battery containers may be visible from a long distance, particularly if they glint in the sun. We expect: • The development uses	No	These mitigation measures are included in the Proposed Development, with the exception of the painting of battery containers which has been assessed on a worst-case scenario as being in the manufacturer's standard finish.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	low-reflectance panels, which are less easily seen from a distance. • The panels are positioned in a way that minimises how much they can be seen from paths and other places with public access. • Battery containers should be painted in a matt colour that minimises their visual impact. • Planting of trees, hedges or other plants to screen the development from nearby paths.		
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The Council accept that the purpose of the RVAA is to identify dwellings which may be subject to such a magnitude of change that the adverse impact could mean that the threshold has been reached. To that end and applying the 250m cut-	No	The level of effect (Major, Major/moderate, etc) is included in the preliminary RVAA (Technical Appendix A7.6: Residential Visual Amenity Assessment **[EN010162/APP/6.4.7.6]**) for each home considered. However, as set out in the preliminary RVAA provided in the PEIR, guidance

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	off, the RVAA concentrated on just 26 properties. It then applies the criteria to arrive at an assessment as to whether the impact is major adverse and therefore to be assessed in the ES. What is clear from any of the figures is that dwellings experiencing a medium magnitude of change are capable of being subject to Major Adverse effects. ... It identified 142 dwellings within the study area, 26 worthy of assessment and a further 53 which would be affected. In each of these 53, the report does not differentiate whether the magnitude of change would be medium or low. So potentially, there could be up to 53 dwellings which would experience a major or major moderate adverse effect.		indicates only homes which will experience the highest magnitude of effects require detailed consideration. It is only those homes for which further information is provided in the RVAA accompanying the ES.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The Applicant's methodology as to whether to choose a property for RVAA assessment is apparently only desk based.	No	Site work to public areas close to homes has informed the RVAA during the detailed assessment. Visits to private property were only undertaken where necessary - in line with guidance.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	It identified 142 dwellings within the study area, 26 worthy of assessment and a further 53 which would be affected. In each of these 53, the report does not differentiate whether the magnitude of change would be medium or low. So potentially, there could be up to 53 dwellings which would experience a major or major moderate adverse effect. As it is a PEIR that has been submitted, the Applicant has stated that a full Residential Amenity Assessment has not been provided but that will follow in due course, after consultation. Only then	No	The level of effect (Major, Major/moderate, etc) is included in the preliminary RVAA (Technical Appendix A7.6: Residential Visual Amenity Assessment **[EN010162/APP/6.4.7.6]**) for each home considered. However, as set out in the preliminary RVAA provided in the PEIR, guidance indicates only homes which will experience the highest magnitude of effects require detailed consideration. It is only those homes for which further information is provided in the RVAA accompanying the ES. The level of effect (Major, Major/moderate, etc) is not a relevant consideration for effects on private amenity outside of the RVAA.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	will we know what are the significant adverse effects on the wider local population, including which individual houses are likely to to be impacted by a major or major moderate adverse effect. The methodology is clear that it is only really concerned with any individual property with the potential to reach the threshold. That is the purpose of the RVAA. The LVIA methodology makes it clear that the LVIA will not address any residential impacts or effects. As it is a PEIR that has been submitted, the Applicant has stated that a full Residential Amenity Assessment has not been provided but that will follow in due course, after consultation. Only then		

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	will we know what are the significant adverse effects on the wider local population, including which individual houses are likely to be impacted by a major or major moderate adverse effect.		
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The RVAA and LVIA have concentrated their attention on the 26 described properties, solely focussing on the threshold test and providing generalisations for everywhere else. But an assessment of the 'big picture' is surely what is required during consultation.	No	The big picture assessment of visual effects is provided in the LVIA (ES Chapter 7, Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment **[EN010162/APP/6.2.7]**).
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	One of the important features of this design is large scale tree planting. It is important to identify the purpose of this intention. In other words, tree and hedgerow planting performs two functions in that they	No	Tree planting included within the Proposed Development serves multiple purposes including enhancements to landscape fabric, character, and biodiversity as well as visual screening. All effects arising from the Proposed Development (whether positive or

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	mitigate views and are also beneficial enhancements. Enhancements are proposals that are not required to mitigate adverse effects, so they can be counted as scheme benefits. Clearly, double-counting mitigation measures as enhancements has implications for judgements about levels of effects, since real enhancements / scheme benefits could potentially outweigh levels of harm. Because the PEIR and supporting documentation has erroneously assumed that landscape / visual mitigating measures can be double-counted as landscape / visual enhancements, it has overestimated levels of beneficial effects, and		adverse) are considered as part of the assessment.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	underestimated levels of adverse effects.		
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	GLVIA3 makes it clear throughout- effects on character and views must be assessed separately, especially because effects on character can occur even if there would be no views of the change. If landscape character and visual effects are conflated, then levels of effects on character are assumed to be lower than they would actually be.	No	Effects on landscape character and views are considered separately in the ES.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The Council would wish that the Environmental Statement (ES) corrects these elements of LVIA planning assertions.	No	No correction is required in this regard.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The Works area maps provided by the Applicant label all the green areas as "Work area 3 Mitigation". This is reinforced by the Zones of Theoretical	Yes	7.6 **[EN010162/APP/6.3.7.6]** and 7.7 **[EN010162/APP/6.3.7.7]** show 'before and after mitigation' effects, both show 'before mitigation' visibility. A note has been added to Figure 7.7 make this clearer.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	Visibility (ZTV) differences in the Volume 3 mapping showing before and after mitigation visibility.		
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The Applicant acknowledges there will be a multitude of significant adverse effects.	No	Significant adverse landscape and visual effects are to be expected for a solar farm of this scale.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	There are a limited number of actual enhancements suggested by the PEIR.	No	There is no planning policy requirement to provide landscape enhancement, although enhancements to landscape can be found in the Landscape Masterplan **[EN010162/APP/2.11]** and Technical Appendix A5.1: Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]**.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	To justify the adverse impacts, the Applicant describes the benefits.	No	ES Chapter 7, Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment describes both positive and adverse effects, and mitigation and enhancement measures. The purpose of the LVIA is purely to describe the effects, not to justify them.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	To provide one pertinent example for this proposal, the occupant of the dwelling by field 97 near Norwell Woodhouse, in a bid to prevent his house being surrounded on all four sides by panels, has suggested to the Applicant that the size of field 98 be reduced.	Yes	A design change has been made to field 98 to reduce the extent of panels.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	One of the key functions of this large scale planting is to mitigate the adverse visual impacts of the infrastructure. The thought process here is that if a resident is going to lose a view across open fields, then better that view be blocked by woodland close up rather than industrial infrastructure. That probably is true but it is still a significant loss of amenity.	No	For the most part, woodland is not proposed close to homes for this reason and screening would be provided by hedges.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	One of the Applicant's staff told an elderly resident (whose house was initially to	No	The time taken for planting to achieve will vary depending on the relative location and elevation of the

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	be surrounded on all four side by panels) it should take 10-15 years for trees to mature enough to hide the panels.		house and solar panels. The LVIA assessment considers the effectiveness of mitigation and the duration of the effects. LVIA (ES Chapter 7, Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment **[EN010162/APP/6.2.7]**)
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	What would not be acceptable is where any resident whose visual impacts were to be mitigated is approached with the suggestion – "mitigation planting has fallen behind but it might be in your best interests to help out with the planting if we show you how".	No	This is not a scenario which would arise. Planting is an integral part of the design, secured through the DCO through the Landscape Masterplan **[EN010162/APP/2.11]** and Technical Appendix A5.1: Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) **EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]**.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The second set of security measures is the planned fencing. The Applicant plans to use deer fencing. In some respects this is preferable as the visual impact of security fencing is much higher.	No	This is the rationale behind the selection of deer fencing which is more in keeping with the rural environment and less visually intrusive.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	Any glint and glare from a distance of over 200m may not lead to any ocular harm. But in open countryside with rolling topography, it is still leads to a visual impact and should not be ignored.	No	ES Chapter 7, Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment **[EN010162/APP/6.2.7]** takes account of glint and glare as part of the nature of views of a solar farm.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	Lastly, the Applicant might advance the argument that they intend to plant lots of trees and make landscape character improvements to improve bio-diversity. The difficulty with that position is that firstly virtually all the trees are required as mitigation measures.	No	Tree planting can both provide screening to mitigate and enhance landscape character, and it can offer biodiversity benefits. These multiple benefits require consideration in the assessment of effects as do the multiple adverse effects of aspects of the development.
Topic Area: Noise and Vibration			
Joint Parish Action Group (JPAG)	An explanation is also needed as to why are there 29 noise sensitive receptors (NSRs) impacted by noise from the cable routes but only 19 of these will be impacted by vibration.	No	Airborne noise travels further than vibration because it propagates through air, which offers less resistance compared to solid materials. Vibration through the ground dissipates energy quickly due to greater density and

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			resistance, limiting its range. As such, fewer receptors are impacted by vibration than by noise.
Notts Area Ramblers	Solar and battery developments will include equipment (e.g. inverters, sub-stations, back-up generators) that generate noise. Noise will spoil enjoyment of paths and other public access. We expect such equipment to be: • Housed in acoustic insulation. • Located as far as possible from paths and public access. • Located behind other buildings or structures.	No	Where required, mitigation measures such as acoustic housing and maximising the distance to receptors will be implemented. Operational noise mitigation measures are detailed in ES Chapter 12 Noise and Vibration **[EN010162/APP/6.2.12]**.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	In Table 1, which focuses on the hardstanding construction, it does not include any plant for the installation of the deer fence poles. Piling is often cited as	No	Piling plant is included in Table A12.2.2 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.12.2]** as part of the installation of PV modules and fencing. Any piling associated with the installation of deer fences is therefore inherently

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	one of the more annoying and impacting repetitive sounds by receptors. As this piling will occur at the outer edges of the development, this noise pollution will often be the nearest to any external receptors.		included as part of the assessment of the PV module construction.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	At paragraphs 10 to 12 which deals with noise from HGV traffic, it concludes "the predicted noise level for HGV movements is 60 dBLAeq,t at a distance of 4 m from the road." Arriving at this conclusion, the Applicant makes certain assumptions, a key one being that the nearest receptor is 4m away.	No	Section 18 of Control of Road Traffic Noise (CRTN) as set out in Technical Appendix A12.2: Noise and Vibration Modelling **[EN010162/APP/6.4.12.2]** states that 4m is the set distance to be applied for all roadside receptors.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	There is no doubt that many receptors will be 4m or more away from the road. However, there will also be receptors closer than 4m.	No	Section 18 of Control of Road Traffic Noise (CRTN) as set out in Technical Appendix A12.2: Noise and Vibration Modelling **[EN010162/APP/6.4.12.2]** states

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			that 4m is the set distance to be applied for all roadside receptors.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	These calculations do not account for other road users, be they pedestrians, cyclists or horse riders and their horses. Chapter 14 recognises that non-motorised users are sensitive receptors. Therefore, there has to be value, given the restricted widths of some of the proposed construction traffic access routes, that a similar calculation to that at paragraphs 10-11 of TA A12.2 be completed, but with a worst case scenario of 2m to the nearest receptor.	No	Section 18 of Control of Road Traffic Noise (CRTN) as set out in Technical Appendix A12.2: Noise and Vibration Modelling **[EN010162/APP/6.4.12.2]** states that 4m is the set distance to be applied for all roadside receptors.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The word 'vibration' does not appear in Chapter 14 or TA A14.1 Vibration is addressed in A12.2 but this is only for on-site construction.	No	The assessment of vibration is undertaken in ES Chapter 12, Noise and Vibration **[EN010162/APP/6.2.12]**. A consideration of Construction Traffic

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			Vibration is presented in Section 4 of Chapter 12.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	It is possible that such route examination detail may well be included in the CTMP. However, if one is examining a vibration issue, then it would make sense for that to be in the Noise and Vibration report.	No	The assessment of vibration is undertaken in ES Chapter 12, Noise and Vibration **[EN010162/APP/6.2.12]**. A consideration of Construction Traffic Vibration is presented in Section 12.4 of Chapter 12.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	Just as with the noise assessment, the deer pole installations are not assessed for vibration.	No	Piling plant is included in Table A12.2.2 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.12.2]** as part of the installation of PV modules and fencing. Any piling associated with the installation of deer fences is therefore inherently included as part of the assessment of the PV module construction.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	Though it is unlikely that their pile driving vibration will have any effect on residences or other buildings, certain wildlife are very vulnerable to vibration. One example would be bees.	Yes	Technical Appendix A5.2: Outline Construction Traffic Management Pan (CTMP) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.3]** states that an Ecological Clerk of Works (ECoW) will be appointed. The scope of works for the ECoW includes planning for known

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			ecological issues and localised constraints and responding to new ones. Therefore, where new sensitivities are identified (i.e. beehives) appropriate mitigation can be identified an implemented, where necessary.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	In 2024, deer post were installed in Norwell too close to several hives. The vibration led to the loss of most of the hives: bees communicate by vibration. There does not appear to be any assessment yet of the ground vibration impacts for large scale deer fence post installation.	Yes	Technical Appendix A5.2: Outline Construction Traffic Management Pan (CTMP) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.3]** states that an Ecological Clerk of Works (ECoW) will be appointed. The scope of works for the ECoW includes planning for known ecological issues and localised constraints and responding to new ones. Therefore, where new sensitivities are identified (i.e. beehives) appropriate mitigation can be identified an implemented, where necessary.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	Additional need for further assessment of the vibration effects on heritage assets (as suggested by PINs) as	No	Technical Appendix A5.2: Outline Construction Traffic Management Pan (CTMP) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.2]** states that

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	HGVs will be passing within 4m of numerous designated heritage assets		a pre-commencement survey will be undertaken to identify defects in the road surface that require remedial measures prior to works commencing. Where required, remedial measures to defects such as potholes will be implemented, with particular focus on those located close to heritage assets and residential properties to minimise the impact from noise and vibration.
Topic Area: Site Selection and Alternatives			
Joint Parish Action Group (JPAG)	The scale of GNR is disproportionate to host communities. The Development extends across an area of 18,119.9ha, of which 2,899.7ha, is encompassed within the Order Limits. The majority of the land within the Order Limits is currently used for arable crops or is otherwise down to pasture.	Yes	The overall Order Limits following the final design changes amount to 1,765ha. The scale of the proposal responds to the government's desire to decarbonise the electricity system by 2035 and the relevant solar PV targets which must be achieved to reach this goal, but it should be noted that the Development has reduced significantly in overall footprint in the final design.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Joint Parish Action Group (JPAG)	The circular nature of the GNR scheme encircles entire communities across the area of 18,119.8ha that the Development extends across. As such the impact of GNR extends across a much greater area than a solar farm such which is more concentrated. This impact is particularly increased by other solar farms and BESS projects, existing and proposed that effectively fill in some of the gaps within the GNR circle.	Yes	The reasons for the nature of the scheme design are assessed in ES Chapter 4, Site Selection and Design **[EN010162/APP/6.2.4]**. Had the Development been concentrated into a smaller area the effects are assessed to have been potentially greater, albeit confined into a more concentrated area. Cumulative effects have been assessed in Chapters of the ES where appropriate. The Development is no longer circular in design
Joint Parish Action Group (JPAG)	No cogent or substantive evidence is provided to support the contention that alternative technologies have actually been considered as alternatives. The River Trent valley is considered suitable by the Government for some form of nuclear electricity	No	Alternatives have been considered in detail in ES Chapter 4, Site Selection and Design **[EN010162/APP/6.2.4]**. This project exports 800MW of clean, cheap power into the grid and can be delivered quickly. Onshore wind was considered too impactful visually in terms of the number and height of turbines required to create

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	generation. West Burton in North Nottinghamshire has been selected as the home of the ambitious STEP fusion energy programme led by the UK Atomic Energy Authority.		800MW of clean power at this grid substation. STEP fusion is to create only 20MW of power at West Burton. Notwithstanding that this is a different grid connection point, it shall not contribute to the UK Government's Clean Power 2030 target.
Joint Parish Action Group (JPAG)	There appears to have been no analysis as to the feasibility as an alternative for example of Small Modular Reactors, a form of nuclear power. A Rolls-Royce SMR power station as an example could have the capacity to generate 470MW of low carbon energy. Neither has there been any consideration of further expansion of generation at Staythorpe Power Station using carbon capture and storage technology.	No	Alternatives have been considered in detail in ES Chapter 4, Site Selection and Design **[EN010162/APP/6.2.4]**. Small Modular Reactors are not fast enough in terms of development and build to meet the UK Government's Clean Power 2030 target and are far more expensive than Solar PV. The chosen technology reduces wholesale power prices. Carbon Capture and Storage is not designed as an electricity generating technology, rather a means to reduce carbon emissions from their source, and for this reason is not assessed in the Alternatives Chapter.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Joint Parish Action Group (JPAG)	There has also been no explanation as to other land that has been considered and has been discounted as being unacceptable with the full reasoning given for discounting such land. The only explanation the PEIR puts forward is that in order to minimise visibility from settlements, this influenced the omission of north-facing valley sides to the south of Kneesall; slopes facing towards the northwest edge of Norwell Woodhouse, and fields close to Bathley. However, no such consideration seems to been considered regarding visibility from Staythorpe and Averham of the BESS and substation for example.	No	The site selection process is documented in ES Chapter 4, Site Selection and Design **[EN010162/APP/6.2.4]** and included a wide range of environmental and technical factors. This has been further refined in the DCO submission. The landscape and visual factors referenced in the JPAG comments are further design factors which have influenced the design after site selection. Visibility of the BESS and substation from Averham and Staythorpe would be very limited as set out within ES Chapter 7, Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment **[EN010162/APP/6.2.7]**.
Joint Parish Action Group (JPAG)	Site selection and early design has taken account of community, technical and	No	The site selection process is documented in ES Chapter 4, Site Selection and Design

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	environmental factors including: Identifying land that is physically and technically suitable for the Development; • Avoiding development within designated landscapes, heritage assets and ecology designations and maintaining separation from these; • Maintaining separation from settlements and homes; • Avoiding development within Green Belt, Local Plan allocations and minimising use of land identified as being of the best agricultural quality; • Limiting development within areas identified as having a higher risk of flooding, and • Working with willing		**[EN010162/APP/6.2.4]** and included a wide range of environmental and technical factors. As detailed in the DaD, whilst willing landowners coming forward will always be a factor in site selection, land availability was not the first consideration and several landowners who promoted their land to the design team were informed that their land was unsuitable for the Development.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	landowners to avoid the need for compulsory purchase. There is an inconsistency however as these factors do not reflect those in the PEIR site selection and consideration of alternatives set out earlier. Site selection has been too heavily driven by landowners, rather than being the most appropriate and suitable land chosen through a robust site selection methodology.		
Joint Parish Action Group (JPAG)	The Design Approach Document and PEIR site selection and consideration of alternatives indicated an area of search based on a 15km radius of Staythorpe substation, but the area of search has actually been cut short by the River Trent and the A1. Unfortunately, the individual topic-based	No	The Trent and A1 boundaries were technical constraints, as set out on page 16 and Figure 2 of the Design Approach Document. Given these constraints, the remainder of the site selection process worked within that limit. Figure 1 of the Design Approach document (page 14 and 15), shows the order limits against the compiled site selection data, the subsequent figures (2-6) are

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	suitability maps in the Design Approach Document don't have the Order Limits overlaid to allow a proper interpretation to be made.		provided only as a way of illustrating the many factors taken into account and do not show the order limits, as the site selection process considered all factors together (as reflected in Figure 1), not each group of factors separately. All factors need to be considered in the round because land which may be 'best avoided' for one environmental reason may be suitable for all other factors and thus more suitable than other areas which are 'not preferred' for more than one reason.
Joint Parish Action Group (JPAG)	There is no explanation as to the rationale of a 15km radius when other NSIP solar projects have longer connection distances to other substations at Cottam and West Burton. There is no cogent or substantive reasoning given as to why the River Trent and A1 have been used as artificial cut offs for the area of search.	No	The river Trent and A1 are not artificial boundaries, but constraints, with much technical work and cost involved in their crossing (cost and time in terms of both design stage and construction). It is also sensitive environmentally to cross wide rivers, with large drill pits required. Where long cable runs can be avoided, this is positive. As shown by Figures 1 (page 14), 5 and 6 (pages 19 and 20 of the Design Approach

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	Other schemes such as Cottam, West Burton, Tillbridge and One Earth cross the River Trent and no explanation is given as to why is the A1 a barrier to this scheme when other major roads aren't barriers to other schemes.		Document), the River Trent and A1 corridor is also a concentration of environmental constraints relating to ecology, hydrology, and land use, which is a further reason to avoid development within or crossing this area. In addition, Figure 1 illustrates that land to the east of the A1 and River Trent is no more suitable for the Proposed Development than that to the west.
Joint Parish Action Group (JPAG)	The Design Approach Document refers to excluding land to the south and east of the railway lines based on potential difficulties with cable connections across the railway. However, that statement seems illogical and irrational when Staythorpe Power Station is actually located on the opposite side of the railway line to its grid connection. These factors do not	No	It is welcome that it is recognised that cost and technical challenge come into the decision making when designing a Development. Of course a search should be constrained by all factors constraining development, including technical challenge and cost challenges. The Development is providing cheap, clean power. The cheaper the achievable build cost of the Development, the more that Solar PV can drive down UK wholesale power costs for consumers.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	therefore appear to be operational constraints that should rightly constrain an area of search. Whilst crossing roads, rivers and railway lines might be more costly and technically challenging, it is not considered to be appropriate to use such features to artificially limit an area of search.		
Joint Parish Action Group (JPAG)	We have further inconsistency in the site selection criteria. In the Design Approach Document, mineral safeguarded areas are listed as 'not preferred' but they don't appear to have influenced the shading shown on Figure 5: Land Use Considerations. Mineral extraction, particularly in terms of sand and gravel is a significant feature of land use in Nottinghamshire,	No	The colour schemes on the Design Approach Document **[EN010162/APP/5.6]** are as described in that they represent an amalgam of factors depending on different categories. Minerals safeguarding areas are deemed 'not preferred' as described. As described in the methodology, areas defined as 'best avoided' carry greater weight in the land selection criteria than land which is 'not preferred'.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	including around Mansfield, the River Trent valley and the River Idle valley. Clay extraction is a significant feature in the Kirton area. Both sand & gravel and clay are nationally important mineral resources and make an important contribution to the construction industry, including the provision of homes, employment and infrastructure.		
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The only way that the Applicant's number at 4.7 above can be achieved is by adding a BESS discharge at a time when the arrays are performing at their maximum.	No	The solar farm has a grid connection export capacity of 800MW. The overall expected build capacity will be 1120MW. This allows for the maximum delivery of power through the 800MW grid connection with appropriate 'overplanting'. If the Development was built out at 800MW it would be expected to deliver a much smaller amount of power relative to the available grid connection.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	In compensation, the occupant suggested panelling could take place in fields 233 and 94, large areas which are likely to be Grade 3b or 4. He has photographic evidence of failing crops there. This move would also slightly reduce the adverse residential amenity impact on the property.	Yes	Panels have been removed from fields adjacent to Kneesall lodge and an assessment of visual effects from this property are detailed in RVAA Technical Appendix A7.6: Residential Visual Amenity Assessment **[EN010162/APP/6.4.7.6]**. Putting panels into fields 233 and 94 would not have been in concert with the design principles detailed in the DaD (Design Approach Document) **[EN010162/APP/5.6]** appendix to ES Chapter 4, Site Selection and Design **[EN010162/APP/6.2.4]**, owing to the steep topography of the fields and therefore the associated effects.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The Applicant does not intend to complete any ALC work on the suggested fields due to their current intended use. The suggested field swap has been ignored so far. However, when the ALC	Yes	The northern section of field 98 has been removed from being a Solar PV area and there has been no necessity to swap fields.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	results finally are published and if field 98 is confirmed at Grade 3a, the Applicant will need to demonstrate that the move is impossible as opposed to too much trouble.		
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The Council would wish this to be expanded upon if the Applicant is going to persist with the 36 groups. Presumably, the Applicant knows the acreage of each individual field as this no doubt would have been determined during the negotiations with each landowner.	No	As detailed in Chapter 8: Ecology and Biodiversity, of the ES **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**, the methods and results of the wintering bird surveys are presented in Technical Appendix A8.4: Wintering Birds Baseline **[EN010162/APP/6.4.8.5]**, including Figure A8.5.1 which shows the survey field groups submitted as part of the DCO application.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The impression the Applicant has given verbally is that all relevant landowners are cooperative.	No	All landowners engaged for providing solar areas have been content to engage in commercial negotiation to lease their land.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The fact that this development covers large areas was the choice of the Applicant. This does make	No	All relevant surveys and studies agreed to be scoped in for the requirements of assessment have taken place across the

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	survey time more time consuming but that was a foreseeable cost which should have been planned for.		Development. In terms of the design shape, it has now evolved and is no longer a circular form, with areas of the Development having been removed following more in-depth environmental study.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The Applicants confirm in paragraph 195 of Chapter 8 that cable fields could be used for such fields. This makes it easier for the Applicant as they do not have to deal with any new landowner, not involved in the project. They also then do not have to survey that person's fields as well.	No	Landowners have been fully engaged where necessary to provide cable routes for the Development.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The Council have serious concerns regarding the design and location of the BESS.	No	It isn't clear what the details of the council's concerns around the site selection for the BESS are, but rationale for the same is detailed in ES Chapter 4, Site Selection and Design **[EN010162/APP/6.2.4]**.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	By this Council's count, there are currently 11 operational utility scale solar	No	The Applicant proposes sheep grazing under the panels. The Order Limits for the Development span

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	plants in the Newark and Sherwood District area and two just over the border with Bassetlaw. It seems likely that there will be a further 3 constructed locally in the near future (Weston, Muskham Wood and Knapthorpe). Of these 14 in the District, 12 stated in their planning applications there would be sheep grazing in the panel fields. The GNR development will occupy more land than the above 14 combined.		1765ha. This is a Development of National Significance. Cumulative effects parameters have been agreed with Newark and Sherwood district council in terms of the scope of the assessments and cumulative effects are featured across the various Chapters of the ES
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	If the areas in Flood zones 2 and 3 were removed as planned panel fields, the project could still progress but in a different design. That might involve more cabling, but that design precedent has already been set in these plans.	Yes	Areas for Solar panel development were removed from Flood Zones 2 and 3 in the final detailed design.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	There is no statutory, regulatory or functionality requirement that means all NSIP solar farms should be 800MW. A redesign would merely affect a contribution towards net zero (in a very minor way) but probably more importantly for some, profit.	No	It is correct to state that solar NSIPs need not necessarily deliver 800MW of power. However, 400kV infrastructure must still be built to accommodate a smaller NSIP, such as a 300MW or 400MW scheme. It is therefore an efficient use of the required substation build to maximise both the grid connection infrastructure at the National Grid side as well as the customer side with relatively reduced environmental effects as the site is scaled up. This contributes more to the desired reduction in wholesale power prices as the overall MW cost of delivery of the Development reduces with scale.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	Despite this, the Applicant still intends to develop in flood zones 2 and 3. These are situated in the River Trent flood plain. The section 3 mapping also	Yes	Solar panel development has been removed from the stated areas containing flood zones 2 and 3.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	classifies these same areas as "not preferred" on the basis that it would be expected that the ALC findings would demonstrate them to BMV land.		
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	This scheme will still go ahead if a consent order is granted, with or without panels going into fields which are BMV land and flood zone 2 and 3.	Yes	The Development would be built if a DCO is granted. The Applicant has removed panels from flood zones 2 and 3 and ES Chapter 17, Agricultural Land **[EN010162/APP/6.2.17]** details Agricultural Land Classification.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	But more poignantly, it would be inconceivable for the Applicant to say something along the lines of "well if we are not allowed to develop in flood zones 2 or3, then there will not be the trees planted or landscape improvements made".	Yes	The Applicant has removed panels from flood zones 2 and 3 and is also creating landscape scale biodiversity improvement.
Topic Area: Recreation and Socio-Economics			

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Joint Parish Action Group (JPAG)	The impact of the project on tenant farmers should be considered separately to the impact on the landowner owned/run farming enterprises. This should include the viability of their remaining landholdings to operate as a profitable farming enterprise. The upstream and downstream impact on agricultural supply chains and those who purchase the arable goods to be lost should also be assessed. The long-term impact on the loss of a generation of active farming and the interrelationship this may have on the assumption that farming could resume post development should be considered.	Yes	These matters are considered in the socio-economic chapter of the ES Chapter 13, Socio-Economics and Tourism **[EN010162/APP/6.2.13]**. It should be noted that land swop deals have been made with the vast majority (if not all landowners) and sheep grazing will continue onsite. There will therefore still be agricultural activity onsite in harmony with the solar and biodiversity park.
Joint Parish Action Group (JPAG)	It is considered to be inappropriate for the PEIR to look to consider	No	The socio-economic benefits of the proposals do stretch far wider than some of the adverse effects. This is

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	socioeconomic effects in terms of potential economic benefits across the whole of Newark & Sherwood and Mansfield, when all other impacts are not considered to extend that far. As an example, this chapter therefore looks at policies in Neighbourhood Plans that are a long way distant from the Study Area, when other chapters haven't. This appears to be trying to overstate the perceived economic benefits whilst underplaying the harm in relation to other matters.		a reality. People will travel from a wider area to work on the Development who are unlikely to suffer any form of adverse effect from it. The Applicant is using a much smaller study area compared to where beneficial impacts will actually impact. The rationality for the study area is clearly provided in the baseline assessment and is a robust approach. The methodology for assessing an appropriate Socio-economic study area is clearly explained in ES Chapter 13, Socio-Economics and Tourism **[EN010162/APP/6.2.13]**.
Joint Parish Action Group (JPAG)	Notwithstanding the definition of Travel to Work Areas for economic purposes, the settlements within the GNR area do not have strong interrelationships with Mansfield. In any event the	No	The methodology for assessing an appropriate Socio-economic study area is clearly explained in ES Chapter 13, Socio-Economics and Tourism **[EN010162/APP/6.2.13]**. TTW's are only a small part of this and are not used solely to define the study area.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	eastern part of the GNR area is in the Lincoln Travel to Work Area and the GNR area immediately abuts the Nottingham Trevel to Work Area and the Worksop & Retford Travel to Work Area. The PEIR is not taking a consistent approach towards use of Travel to Work Areas. Using 2011 census information is considered to be far too dated, being not only pre-Covid but also fails to reflect substantial housing growth and employment growth since then.		
Joint Parish Action Group (JPAG)	Limiting the impact on tourism to a 5km distance from the Order limits during the operation is considered to be inappropriate because accommodation these days tends to be used as a base from where visitors go out to	No	The methodology for assessing the tourism study area is clearly explained in ES Chapter 13, Socio-Economics and Tourism **[EN010162/APP/6.2.13].**

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	explore a wide geographical area, particularly in rural areas.		
Joint Parish Action Group (JPAG)	The construction phase is estimated to create up to around 120 local net direct construction FTE jobs and 60 local net direct manufacturing FTE jobs. This is temporary employment and construction projects tend to use a transitory labour force that moves from project to project, rather than necessarily providing local employment.	Yes	Please refer to the outline Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan (oSSCEP) at **[EN010162/APP/6.4.13.2]** for job numbers and detailed analysis of how the Applicant is creating beneficial effects on Socio-Economics, including the EG Academy having already provided 142 CPD accredited courses to local students and the overall plan moving forward
Joint Parish Action Group (JPAG)	The PEIR suggests that based on a 2,186ha area of agricultural loss during construction (work areas, 1, 2a, 2b, 4, 5 and 7), this would support approximately 9 employees, resulting in an overall net gain in employment as a result of	No	The Socio-Economics assesses the effects on employment, alongside farming output changes according to the updated Order Limits which will accompany the planning application. ES Chapter 13, Socio-Economics and Tourism **[EN010162/APP/6.2.13]**.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	the construction phase of 166 direct local FTE jobs. However, area 3 for mitigation/enhancement and area 8 access works will also be lost from the current arable farming so need to be assessed as being lost which the PEIR doesn't do. In any event the impact in terms of the loss of land is on individual farms, including tenant farmers.		
Joint Parish Action Group (JPAG)	In relation to the impact of the loss of employment the PEIR includes inconsistent figures. The PEIR refers to during construction 2,186ha of land lost would equate to 9 agricultural employees lost, but during operation a lesser 1,405 ha lost would also lead to a loss of 9 employees from agriculture. This inconsistency is not explained. Later in the	Yes	These figures have been recalculated as the overall land take has reduced. This is more clearly detailed in the ES, Chapter 13, Socio-Economics and Tourism **[EN010162/APP/6.2.13]**.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	socioeconomic section of the PEIR it is says 2,900ha will result in loss of 18 FTE jobs during construction, which is double the figure stated elsewhere. Also, later the PEIR says 2,186ha lost would equate to a loss of 14 FTE jobs. The impact on family farmers needs to be considered in particular.		
Joint Parish Action Group (JPAG)	The impact is not the loss of land from a single farming enterprise but is instead parts of numerous farming enterprises. There has been no assessment as to how many farms are affected and to what extent. A simple mathematical equation does not represent the full picture of the impact. If the loss of land to a tenant farmer means that their farm is no longer viable then that could result in the loss of that	No	There are no tenant farmers losing their livelihoods. Deals have been struck with tenant farmers to take different parcels of land. Interviews with landowners and farmers have taken place to assess impacts, rather than merely mathematical calculation. This information is included for clarity in ES Chapter 13, Socio-Economics and Tourism **[EN010162/APP/6.2.13]**.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	entire farming enterprise and potential the home for the tenant farming family. A proper in-depth analysis of the actual impact rather than some theoretical loss of jobs should be undertaken.		
Joint Parish Action Group (JPAG)	The applicant Elements Green Trent Ltd is a loss-making company, its latest published accounts up to 31 December 2023 show it made a loss of (£1,170,430) and it records show it having just 2 employees. The parent company Elements Green Ltd only has 35 group employees.	No	SPVs are structured in this way for the vast majority of developments, from housing to commercial developments, to renewable developments. EG is proud to be a UK-based developer investing in UK-plc and driving investment from abroad into the local area. This is examined in the Funding Statement **[EN010162/APP/4.2]**.
Joint Parish Action Group (JPAG)	There is no explanation as to where these suggested future jobs will be located, the applicant company is based in London and has no local base. Aspects such as CCTV supervision or system management can be done	No	The details of jobs available to maintain the scheme have been provided in the Outline Skills and Supply Chain Employment Plan (oSSCEP) TA13.2 **[EN010162/APP/4.2]**.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	remotely and as such does not guarantee local employment. Management of premises can often by undertaken by national facilities management companies who again may not provide any actual local employment.		
Joint Parish Action Group (JPAG)	The PEIR claims that the suggested sheep grazing is expected to support 11 jobs. However, local residents report having had conversations with the farmer indicated by the applicant to be the party to be going to undertake the sheep grazing, and they have apparently stated that only two jobs are planned to be created. JPAG have not themselves spoken to the sheep farmer but have no reason to doubt what local residents have reported.	No	This is incorrect intelligence. In the outline (oSSCEP) TA13.2 **[EN010162/APP/4.2],** the methodology for job creation has been clearly explained and evidenced.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Joint Parish Action Group (JPAG)	In the same discussions the sheep farmer has allegedly said that they are assuming that 10% of the sheep stock will be lost through illness and injury because grazing over such a large area and at such a low density amongst the solar panels means that supervising the flock and allowing all sheep to be seen personally regularly as per the Defra 'Code of recommendations for the welfare of livestock: sheep' requires.	No	Please refer to the promotional video involving our sheep farmer on the company website. His welfare standards, expertise and love of sheep and what he does are clear to see alongside his good reputation. This would appear to be an unfair allegation with no evidential basis. Sheep grazing amongst solar panels is widely accepted to be better for animal welfare as the sheep take advantage of the shade in weathers.
Joint Parish Action Group (JPAG)	The DCO application should explain how the health and welfare of livestock can be ensured over such a huge area. It is noted that the applicant has undertaken publicity claiming that 9,000 sheep including lambs will graze the land, that figure	No	The employment figures quoted bear out the labour-intensive nature of grazing the land and account for the welfare of the livestock.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	does not match the 5,488 sheep quoted in the PEIR.		
Joint Parish Action Group (JPAG)	In addition, the Defra statistics which refer to the Defra, Farm Business Survey, identify that average farm income in the East Midlands for cereals was £153,000, for general cropping was £180,100, but for grazing livestock it was only £20,300. Accordingly, there is a 7.5-fold difference in income for an average arable farm to an average grazing livestock farm. As such the proposal is substantially lowering the agricultural economic potential of the land to sustain agricultural incomes, with the knock-on effect on the wider economy of lower spending power.	No	This analysis doesn't take account of the rent the farmers will gain from the solar farm, which is substantial. The actual spending power will therefore increase for local farmers and have a positive effect on the local economy, alongside the additional boost the grazing will create, which is accounted for in the ES. The output calculations are fully set out in the ES and are a worst-case scenario. The actual loss of output has reduced with the reduction in the scale of the Development. ES Chapter 13, Socio-Economics and Tourism **[EN010162/APP/6.2.13]**.
Joint Parish Action Group (JPAG)	Whilst it may well be that the sheep farmers may be paid	No	The socio-economic chapter assesses the numbers in terms of

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	an additional amount by the applicant in lieu of needing to cut the grass; the data however shows how little income can be sustained by a sheep grazing farm. As such the suggestion that sheep grazing would sustain higher levels of employment than arable seems illogical.		job creation and income loss / gain as a result of the proposals, but it must be noted that the sheep grazing is the additional income on top of the solar income (which itself is high). The methodology for job numbers is clearly set out in the Outline Skills and Supply Chain Employment Plan (oSSCEP) TA13.2 **[EN010162/APP/4.2]**.
Notts Area Ramblers	The scale of the impact of this application on the countryside, and the cumulative impact of other solar developments in the area is significant, and everything possible should be considered to limit any detriment to access and enjoyment of the current PROW network and the countryside generally, and to seize the opportunity to provide compensatory improvements.	Yes	Effects have been avoided, where possible, and minimised where they cannot be avoided. Mitigation then addresses any effects, and enhancement (creation of additional routes) is also proposed. The effects on recreation are assessed as beneficial, overall, as set out in ES Chapter 18, Recreation **[EN010162/APP/6.2.18]**.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Notts Area Ramblers	Ramblers welcome current proposals such as introducing new permissive paths to create a circular traffic-free route, and screening and widening PROW corridors adjacent to proposed solar panels.	No	Noted. New permissive routes have been proposed to increase the connectivity of the network during the operational phase, including 21 new permissive footpaths, and 6 new permissive bridleways, creating 32.6 km of new permissive route, as described in Table 18.7 in Chapter 18: Recreation, of the ES **[EN010162/APP/6.2.18]**. A circular recreational route would be created around the Order Limits, covering 50.6 km, including 12.5 km of new permissive path.
Notts Area Ramblers	Ramblers' Guidance to Developers for Green Energy Developments is attached. This should be used to facilitate ongoing discussions to improve the experience of walkers to the area.	Yes	The Applicant considered the Ramblers' Guidance to Developers for Green Energy Developments in creating the overall footpath strategy.
Notts Area Ramblers	Weston FP11 (DB032) – Approx 250 metres from SK762674 to SK761672 This section of FP runs	Yes	NT|Weston|FP11 is no longer proposed to be diverted.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	across part of panel block DB032. The proposed diversion will be approx. 250 metres long with panels on one side. We support this diversion, which will be less affected by panels. The diversion could be improved by moving it approx. 50 metres east to run alongside the Beck.		
Notts Area Ramblers	Laxton & Moorhouse FP11 (DB032) – Approx 300 metres from SK761672 to SK758671 This section of FP runs across part of panel block DB032. The proposed diversion will be approx. 1,200 metres long with panels on one side. We support this diversion, which will be less affected by panels, The diversion could be improved if it is moved approx. 100-50 metres east to run alongside the Beck.	Yes	The diversion of NT|Laxton and Moorhouse|FP11 has been reduced by 150 m and NT|Weston|FP9 and NT|Weston|FP11 would no longer be closed. As a result, it would no longer be possible to move the new diversion alongside Moorhouse Beck. A full description of the diversions is available in Table 18.6 of Chapter 18: Recreation, of the ES **[EN010162/APP/6.2.18]**.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Notts Area Ramblers	Kelham FP7A (DB006) – Approx 300 metres from SK745573 to SK745571 This section of FP runs across part of panel block DB006 with panels on both sides. This is an historical and logical route from Caunton to Averham and Upton. The proposed diversion will be approx. 750 metres long with panels on one side. We object to this diversion. It is too long and involves walking round three sides of a field. It would be better to maintain the original line of the FP in a corridor between fences for this short section.	Yes	The diversion of NT|Kelham|FP7A remains part of the Development proposal. The 200 m NT|Kelham|FP7A route would be entirely closed and replaced with 460 m of footpath which would follow the edges of the solar PV area. If the route was to remain in situ, it would be surrounded by solar PV. The planned diversion would be 260 m longer but would allow more open views to the west.
Notts Area Ramblers	Four DMMOs that have been registered by Nottinghamshire County Council are affected by areas of panels.	No	The DMMOs have been considered within Chapter 18: Recreation, of the ES, in section **[EN010162/APP/6.2.18.5.5]**.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Notts Area Ramblers	DMMO 1230: Norwell Woodhouse to Ossington Road. Approx 1,000 metres of the line of this DMMO in Laxton & Moorhouse from SK735635 to SK732644 crosses fields with proposed panel block DB029. The Developer must acknowledge the existence of this DMMO, and plan for adjustment to infrastructure.	No	The Applicant acknowledges the existence of DMMO 1230. Section 18.5.5.3: DMMO 1230, of Chapter 18: Recreation, of the ES **[EN010162/APP/6.2.18.5.5]**, provides a description of this DMMO as per the modification order application register. The DMMO is approximately 1.6 km in length and sits within Norwell and Laxton and Moorhouse parish council boundaries. The DMMO is within an area planned for Work no.1, solar PV for a total of approximately 400 m, associated with fields 135 and 136. As a result, the DMMO would no longer be accessible in this area. A network of new permissive paths have been proposed here, which would continue to provide a connection between Norwell and Ossington Road, as shown on Inset 18.3. Permissive Footpaths 9, 10, 11, and 12 would provide additional

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			connectivity and added opportunity for circular routes.
Notts Area Ramblers	DMMO 1249: Maplebeck to Eakring BW. The line of this DMMO in Maplebeck parish from SK693611 to SK708609 will be across fields with proposed panel block DB013. In Eakring parish, the line of the DMMO will follow existing Eakring FP16 for 800 metres from SK687619 to SK679618 on a track separated from panel block DB015 by an existing hedge. The Developer must acknowledge the existence of this DMMO, and plan for adjustment to infrastructure.	No	The Applicant acknowledges the existence of DMMO 1249. Section 18.5.5.6: DMMO 1249, of Chapter 18: Recreation, of the ES **[EN010162/APP/6.2.18]**, provides a description of this DMMO as per the modification order application register. The DMMO is approximately 5 km in length and sits within Eakring and Maplebeck parish council boundaries and is shown on Inset 18.6. The DMMO follows the route NT|Eakring|FP16 for 1.6 km when it is within the Recreational Study Area and so impacts would be the same as those assessed in rows 36 of Table 18.7. The route then crosses an area associated with work no. 2, cable for 65 m in field 77, and subsequently, an area planned for Work no.1, solar PV for 850 m in fields 2, 73, and 74. As a

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			result, the DMMO would no longer be accessible in this area. In combination with NT|Eakring|FP16, NT|Winkburn|BW9, NT|Maplebeck|FP7, and NT|Maplebeck|FP1, the newly proposed Permissive Bridleway 6 and Permissive Footpath 16 would continue to provide a connection to Maplebeck. These routes would provide additional connectivity and added opportunity for circular routes.
Notts Area Ramblers	DMMO 1203: Kersall to Caunton BW. This DMMO proposes upgrading existing Kersall FP6 to BW. Proposed BW adjacent to panel block DBN019 for approx. 200 metres from SK716619 to SK717618 on stone track separated from panels by existing hedge. The Developer must acknowledge the existence	No	The Applicant acknowledges the existence of DMMO 1203. Section 18.5.5.6: DMMO 1203, of Chapter 18: Recreation, of the ES **[EN010162/APP/6.2.18]**, provides a description of this DMMO as per the modification order application register. The DMMO is approximately 3.4 km in length and sits within Kersall and Caunton parish council boundaries. The DMMO follows the route of

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	of this DMMO, and plan for adjustment to infrastructure.		NT|Kersall|FP6 and NT|Caunton|FP6A when it is within the Recreational Study Area.
Notts Area Ramblers	DMMO 1255: Winkburn BW9 to Hockerton BW8 This DMMO extends existing Winkburn BW9 for nearly 2km to Hockerton BW8. Approx 100 metres from SK 694607 to SK693607 of the DMMO will be adjacent to panel block DB013.The Developer must acknowledge the existence of this DMMO, and plan for adjustment to infrastructure.	No	The Applicant acknowledges the existence of DMMO 1255. Section 18.5.5.6: DMMO 1255, of Chapter 18: Recreation, of the ES **[EN010162/APP/6.2.18]**, provides a description of this DMMO as per the modification order application register. The DMMO is approximately 1.9 km in length and sits within Winkburn's parish council boundary. The DMMO is within the Order Limits for just 100 m and follows the route of the proposed Permissive Footpath 16. Access along the DMMO would not be affected by the Development, although there would be views of solar panels to the north (field 74) for approximately 100 m of the route. The new permissive footpath running north alongside Hagley's

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			Plantation would provide additional route options.
Notts Area Ramblers	Please confirm that PROW will only be diverted or temporarily closed and not deleted. There is no reason to delete PROW, given the statement that "...all routes will revert back to the baseline…."	No	A decision over diversion or restoration of the original route is to be taken at the end of the operational life, please refer to the Outline Decommissioning Restoration Plan (oDRP) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.6]**.
Notts Area Ramblers	Plan key includes "Proposed PROW Deletion", whereas PEIR Chapter 18 (Recreation) Section 18.10, which summarises the effect on PROW during construction, operation and decommissioning of the site, makes no mention of "deleting" PROW.	No	No PRoW are being deleted, unless a diversion is being created for them - in which case they're called "diversions" in ES Chapter 18, Recreation **[EN010162/APP/6.2.18]**.
Notts Area Ramblers	It is also important to recognise that many Rights of Way are part of our history, and have often been in existence for a hundred years or more. However,	No	This is noted, and has been the strategy of the Development throughout.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	sometimes green energy developers propose moving paths because this suits the design of their installation plans. In general, as with all development, rights of way should be retained unless there is a very good reason for them to be diverted or the diversion proposed is more pleasant and convenient for walkers.		
Notts Area Ramblers	If the development is on land with other access rights (such as open access) these should be retained or, if that is impossible, suitable land nearby should be offered in compensation so that there is no 'net loss' of public access rights.	No	There is no open access land within the Order Limits.
Notts Area Ramblers	If there are traditions of public access on the land, these should be retained wherever possible.	No	These have taken into account, where the Applicant has been made aware of them.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Notts Area Ramblers	In general, we expect: • No rights of way to be extinguished, although temporary diversions for the period of that the equipment is in place may be discussed • Rights of way and other paths or access to be kept in their current location unless there are benefits to users of the right of way by adjusting the alignment. • Where permissive paths are proposed, these are be retained for the length of the development and will be complementary to, but not replace, existing rights of way • New Rights of Way to be added to make better connections in the local path network.	No	These are noted, and generally accord with the Development proposals. During all phases of the Development, PRoW and permissive routes would be managed in accordance with the final Recreational Routes Management Plan (RRMP), which would accord with the outline RRMP (Technical Appendix A18.1 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.18.1]**). This includes measures such as the management of construction works that cross PRoW so that the PRoW can remain open during the works. This mitigation is treated as being embedded as part of the Development, and hence effects are assessed with this mitigation in place. For more information, please refer to Chapter 15: Recreation, of the ES **[EN010162/APP/6.2.18]**.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	• Existing paths to be made wider than the current requirements of 1m for footpaths and 2m for bridleways on cross field paths (1.5m and 3m respectively for field edge paths); this allows for the growth of hedges and for the maintenance of the path surface. • Access Improvements through permissive paths, and upgrades to path surfaces & drainage, and infrastructure, such as gates replacing stiles, signposts, way-markers and information boards. • The developer must guarantee that any diverted paths are restored to their original alignment when the		

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	development is decommissioned. This must also be in the attached Conditions if the Planning Authority approves the plans. • Where there is a DMMO within the development, this must be treated as an existing right of way; the DMMO may be to upgrade a footpath to a bridleway.		
Notts Area Ramblers	Given the height of solar panel and battery containers, when in proximity to a Right of Way, their presence will severely limit the openness previously enjoyed by walkers.	No	This is noted and assessed in both the landscape assessment (ES Chapter 7, Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment **[EN010162/APP/6.2.7]**) and recreation assessment (ES Chapter 18, Recreation **[EN010162/APP/6.2.18]**).
Notts Area Ramblers	Proposals that seek to fence paths into a narrow intimidating corridor, spoil the enjoyment of walking on the	No	This can be the case but depends on the existing path route and condition. There are many "green lanes" in the area which are similar

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	path, and can mean the path surface is more easily damaged by use.		to what is proposed in these circumstances.
Notts Area Ramblers	Particular care is required in or adjacent to Conservation Areas, to ensure that the views of important buildings and structures are not inhibited by the proposals.	No	Conservation areas are assessed in ES Chapter 11, Cultural Heritage, and Archaeology **[EN010162/APP/6.2.11]**.
Notts Area Ramblers	We expect the following: • Widths of rights of way should be increased with the right of way being a minimum of 10 metres away from the fencing; this additional width will be permissive. • Trees, hedges or other plants should be planted so that fences are screened from path users but varying the height may help mitigate the enclosed experience of using the path. This may mean that more width is needed to leave enough	No	This is noted, however it may not in all cases be reasonable, nor deliverable. It is very rare for existing rights of way to be 10 m from their boundaries, and in many cases is 1-2 m only. An Outline Recreational Routes Management Plan (oRRMP) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.18.1]** will be submitted with the application, setting out how routes will be managed and maintained.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	space for both planting and the path. When very young hedge plants and saplings are used it will take a number of years before they provide visual screening. In more sensitive locations we expect the planting of larger or semi-mature trees and shrubs. • The developer should provide plans for maintenance of plants and the path so that the path condition and width are maintained. • The fences used should be open mesh fencing, rather than close boarding or metal palisade-type fencing, as they are less intrusive or intimidating for path users.		
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	This has probably been included to hint at a potential employment benefit to this	No	Noted.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	country due to the use of UK steel.		
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The Council note the following proposed security measures. The employment of security guards during the construction phase. It is hoped that ES will contain an approximate assessment of how many person hours will be required to adequately protect the site. This is relevant for the socioeconomic assessment.	No	Security guards are be included in indirect employment which is already accounted for as part of indirect multipliers within the assessment. ES Chapter 13, Socio-Economics and Tourism **[EN010162/APP/6.2.13]**.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	Deer fencing is much easier to breach. The Council would welcome a summary in the ES of any discussions regarding security between the Applicant and Nottinghamshire Police and their Design Out Crime Officers.	No	The Applicant is content with the current security arrangements planned which are standard on UK solar farms. Solar farms in the UK tend to get the balance of aesthetics and security right, with deer fencing acting as a deterrent without being visually unappealing.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	Paragraph 83 of Chapter 17 addresses the impact of farm business with the	No	Impact on farm businesses is fully assessed within ES Chapter 13, Socio-Economics and Tourism

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	qualification that they are yet to be fully assessed. This is understandable.		**[EN010162/APP/6.2.13]** the assessment.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The Council are of the view that in terms of explaining financial benefits in the ES, then it should be made clear that all financial benefits mentioned are for landowners, not farmers.	No	Not all of the financial benefits accrue to landowners. Sheep farmers benefit. Agricultural contractors to periodically cut hedgerows will also benefit financially. Wider financial benefits and GVA are discussed in Chapter 13, Socio-Economics and Tourism **[EN010162/APP/6.2.13]**.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	It was hoped that as part of the baseline study, the Applicant would identify which of the fields to be panelled is currently farmed by tenant farmers. Unfortunately that baseline data has not been made available.	Yes	The ALC, ES Chapter 17, Agricultural Land **[EN010162/APP/6.2.17]** has been conducted and provides full detail of the 22 farm businesses within the order limits.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	It is more than likely that the majority of landowners signed up to the scheme, prior to recent changes in inheritance tax (IHT). The	No	Individual tax and estate planning matters fall outside the scope of the assessment, but landowners have been engaged on the Development since 2021, (IHT) changes have

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	Applicant takes a very bullish approach to the farming industry.		been very recent in 2024. There is no evidence of the Applicant adopting a bullish approach to the farming industry.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	It may not be reasonable to expect the ES to complete a comprehensive tax liability projection for the landowners in the scheme. It is possible that the Applicant might take the view that that is a private matter and not the Applicant's problem. However, there does appear to be an argument that a more general assessment is required as part of the socioeconomic impact assessment.	No	Individual tax and estate planning matters fall outside the scope of the assessment and indeed this would not be reasonable.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	Take the example of someone inheriting an 82 hectare farm with 30 hectares leased out to the Applicant with 32 years to run on the lease, bringing in at today's prices £1000 per	No	Individual lease agreements with landowners and the Applicant are contractually confidential.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	acre per annum (but coupled to rising electricity prices). Total future expected lease income would be circa £2.4million which would be included in the IHT liability. It is a fair question to ask whether by participating in this project does a landowner now face a greater risk of having to divest assets to meet IHT liabilities than would have been the case had they had continued farming.		
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	This Applicant actually goes further than most with the sheep grazing arguments and sees it as an agricultural employment gain, concluding that because they expect 5,488 sheep to graze on the panel fields during the operational phase, then that would	No	The full sheep employment assessment and its methodology ES Chapter 13, Socio-Economics and Tourism **[EN010162/APP/6.2.13]**.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	deliver 10 direct FTE jobs per annum.		
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	Firstly, these sheep farmers are presumably already employed as such (or self-employed). The new jobs will either be new entrants (competitors) or extra staff taken on by the existing sheep farmers.	No	The full sheep employment assessment and its methodology can be seen within the ES Chapter 13, Socio-Economics and Tourism **[EN010162/APP/6.2.13]**.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	What the appendix does not do is provide baseline information on local leisure and tourism businesses despite the acknowledgement that any impacts on these must be assessed as per national policies.	No	Noted. As detailed in Chapter 13: Socio-Economics and Tourism of the ES **[EN010162/APP/6.2.13]**, information on socio-economics and tourism within the Study Area was collected through a detailed review of existing studies and datasets. These are summarised in Table 13.11: Summary of Desk Study Sources Used of Chapter 13: Scio-Economics and Tourism of the ES **[EN010162/APP/6.2.13]**. This includes Population and Deprivation, Economy, Employment and Skills, and Tourism.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			Public rights of way, land use, tourist economy, accommodation are scoped into the assessment of impact on the tourism economy. Baseline information on these is provided in sections 13.5.2 and 13.8.5 of ES Chapter 13, Socio-Economics and Tourism **[EN010162/APP/6.2.13]**. These sections also set out the findings, with respect to the tourism economy, of a survey of users of Public Rights of Way in the area. The assessment of effects on the tourism economy considers the potential effect on tourism resources, which, based on the findings of the landscape and visual impact assessment (ES Chapter 7 **[EN010162/APP/6.2.7]**), are restricted to effects on tourists using the local road and public right of way networks.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	A baseline study is not the correct vehicle for assessing the likely impacts on these	No	Noted. A desktop socioeconomic baseline assessment has been carried out to assess the social and

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	businesses. Instead it should hopefully inform on the presence of leisure and tourism assets, particularly within the order limits, that might be impacted by the development. The appendix adopts an over-restrictive definition of tourism receptors as just those within Newark Town Centre, Southwell and Sherwood Forest.		economic characteristics of the area in the context of the Development. This is available within Technical Appendix A13.1, Socioeconomic Baseline Report **[EN010162/APP/6.4.13.1]** and its key conclusions pertaining to this assessment are set out in section 13.5.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The effects on short term lets, part informed by a basic graphic from AirDNA, is summarised as being disregarded because there are not many of these properties, compared to Southwell and Newark. So in other words, they can be forgotten about. How consistent this is with the Applicant's promise of a	Yes	The assessment has built upon this and conducted a detailed assessment on short term accommodation impacts. The methodology can be seen within the ES Chapter 13, Socio-Economics and Tourism **[EN010162/APP/6.2.13]**.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	"detailed assessment" is not clear.		
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	A check of Booking.com and Airbnb reveals some short term holiday lets which will be heavily impacted by the development.	Yes	The assessment has built upon this and conducted a detailed assessment on short term accommodation impacts. The methodology can be seen within the ES Chapter 13, Socio-Economics and Tourism **[EN010162/APP/6.2.13]**.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	Short term holiday lets are of course just one type of business likely to be affected.	Yes	The methodology and scope can be seen within the ES Chapter 13, Socio-Economics and Tourism **[EN010162/APP/6.2.13]**.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	There is no baseline data on caravan parks, glamping sites, angling lakes, retail or licensed premises or commercial stables and riding schools.	No	Public rights of way, land use, tourist economy, accommodation are scoped into the assessment of impact on the tourism economy. Baseline information on these is provided in sections 13.5.2 and 13.8.5 of ES Chapter 13, Socio-Economics and Tourism **[EN010162/APP/6.2.13].** These sections also set out the findings, with respect to the tourism

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			economy, of a survey of users of Public Rights of Way in the area.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The argument has been voiced locally that the Applicant has included so much demographic detail in order to disguise the fact that it will not address any impacts on local leisure and tourism small businesses. The Council do not express a view on this. Clearly, new baseline data will be required for the ES.	No	The Applicant makes note of this comment, the baseline data methodology and rational is described within the ES Chapter 13, Socio-Economics and Tourism **[EN010162/APP/6.2.13]**.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The socioeconomic impacts of this project can be divided into four categories – local, regional, national and international.	No	Noted.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	This is offset to a degree by disadvantages such a reduction in food production and by higher material imports, negatively affecting the balance of trade.	No	Agricultural production impacts have been assessed in detail within the ES Chapter 13, Socio-Economics and Tourism **[EN010162/APP/6.2.13]**.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Topic Area: Traffic and Transport			
Joint Parish Action Group (JPAG)	JPAG notes that the response from Norwell & Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council highlights various errors in relation to the transport documents with regard to speed limits, environmental weight limits, construction traffic routing and heavy loads. It is concerning that such basic information is incorrectly stated and suggests that too much reliance has been placed on desk-top studies and tools such as Google Streetview rather than consultants actually visiting every part of the 18,119.9ha over which the Development extends in area. As an example, the incorrect statement of the 40mph	Yes	It is unfortunate that some of the information contained within the reports contain errors and / or outdated information. Whilst the reports have been informed by online resources, they have also been supplemented by numerous site visits of the routes over the past year. There are no panels now proposed in South Muskham. Data used to formulate the Environmental Statement has been bolstered by the site visits required for more the more in-depth assessment required.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	speed limit on the B6325 as it passes through South Muskham can only come from viewing Google Streetview (which dates from 2009) because the speed limit was reduced to 30mph by an Order in 2016; so, anybody actually visiting the study area for this project in the last 9 years would clearly have seen the 30mph speed limit in place.		
Joint Parish Action Group (JPAG)	For EIA, the zones of influence under the heading of Traffic and Transport includes three key A road corridors being the A617, the A616 and the A1 (part of the Strategic Road Network). However, the key A road corridor of the A46 has not been assessed, that road is part of the Strategic Road Network and as the DCO for the Newark bypass	No	The A46 was considered within the study area for PEIR and is again considered within ES Chapter 14, Traffic and Transport [**EN010162/APP/6.2.14].** The A46 is however screened out for assessment as it does not meet the impact thresholds. Cumulative impacts were not considered at the PEIR stage but the works for the Newark bypass and the A46 are considered in the ES chapter.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	is to be scoped in for cumulative impacts it seems illogical not to consider the A46 corridor for traffic and transport.		
Joint Parish Action Group (JPAG)	A list of settlements as sensitive receptors have been identified. Those listed are: Averham, Little Carlton, Maplebeck and Moorhouse, Bathley, North Muskham, Norwell, Caunton, Cromwell, Kelham, Ossington and Kneesall. This list appears incomplete and should also include: Staythorpe, South Muskham, Carlton on Trent, Sutton on Trent, Tuxford, Weston, Hockerton, Averham Park and Norwell Woodhouse.	No	The traffic and access design has changed with the reduction in the scale of the Development due to Environmental Study. Appropriate settlement lists are detailed in the Traffic and Transport, Chapter 14 of the ES **[EN010162/APP/6.2.14]**.
Joint Parish Action Group (JPAG)	Individual Parishes have been encouraged to comment on traffic issues. The proposed construction traffic access routes through	No	Passing places are proposed along the routes being used for construction where the road widths do not currently comfortably accept HGV traffic and these are shown on

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	much of the area are unsuitable because they overly rely upon narrow single-track roads and dissect communities by passing through them. For example, the routes chosen will be a barrier to people moving from one part of the village to another in Moorhouse, Ossington, Cromwell, North Muskham, South Muskham, Weston and Carlton on Trent (not counting A roads). Many of these villages either have no designated footways and/or have in the past experienced fatal accidents with HGV and pedestrian conflict, notably at Carlton on Trent at the junction of the Great North Road and the A1 overbridge.		Figure 14.5 of ES Chapter 14, Traffic and Transport [**EN010162/APP/6.2.14**]. This will ease two-way traffic flows. The ES Chapter also assesses the impact of construction traffic on matters such as non-motorised user severance, amenity, and fear and intimidation. Road safety is also assessed.
Joint Parish Action Group (JPAG)	Concerns regarding the proposed use of narrow	No	Non-motorised users are considered in the ES Chapter 14,

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	roads with no pavements which are used by walkers, horse riders and cyclists, increasing collision risk, and fear and intimidation are legitimately held by local residents.		Traffic and Transport **[EN010162/APP/6.2.14]** and measures are identified in Technical Appendix A5.2: Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.2**] in areas with an increased likelihood of interaction.
Joint Parish Action Group (JPAG)	In addition, a number of the routes chosen either flood regularly such as the A617 between Kelham and Newark and Trent Lane between Kelham and South Muskham. Also, Kelham Lane at Little Carlton is closed during times of flooding as part of the diversion provisions put in place when the A617 is closed. The traffic routings have been put together without any apparent local knowledge or understanding of the road network.	No	Technical Appendix A5.2: Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.2]** outlines that HGV deliveries will be paused when an 'abnormal incident' has occurred on the network, such as road closures due to flooding. The proposed routes have been put forward based on desk studies and site visits.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Notts Area Ramblers	During construction, a temporary Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) may be needed to close the path for safety reasons. Such closures should be kept to a minimum. Alternatively, it may be possible for access to be controlled by banksmen so the path can be kept open.	No	ES Chapter 18, Recreation **[EN010162/APP/6.2.18]** proposes that no routes are closed because of construction traffic crossing, but that either the route is by default open (with gates preventing public access to the construction site), or a banksman is present to allow usage of the route temporarily, whenever required. The Applicant will have the same rights as the landowners, in that they will be leasing the land, hence do not need specific orders to be able to drive on the PRoW, but will need to manage them for safety as above.
Notts Area Ramblers	We expect: • Arrangements for closing or controlling use of paths to be set out in the Construction Traffic Management Plan. • A temporary diversion if a path has to be closed using a TRO or, if that is not possible,	Yes	ES Chapter 18, Recreation **[EN010162/APP/6.2.18]** sets out the arrangements for PRoWs.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	alternative routes to be identified and advertised. • Protective surfaces to be laid on any paths taking heavy traffic to protect the pre-existing surface. • Reinstatement of any impacted path surfaces to a firm and safe condition within a set time after construction.		
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	As it stands at the moment, it is not known whether the construction HGVs and the AILs will pass in close proximity to any of the above building types. It is possible that such route examination detail may well be included in the CTMP.	No	Figure 14.4: Site Access Locations **[EN010162/APP/6.3.14.4]** and Figure 14.7: Abnormal Load Routes **[EN010162/APP/6.3.14.7]** within ES Chapter 14, Traffic and Transport **[EN010162/APP/6.2.14]** show the proposed routes of HGVs and AILs, respectively.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	Paragraph 31- there is no 20mph speed restriction in the village of Norwell.	No	Noted.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	A14.1.4.4 Bus Travel. This section does not	No	Reference is now made to the Notts bus within ES Chapter 14, Traffic

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	acknowledge the Nottsbus on demand scheme. This scheme, by its very nature, does not have set routes or timetables. This is a relevant point for the CTMP. For some of the CTMP roads, there will be a wish to avoid construction HGVs meeting wide vehicles in opposition. Nottsbus might cause a problem there.		and Transport **[EN010162/APP/6.2.14]** and the Technical Appendix A14.1: Transport Statement **[EN010162/APP/6.4.14.1]**. Passing places are proposed along the routes being used for construction where the road widths do not currently comfortably accept HGV traffic and these are shown on Figure 14.5 **[EN010162/APP/6.3.14.5]** of ES Chapter 14, Transport and Access. This will ease two-way traffic flows. The Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (Technical Appendix A5.2) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.2]** sets out that HGV deliveries will be scheduled to occur outside of sensitive periods and therefore minimise traffic impact.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	Paragraph 76. Typographical error. A47 should read A46.	Yes	Noted.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	Paragraph 79. The A614 is a national speed limit road if one proceeds north from its junction with the A616 near Ollerton. South of this junction, it has a 50mph camera monitored speed limit till just north of Nottingham. This error is repeated in paragraph 115 of Chapter 14.	Yes	Noted.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	Paragraphs 80 and 81. The speed limits are again wrong. Driving south on this road from its junction with the A1, the national speed limit applies until reaching South Muskham where a 30mph limit applies up to its junction with the A616. This stretch of road is a key route for construction traffic. This error is repeated in paragraph 117 of Chapter 14.	Yes	Noted.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	Paragraph 82. 2 key features of this road are that there is 4.1m height restriction and a 7.5 tonne environmental weight restriction.	No	Noted.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	Paragraph 83. For the stretch of Vicarage lane to be used as the construction access for this development, the speed limit is all 30mph, not the national speed limit.	No	Noted.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	Paragraph 83. For the stretch of Vicarage lane to be used as the construction access for this development, there is an environmental weight restriction of 7.5 tonnes. This error is repeated in paragraph 118 of Chapter 14 but corrected in Table 14.12.	Yes	Noted.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	Paragraph 86. Though for the majority of this road, the national speed limit applies, an important section passing	Yes	Noted. The access strategy for this area

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	through Ossington village is governed by a 30mph limit. This omission also applies to paragraph 122 of Chapter 14 but is mentioned in Table 14.12 in that chapter. This stretch of road is a key route for construction traffic. Here, it has the capacity to cause significant adverse impacts. There will be many who feel that a 3058% increase in HGV movements through this village is too high an adverse impact.		near Ossington and Moorhouse has been reconsidered post-PEIR and now includes the use of an internal haul road so HGV traffic does not pass through Ossington / Moorhouse. ES Chapter 14, Traffic and Transport **[EN010162/APP/6.2.14]** considers the severity of impacts resulting from construction traffic.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	With regard to TA A05.2, there is a typographical error in Table A5.2.4 substituting Cromwell with Cramwell.	No	Noted.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	It is appreciated that the CTMP is work in progress. One of the more challenging traffic movement plans will be the Abnormal Indivisible Loads (AIL). TA A05.2 makes an initial assessment	No	Figure 14.7: Abnormal Load Routes **[EN010162/APP/6.3.14.7]** within ES Chapter 14, Traffic and Transport **[EN010162/APP/6.2.14]** show the proposed routes for AIL movements and Appendix E of the Technical Appendix A14.1: Transport

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	on potential route suitability. It is not possible to analyse these routes as, though paragraph 70 of A05.2 states that the routes being considered are shown at Figure A5.2.3, there is no such figure.		Statement **[EN010162/APP/6.4.14.1]** provides AIL route assessment reports by a AIL transportation specialist.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The implication from paragraph 69 of A05.2 is that the heaviest AIL will be 180te net weight. No figure is yet provided for the estimated maximum loaded gross vehicle weight. In the absence of the aforementioned figure, guidance has been sought from the Highways Agency Heavy and High Routes publication.	No	Noted. The maximum gross weight of vehicles will be established when the specialist AIL transportation company have selected the most appropriate vehicle available at the time. This will be agreed with the relevant authorities confirmed and included in the detailed version of the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (Technical Appendix A5.2) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.2]**.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The implication from paragraph 69 of A05.2 is that the heaviest AIL will be 180te net weight. No figure is yet provided for the	No	No

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	estimated maximum loaded gross vehicle weight. In the absence of the aforementioned figure, guidance has been sought from the Highways Agency Heavy and High Routes publication.		
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	Broadgate Lane is shown as a possible diversion route for the closure of Caunton Road (between the A616 and A617). There is a strong argument that this route would be unsuitable for diverted HGVs. This option is in need of review.	No	Closure of Caunton Lane is not now expected. Notwithstanding, any diversion routes associated with road closures would require to be agreed with the Local Highway Authority.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	This is the first time that it has been implied that construction HGVs will pass through Norwell. The village is not shown on the access route mapping. This may just be an error. Paragraph 85 of Chapter 14 states that Norwell is not on a	No	Construction traffic will not pass through Norwell.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	designated route but paragraphs 157 and 176 of that same chapter reinforce the belief that there will be HGV traffic passing through this village.		
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	In the case of one such build, they will be passing within 1m of a Grade 2 listed asset. If HGVs do pass through this village, either by instruction or accident, then there will be a prima facie case that the drivers and the project transport manager will be committing an offence under the Road Traffic 65 Regulations Act 1984.	No	Construction traffic will not pass through Norwell.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	Table 14.12 in Chapter 14 provides a description of the B6325, calling it the Great North Road. It wrongly states that the stretch of this road passing through South Muskham is subject to a	No	Noted - text has been updated in both the ES Chapter 14, Traffic and Transport **[EN010162/APP/6.2.14]** and the Technical Appendix A14.1: Transport Statement **[EN010162/APP/6.4.14.1]**.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	40mph speed restriction whereas it is actually 30mph. The description of the road is also misleading. It states there are some commercial property accesses present. At the Council's last count, there are four such accesses, so strictly speaking this is true.		
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	What the description does not mention, is the entrance to the children's playground on this road. It also fails to mention the 12 residential driveways joining onto this road, with a further 7 additional dwellings having pedestrian exits to this road. This road is more residential than commercial. With its playground exit onto this road and the majority of buildings being residential, it is believed that the B6325 part of South Muskham	No	Solar arrays are no-longer proposed in this area and this road is no-longer identified as a route for construction traffic.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	should be classified as a sensitive receptor.		
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	Tt might make matters clearer, when referring to this road, if subsequent reports call it the B6325. Referring to it as the Great North Road in this area of the County can sometimes be ambiguous. Other transport related reports submitted by the Applicant refer to it as the B6325.	No	Noted.
Topic Area: Other Themes (Consultation and Engagement, DCO Process, Interrelationships, Safety)			
Joint Parish Action Group (JPAG)	The applicant has not had due regard to the volume of supporting material in determining the consultation period for this proposal. Factors such as the time of year and weather can have a detrimental impact on public engagement and the ability of certain groups of society from engaging with	No	Evidence shows that key stakeholders and members of the community engaged well with Phase Two Consultation, which is consistent with the level of response seen during Phase One Consultation. Over 500 people attended our exhibition events, which is similar to the amount of people who attended our non-statutory consultation exhibition

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	the consultation. Consultation in the depth of winter in January and February is less than an ideal time of year to achieve public attendance at consultation events for example.		events. The Applicant also extended their event times, and held two pre-event briefings, to ensure interested parties had ample opportunities to learn more about the proposals, ask questions, and provide feedback. The Applicant held an online webinar to ensure that those who could not attend an in-person exhibition event, were given the opportunity to learn more about the proposals and ask questions. A total of 19 people attended the webinar. The Development and engagement opportunities surrounding Phase Two Consultation have been well-advertised in local media and there is little evidence of people missing out in terms of consultation. Details of the consultation process can be found here **[EN010162/APP/5.1]**.
Joint Parish Action Group (JPAG)	Parish Councils only tend to meet on a monthly basis, they have limited resources and as such their Clerks do	No	The Applicant exceeded the statutory minimum timeframe of 28 days by holding our consultation period over 42 days. Newark and

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	not have large amounts of time available to read, digest and advise their Councils on consultation documents received. The consultation period has only included 30 working days which has been challenging for Parish Councils to commission professional assistance. Whilst it is noted that in sections 42 and 45 of the Planning Act 2008 there is a minimum period of 28 days for this consultation, a statutory minimum doesn't equate to that being adequate. Exceeding the statutory minimum period does not equate to consultation being adequate either.		Sherwood District Council noted that a six-week consultation period was proposed, and such period of time is considered to be reasonable, reflecting a best practice approach as deployed on other similar NSIP projects.
Joint Parish Action Group (JPAG)	Timing of consultation has practical implications, for example many Parish, Village or Community	No	The Applicant contacted all key stakeholders and those who registered to be kept informed of the timescales for the statutory

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	Magazines/Newsletters have lead-in times of several weeks and are typically not published in January because of the Christmas and New Year period. As such the choice of consultation across the months of January and February is unhelpful to allow Parish Councils and Parish Meetings to publicise the proposal locally.		consultation on 18 October 2024. This communication informed key stakeholders that the Applicant was anticipating to launch Phase Two Consultation in early 2025, rather than in the Autumn of 2024 as previously planned. This provided key stakeholders and community members with advanced notice of the proposed timescales for statutory consultation. Following this, the Applicant contacted all key stakeholders and those who registered to be kept informed of the publication of the Statement of Community Consultation on 19 December 2024, outlining the Applicant's commitment to consult between January and February 2025. The Applicant was committed to conducting a transparent and rigorous consultation process and issued the above communications with key stakeholders to ensure they were kept up to date

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			throughout the development process. As part of Phase Two Consultation, the Applicant distributed over 5,900 postcards to properties within the core consultation zone. This resulted in over 500 attendees at our series of events and over 300 pieces of feedback received. This is very similar turnout to the non-statutory consultation, the evidence appears to be that this is indicative of the number of interested parties in the Development. All information regarding the consultation process can be located in the Consultation Report **[EN010162/APP/5.1]**.
Joint Parish Action Group (JPAG)	Early engagement with parish and town councils is specifically advised by the guidance (Reference ID 02-022-20240430) to help applicants to ensure they find the best approach to engage the relevant	No	The Applicant has held several meetings with the parish councils and parish meetings involved in the Development. This included meeting with 17 out of the 18 host parishes, many of which took place between early summer 2024 through to late November 2024.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	communities in the most effective and proportionate way. It is therefore disappointing that the applicant did not seek to engage with the Parish Councils over the timing and duration of the consultation period.		In addition to this, the Applicant held two pre-event briefings for key stakeholders to provide opportunities for them to find out more information about the updated proposals and provide feedback during consultation. These invitations were extended to parish councils and parish meetings involved and interested in the Development.
Joint Parish Action Group (JPAG)	There is no statutory maximum period for pre-application consultation and a substantially longer period should have been used for this project given the scale and nature of the project. The consultation undertaken is not considered to have been adequate.	No	The Applicant held its Phase Two (statutory) Consultation for a period of six weeks. This was consistent with the approach taken during Phase One (non-statutory) Consultation. Prior to commencing Phase One Consultation, the Applicant shared a draft methodology with the Local Planning Authorities of Newark and Sherwood District Council and Nottinghamshire County Council for their review and comment. Experience of the Phase One Consultation has been considered

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			by the Applicant in preparing their approach to statutory consultation. As part of this, the Applicant consulted with Local Planning Authorities on the draft Statement of Community Consultation on the proposed timescale for Phase Two Consultation. Newark and Sherwood District Council noted that a six-week consultation period was proposed, and such period of time is considered to be reasonable, reflecting a best practice approach as deployed on other similar NSIP projects. The consultation was designed not to coincide with public holidays, offering as much possibility for maximum attendance. Again, in terms of duration, the Applicant exceeded the statutory consultation duration by 14 days.
Joint Parish Action Group (JPAG)	Unfortunately, the applicant appears to have failed to go through a programme to update all documents to	No	The Applicant makes note of this comment, and can confirm the latest version of NPPF has be referenced

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	ensure that they correctly referred to the December 2024 version of the NPPF before the consultation. Whilst it is understood that the timing between the latest NPPF being published and consultation commencing was short, the applicant has substantial professional consultancy resource at their disposal and a programme of updating could have been achieved in that timeframe.		in the ES Chapter 6, Planning Policy **[EN010162/APP/6.2.6]**.
Joint Parish Action Group (JPAG)	The PEIR identifies three phases as: Construction Phase (2027 - 2029); Operational Phase (2029 - 2069); and Decommissioning Phase (2069 - 2070). However, in terms of lifetime it describes the operational life of the Development is expected to be 40 years with the 40 years starting when full	No	The operational period of the Development would be mandated to be 40 years, as set out in the Applicants DCO Application. The 40 years would start at the sooner of when full operation is first achieved, or three years from when electricity is first exported from the Development (ES Chapter 5, Development Description **[EN010162/APP/6.2.5]**). This allows

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	operation (maximum electrical export) is first achieved. The PEIR says this would be limited to a maximum of three years (36 months) from when electricity is first exported from the Development. This allows for phasing of commissioning, whilst also limiting the duration of the phasing. This appears to be inconsistent as if connection wouldn't be until 2029, then if maximum electrical export takes 3 years until 2032; then the stated 40 years post maximum electrical export would mean the operational phase could go through to 2072.		for phasing of commissioning, whilst limiting the duration of the phasing.
Joint Parish Action Group (JPAG)	There is a fundamental inconsistency in the amount of land area to be covered by solar PV. In the description of development	No	The Development will have a delta between actual land that sits underneath panels and \PV panel work areas. The land utilised for the PV areas is larger due to spacing

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	in the Design Approach Document which is one of the PEIR Technical Appendices, it says 1,500ha of the 2,900ha of land will be used for solar PV. However, in the PEIR document itself, in the context of illustrative design15 it says there will be 545ha of solar PV modules, and the PEIR sets a design limitation of up to 700ha of solar PV modules. This is a fundamental difference between these two documents, with the Design Approach Document suggesting an area of solar PV almost three times as large as the PEIR says it has based the actual assessment of impacts on. This suggests that the PEIR has substantially under		between the panels allowing for grass cutting and associated maintenance as detailed in ES Chapter 5, Development Description **[EN010162/APP/6.2.5].** The total area of the Order Limits has now been reduced to 1765 ha.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	considered the environmental effects.		
Joint Parish Action Group (JPAG)	The PEIR refers to two Angling Clubs (Stillwater, Cromwell and Nottingham Piscatorial at Muskham Lakes) within the Recreation Study Area which are to be considered in this assessment. However, there is a further recreational fishery namely Cromwell Lake Fishery which also needs to be considered. Each are popular and recognised clubs providing high recreational amenity to the surrounding area.	No	The Applicant notes Cromwell Lake Fisheries club falls outside of the recreational study area (250 m buffer of the Order Limits) and was not assessed due to being 450 m away from the Order Limits of the Development as detailed in ES Chapter 18, Recreation **[EN010162/APP/6.2.18]**.
Joint Parish Action Group (JPAG)	In this case the GNR proposal has given rise to stress in the local community arising from concern over the massive industrial scale of the proposal; the inclusion of BESS aspects; the lack of	Yes	The Applicant acknowledges the UK has set ambitious and legally binding targets to eliminate carbon emissions and achieve net zero carbon emissions by 2050. Large scale solar is recognised as having an important role in helping achieve this target. The British Energy

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	information and incorrect information contained in the consultation documents; the incidents that have taken place involving BESS; the suggested impact of vibration and noise; likely damage resulting from HGVs; inevitable pedestrian and vehicular conflict including in areas where past conflict has resulted in fatalities; the circular enveloping nature of the Order Limits; and the likelihood of increased surface water run-off from slopes in excess of 6% into river catchments that have a recent severe impact of flooding homes and businesses.		Security Strategy, published April 2022, specifically aims to increase the UK's solar capacity fivefold by 2035. The ES Chapter 12, Noise and Vibration **[EN010162/APP/6.2.12]** states the effects of noise and vibration during construction / decommissioning phases are predicted to be negligible to minor adverse. Additionally, Chapter 12 proposes adequate noise screening. ES Chapter 2, Environmental Impact Assessment **[EN010162/APP/6.2.14]** details the routing principles to maximise safety, efficiency, and economic benefits of the Development. An example of the economic benefit is efficient transport routes minimising road damage and the need for repairs. Further, the Applicant will detail risk and mitigation in terms of pedestrian and vehicular conflict within the Construction Traffic

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			Management Plan (CTMP) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.2]**. The Applicants Fire Safety Management Plan (FSMP) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.4]** details BESS safety and mitigation measures in the event of a fire. ES Chapter 9, Water Recourses **[EN010162/APP/6.2.9]** state there are no significant hydrological effects from the Development. Additionally, the FRA **[EN010162/APP/6.4.9.1]** notes that where areas of Work Area 1: Solar PV intersect with slopes of greater than 6%, measures such as filter drains and berms will be implemented to reduce runoff rates.
Joint Parish Action Group (JPAG)	Clarity about the Staythorpe BESS that has now been incorporated into the Order Limits is required. It is accepted that has been granted planning permission	No	Staythorpe BESS is expected to be constructed prior to the Development being consented. The Development would connect into the substation adjacent to Staythorpe BESS and the extent of the order

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	on appeal, but is not shown as part of the GNR project yet it is included in the Order Limits boundary and as Elements Green now own the company that obtained the planning permission it will inevitably form part of the overall GNR project.		limits in this area are refined to clarify this in the application submission. As shown in Figure 5.2 **[EN010162/APP/6.3.5.2]** Staythorpe BESS is located within the order limits due to associated infrastructure relating to the connection of the Development.
Joint Parish Action Group (JPAG)	There is no requirement for a solar farm to be a specific size in terms of output or area. The choice of output being 800MW is an arbitrary figure chosen by the applicant, presumably for economic reasons.	No	The Applicant notes multiple economic reasons that the Development is 800MW in size. Firstly, to reduce wholesale power bills by achieving economies of scale by building large solar farms. In terms of the economics of the grid connection itself, utilising the full export capacity of a grid connection bay means the same infrastructure needs to be built to achieve a higher number of MW, reducing cost per MW overall and once more cost to bill payers. This has the added benefit of fewer electrical substations need to be

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			built to accommodate developments.
Joint Parish Action Group (JPAG)	The cumulative assessment in the PEIR Technical Appendix is not complete and the PEIR has not fully considered cumulative impacts across all headings. Fundamentally it doesn't consider existing energy infrastructure or energy generation such as Staythorpe Power Station, Staythorpe Substation or the Overhead Lines. The GNR is inextricably directly linked to the existing and planned energy network and energy generation infrastructure.	Yes	The Applicant acknowledges the cumulative effects were not stated in the Preliminary Environmental Information Report, as disclosed in said document. The ES Chapter 7, Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment **[EN010162/APP/6.2.7]** fully considers the cumulative effects of all relevant assets agreed with the local authority within the defined radius of the Development.
Joint Parish Action Group (JPAG)	The cumulative assessment scopes out NSIP proposals a bit further away such as Fosse Green and scopes out DCO proposals at early stage such as Steeples Renewables. This is	No	The parameters of the cumulative effects assessment detailed in ES Chapter 7, Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment **[EN010162/APP/6.2.7]** were agreed upon with Newark and Sherwood District Council. The methods used

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	considered to be inappropriate due to the need to consider the impact of concentration and clustering as the WMS requires.		to select cumulative sites accords with PINS guidance and uses a "zone of influence" for each topic. Where a cumulative development is outside the zone of influence, there is no potential for cumulative effects - there is therefore no likely significant impact of concentration and clustering.
Joint Parish Action Group (JPAG)	The list of places in the Technical Appendix only uses application numbers with no location address or settlement listed making the list unhelpful to use. In addition, the map that shows the location of the other assessed projects for cumulative assessment should show a lot more schemes, this is important to allow the inter-relationship to be understood. In a number of cases the boundaries of these other schemes abut the Order Limits.	No	The parameters of the cumulative effects assessment as detailed in ES Chapter 7, Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment **[EN010162/APP/6.2.7]** were agreed upon with Newark and Sherwood District Council. The methods used to select cumulative sites accords with PINS guidance and uses a "zone of influence" for each topic. Figure 2.1A **[EN010162/APP/6.3.2.1]** and 2.1B **[EN010162/APP/6.3.2.2]** show the developments that have been identified to be taken forward to stage 3 and 4 of the cumulative assessment process

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			[EN010162/APP/6.2.7]. The table in Technical Appendix A2.1: Cumulative Assessment Stages 1 and 2 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.2.1]** sets out the reasoning for the selection or otherwise of individual schemes.
Joint Parish Action Group (JPAG)	Although the JPAG understands that the PEIR by its nature is provisional and accordingly some investigations or assessments are still to completed, it is disappointing that fundamental work streams are incomplete and the documents contain numerous basic errors, inconsistencies and anomalies.	Yes	The Environmental Statement aims to provide further information set out in Schedule 4 of the EIA Regulations, ES Chapter 1, Introduction **[EN010162/APP/6.2.1]**. The Environmental Statement has been produced to document the outcome of the EIA process, as required by the EIA Regulations.
Joint Parish Action Group (JPAG)	However, because the DCO examination process doesn't allow much flexibility to accommodate changes/modifications to the scheme, now is the	No	Noted.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	appropriate time to be able to make an evidenced based argument in respect of changes to the scheme.		
Joint Parish Action Group (JPAG)	In the absence of complete and final assessments, JPAG has not been able to comment on all matters and as such JPAG may need to raise different or additional matters in the form of a relevant representation following acceptance. It is anticipated that JPAG will continue to operate as an alliance and will participate in the examination process to advance the position of itself and the constituent Parish Councils and Parish Meetings.	No	The Applicant welcomes ongoing engagement with the JPAG and discussions around common ground.
Notts Area Ramblers	If cameras are installed to protect the site, these must be inward-facing to prevent the surveillance of walkers.	Yes	The Applicant makes note of this comment and commits to inward-facing surveillance technology, as outlined in ES Chapter 5, Development Description

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			[EN010162/APP/6.2.5] of the Environmental Statement.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	Given the size of the development proposal, it is not perhaps surprising that the quantity of material supplied by the Applicant is voluminous. Set against that fact is that only 30 working days have been allowed for responses. Whereas it is understood that there is a minimum period of 28 days for this consultation (section 45 Planning Act 2008), the Council are unaware of a statutory maximum period for Stage 2. The Council is aware that the national guidance suggests a maximum of 8 weeks, noting the need for flexibility, depending on the scale and nature of the project. The Council note that prior to Phase One Consultation,	No	The Applicant held its Phase Two (statutory) Consultation for a period of six weeks. This was consistent with the approach taken during Phase One (non-statutory) Consultation. Prior to commencing Phase One Consultation, the Applicant shared a draft methodology with the Local Planning Authorities of Newark and Sherwood District Council and Nottinghamshire County Council for their review and comment. Experience of the Phase One Consultation has been considered by the Applicant in preparing their approach to statutory consultation. As part of this, the Applicant consulted with Local Planning Authorities on the draft Statement of Community Consultation on the proposed timescale for Phase Two Consultation. Newark and Sherwood District Council noted

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	some form of methodology was agreed with the Local Planning Authority and County Council. It is not known whether this covered the timing for, or length of the Stage Two Consultation. Equally, it is not known whether The Planning Inspectorate (PINs) have signed off on 6 weeks. Whatever the case, it is the Council's view, (given that if approved in its current form it will be the country's largest solar generating station) that the full 8 weeks should have been allocated for Stage 2.		that a six-week consultation period was proposed, and such period of time is considered to be reasonable, reflecting a best practice approach as deployed on other similar NSIP projects. The consultation was designed not to coincide with public holidays, offering as much possibility for maximum attendance as we could. Again, in terms of duration, the Applicant exceeded the statutory consultation duration by 14 days.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The website echo's this sentiment by stating "Approximately 800 acres will be dedicated for wildlife enhancement, including the planting of 50,000 trees." The message is clear throughout published	No	Noted. The proposals now include 64,500 trees to be planted.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	material and the PEIR that 50,000 trees are an enhancement.		
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The Applicant helpfully paraphrases paragraph 5.11.12 of the Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1) (2023).	No	Noted.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The Port Talbot works have not closed completely and it is understood that it will continue to mill steel slabs imported from overseas. It is hoped that the ES can enlighten further on steel sourcing so as to provide firmer assessments on the scale of imports from China and the implications for employment in the United Kingdom.	Yes	The Applicant expects the steel used for mounting solar PV structures to be manufactured in the UK in electrical 'arc' furnaces as detailed in ES Chapter 5, Development Description **[EN010162/APP/6.2.5]**. An alternative that the Applicant may consider is importing ready-made mounting structures from abroad. A worst-case basis for assessment purposes has been used in each of the technical assessments set out in the ES Chapters 7-19 **[EN010162/APP/6.2.7-19]**, as appropriate.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The Council would wish there to be clarification in the	Yes	Figure 5.7 **[EN010162/APP/6.3.4.7]** further details a typical CCTV pole

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	ES about the specifications for the CCTV and lighting poles. Clearly if these are to be steel or aluminium, there needs to be additional entries in the Production and Materials Transport Emissions tables. If they are to be wooden, there is a greenhouse gas cost to pole production and transporting them to site.		proposed for the Development. The predicted impact of the Development cross production, construction, operation, and decommissioning can be fully viewed within Technical Appendix A15.1: Lifecycle Greenhouse Gas Evaluation **[EN010162/APP/6.4.15.1]**.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	There is a similar argument when addressing the issue of deer fencing. This is mentioned in the production emissions. The Applicant sets the fence total length to be 150km. It cites one supplier as an example - Ultimate One Online. Using their product as an example, the Applicant will need at least 1500 of their 100m wire roles. The weight of that steel according to that	Yes	The Applicant acknowledges this comment. The predicted impact of the Development cross production, construction, operation, and decommissioning can be fully viewed within Technical Appendix A15.1: Lifecycle Greenhouse Gas Evaluation **[EN010162/APP/6.4.15.1]**.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	company would be 163.5 tonnes.		
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	Paragraph 60 of Chapter 5 confirms that galvanised steel poles will be used to support the panel frames. However, paragraph 213 of Chapter 9 states the "poles will be made from high-grade aluminium and stainless steel", the latter of which has a higher embodied carbon factor than galvanised. For the purposes of this analysis, galvanised steel will be presumed. On page 3 of Appendix A15.1, the Applicant estimates that 44,800 tonnes of steel will be required for this purpose.	No	The Applicant expects the steel used for mounting solar PV structures to be manufactured in the UK. The Applicant notes this would support UK manufacturing and have a lower carbon footprint of manufacturing and transportation. An alternative that the Applicant may consider is importing ready-made mounting structures from abroad. A worst-case basis for assessment purposes has been used in each of the technical assessments set out in the ES Chapters 7-19 **[EN010162/APP/6.2.7-19],** as appropriate.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	As for the substation construction, it is not known what grade steel is intended. The assumption is made that it will need to be coated.	No	The Applicant used a worst-base basis for assessment purposes in each of the technical assessments set out in the ES Chapter 7-19

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	Taking the worst case scenario, the same grade as above will be adopted. This means that the 2800 tonnes of substation construction steel would cause 8064 tonnes of CO2. This brings the running total down to 839,321 tonnes of CO2 avoided. The same miscalculation has been made with the BESS storage containers. It assumes each container will be capable of storing 4MWh and therefore 220 of them will be required.		**[EN010162/APP/6.2.7-19]**, as appropriate.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	It will be assumed that the southern Chinese port of Shenzhen is the main destination on the mainland and that the overwhelming majority of the journey from the chosen sample town of Turpan (part of the Chinese rail freight northern network, close to Xinjiang) will be by	No	The Applicant used a worst-base basis for assessment purposes in each of the technical assessments set out in the ES Chapter 7-19 **[EN010162/APP/6.2.7-19]**, as appropriate.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	rail. An HGV delivery mileage of the panel containers to the rail freight depot from Xinjiang is estimated as 300km. Using Chinese rail infrastructure mapping, the rail distance is estimated at 3,700km. Transporting 64,442 tonnes (110% of 58584 tonnes) of panels on this journey would cause 4638 tCO2e for HGV emissions and 6,626 tonnes for rail freight (using the GHG 2024 Conversion factors). This totals 11,264 tonnes of CO2. This is a conservative figure as the HGV distances are likely to be much higher.		
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	This appears to be the first mention of waterproof ducting as a construction material. It does not appear in the emissions tables. There is no mention of how	Yes	The embodied carbon associated with the plastic included in the cables is considered in the ES Chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15]**.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	many kilometres of it are needed or its relationship with the thermal sand. It is assumed that it will be some form of plastic which will have a significant embodied carbon factor. But without more information , it is impossible to factor in this material. Clearly more information is required.		
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The Applicant has clearly noted comments from consultees on the assessment on pollution for the operational phase.	Yes	Noted.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The focus of the assessment is on the damage to the fronts of panels from sharp projectiles. It concludes that there would be negligible impact on water bodies and therefore a negligible significance of effect. It is surprising to learn from Appendix A15.1 that the	No	The performance of the Development components will be monitored continually through the operational phase. For the purposes of the assessment undertaken, the solar PV modules have been assumed to be replaced on average 0.1 times over the 40 years as detailed in ES Chapter 5,

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	Applicant expects 90% of the panels to last the full 40 years. The Council would wish there to be an evidence based affirmation of this assumption.		Development Description **[EN010162/APP/6.2.5]**.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The Applicant has divided the order limit area into 36 defined groups of individual fields. These groups do not visibly distinguish between panel and cabling fields. Elsewhere in the PEIR, since the Stage 1 consultation, the Applicant has now helpfully numbered each individual field.	No	Fields are numbered and cable fields have been reduced significantly along with the size of the Order Limits. It is simple to distinguish between cable and PV fields.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	Applicant's staff have stated verbally that many will be 8 - 10 metres wide, with presumably narrower trenches within the arrays.	No	Noted.
Norwell Solar Farm Steering Group	The PEIR states that they could be up to 30m. That may be necessary in some places. Certainly where the	No	The ES Chapter 5, Development Description **[EN010162/APP/6.2.5]** states the width of the cable trench will vary, depending on the number

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	intended cables are medium voltage destined for the next substation these will be significant projects. It is not known how wide the trench running alongside the Beck in the Figure 18 will be. For the sake of discussion, a width of 10m will be assumed. Depth will be conservatively assumed at 1m below ground level. This is informed by paragraph 68 of Chapter 5 which assumes cabling burial depth of 0.6m to 1.5m. The 3 phase cables will need to rest on top of, and be covered by thermal sand which is required to dissipate heat away. Then the trench will be back filled. The stretch of trenching required alongside the Beck here is approximately 254m		and voltage of cables at a given location and on their arrangement within the trench. The width of the working area and trench is expected to be a maximum of 30 m (up to a 12 m trench, plus 9 m working corridor on either side). The PV fields alongside the Beck near Norwell have been removed following further environmental study.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	long. This equates to something in the region of 2,000m3 of soil to be excavated near to the Beck, using heavy plant machinery. The approximate weight of that clay rich soil would be 3,200 tonnes. Added to that groundwork is further excavation.		

3 SECTION 47 TARGETED CONSULTATION APPLICANT RESPONSE TABLE

Table 3: Section 47 Targeted Consultation Applicant Response Table

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR3_L_005, GNR3L_006, GNR3_L_007, GNR3_E_015, GNR3_E_016, GNR3_OFF_017	Respondents express general concern for the use of Area 1. Includes traffic disruption, noise. One respondent specified concern for Scarthingmoor Rise and Gypsy Lodge Farm.	No	ES Chapter 14, Traffic and Transport **[EN010162/APP/6.2.14]** provides details of the existing and proposed forecast traffic flows in this area and assess the impact. Moorhouse Road and Weston Road are classified as being of 'High' sensitivity and 'Medium' sensitivity ratings respectively and the impact from traffic assessed accordingly.
GNR3_L_005, GNR3L_006, GNR3_L_007, GNR3_E_015, GNR3_E_016, GNR3_OFF_017	Respondents expressed concern for the visibility junction of Moorhouse Road and Weston Road. Respondents further suggested additional signage.	No	ES Chapter 14, Traffic and Transport **[EN010162/APP/6.2.14]** and Technical Appendix A14.1: Transport Statement **[EN010162/APP/6.4.14.1]** consider road safety, including this location. Signage and traffic management will need to be agreed with the local highway authority within the detailed version of the outline Construction Traffic Management Plan in Technical Appendix A5.2: Outline Construction Management Plan **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.2]**.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR3_E_002, GNR3_L_005, GNR3_L_006	Respondents state travellers have recently occupied an area affecting area 1 of the proposals.	No	Noted.
GNR3_L_006, GNR3_L_007	Respondent expressed concern for the disruption of construction of passing lanes.	No	Increase in traffic levels during construction is an unfortunate consequence of Developments and measures are included in Technical Appendix A5.2: Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.2]** to reduce this impact.
GNR3_L_006, GNR3_L_007	Respondent expressed concern for area 1 impacting flooding at Partridge Farm Moorhouse Road. Respondent expressed concern for the flooding of Moorhouse Road increasing safety hazards.	No	As outlined in the FRA **[EN010162/APP/6.4.9.1]**, research outlines that solar panels do not have a significant effect on runoff volumes or peak flows, however where ground beneath panels is bare there may be an increase in peak discharge. Grassland under the PV arrays will act to bind the soil and slow the flow of water from the PV arrays. The existing flooding issues on Moorhouse Road will not be exacerbated

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			by the Development and alternative transport routes are available to access the Site in the event of Moorhouse Road being flooded.
GNR3_L_006, GNR3_L_007, GNR3_E_015, GNR3_E_016, GNR3_OFF_017	Respondent expressed concern for vehicles travelling over the speed limit creating a safety hazard. Respondents expressed concern for the safety of pedestrians, cyclists, and horse riders within area 1.	No	All construction traffic will be expected to drive at speeds appropriate to the road and conditions. Technical Appendix A5.2: Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.2]** sets out that where interaction with non-motorised users is more likely, construction traffic will be required to drive at reduced speeds
GNR3_E_015, GNR3_E_016, GNR3_OFF_017	Respondents expressed concern for noise pollution in general within area 1.	No	Potential noise effects, including those on area 1, are assessed in ES Chapter 12, Noise and Vibration **[EN010162/APP/6.2.12]**. Technical Appendix A5.3: Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.3]** provides details of mitigation which can be implemented minimise noise and vibration during construction activities.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR3_E_015, GNR3_E_016, GNR3_OFF_017	Respondents expressed concern for air pollution due to the use of area 1.	No	ES Chapter 16, Miscellaneous Issues **[EN010162/APP/6.2.16]**, addresses the potential for significant air quality effects by considering the baseline environment and setting out the potential impacts that could occur during the construction, operation, and decommissioning phases of the Development. Section 16.2: Air Quality is supported by ES Chapter 14, Traffic and Transport **[EN010162/APP/6.2.14]**. Background air quality in the vicinity of the Order Limits is good, with low levels of air pollution. Based on the activities comprising the Development, it is anticipated that there would be limited, and not significant, effects on air quality during the construction, operation, and decommissioning phases. However, pollution effects are not threshold-based, and hence mitigation to further reduce impacts is set out in the outline CEMP (Technical Appendix A5.3: Outline Construction Environmental Management

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			Plan **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.3]**), outline CTMP (Technical Appendix A5.2: Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.2]**) and outline DRP (Technical Appendix A5.6: Outline Decommissioning and Restoration Plan **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.6]**).
GNR3_L_006, GNR3_L_007	Respondent expressed concern for the vibration from construction traffic on nearby properties.	No	The impact of vibration from construction traffic is considered in ES Chapter 13, Noise and Vibration **[EN010162/APP/6.2.12]**. As discussed, the delivery route will be maintained and improved before, during and after the construction period, ensuring vibration from traffic will be minimised as far as practicable.
GNR3_E_015, GNR3_E_016, GNR3_OFF_017	Respondents expressed concern for a Traffic Assessment Study not being carried out for area 1.	No	ES Chapter 14, Traffic and Transport [**EN010162/APP/6.2.14**] provides details of the existing and proposed forecast traffic flows in this area and assess the impact. Moorhouse Road and Weston Road are classified as being of 'High' sensitivity and 'Medium' sensitivity ratings respectively and the impact from traffic assessed accordingly.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR3_L_005	Respondent expressed concern for limited passing areas.	No	The approach to passing places seeks to balance the need for an appropriate provision to facilitate two-way movements, whilst not overly providing places and causing more disruption and impact. Passing places are proposed along the routes have considered this alongside the inter-visibility between places and forecast traffic levels. Technical Appendix A5.2: Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.2]** sets out measures to reduce and control this impact, including the scheduling of deliveries and avoiding peak road network periods.
GNR3_L_005	Respondent expressed concern for the suitability of Scarthingmoor Rise for HGVs.	No	Passing places are included on the approach to this location. These are shown on Figure 14.5: Passing Place Locations **[EN010162/APP/6.3.14.5**]
GNR3_L_007	Respondent expressed concern for the safety of the junction of Weston Road and Great North Road. Respondent expressed	No	ES Chapter 14, Traffic and Transport **[EN010162/APP/6.2.14]** and Technical Appendix A14.1: Transport Statement **[EN010162/APP/6.4.14.1]** consider road safety, including these locations.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	concern for the safety of the bend on Weston Road.		
GNR3_OFF_001, GNR3_E_006, GNR3_E_008, GNR3_OFF_007, GNR3_OFF_011, GNR3_OFF_009, GNR3_E_010, GNR3_E_011, GNR3_L_005	Respondents expressed general concern for area 2.	No	Noted.
GNR3_OFF_004, GNR3_E_008, GNR3_OFF_007, GNR3_OFF_011, GNR3_OFF_009, GNR3_E_010, GNR3_L_005, GNR3_E_006, GNR3_E_007	Several respondents expressed concerns regarding the safety and visibility at the junction of Ossington Lane and the B1164, particularly in relation to the brow of the railway bridge which may obstruct drivers' vision when turning right. Concerns were also raised about the overall volume and speed of traffic on the B1164, including the hazardous nature of the turn-off from the Great North Road near Sutton on Trent. Some residents noted they actively avoid the B1164	No	ES Chapter 14, Traffic and Transport **[EN010162/APP/6.2.14]** and Technical Appendix A14.1: Transport Statement **[EN010162/APP/6.4.14.1]** consider road safety, including this location. Additional signage and traffic management will need to be agreed with the local highway authority within the detailed version of the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (Technical Appendix A5.2: Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.2]**.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	junction due to safety concerns and suggested potential mitigation measures such as clearer signage, traffic control, lower speed limits, traffic lights, and speed humps.		
GNR3_E_001, GNR3_E_006, GNR3_E_007, GNR3_E_008, GNR3_OFF_007, GNR3_L_001, GNR3_OFF_009, GNR3_E_010, GNR3_L_005	Respondents express concern for area 2 increasing traffic and HGV movement. Some respondents specified safety concerns.	No	ES Chapter 14, Traffic and Transport **[EN010162/APP/6.2.14]** and Technical Appendix A14.1: Transport Statement **[EN010162/APP/6.4.14.1]** consider road safety, including this location. These documents also set out the worst-case traffic forecast during the construction phase and assess the impact accordingly. Passing places are proposed to alleviate disruption and better facilitate two-way flows. Technical Appendix A5.2: Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.2]** sets out measures to reduce and control this impact, including the scheduling of deliveries and avoiding peak road network periods.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR3_OFF_004, GNR3_E_006, GNR3_E_007, GNR3_E_008, GNR3_OFF_011, GNR3_E_011	Respondent expresses concern for vehicles travelling over the speed limit.	No	All construction traffic will be expected to drive at speeds appropriate to the road and conditions and comply with UK laws.
GNR3_OFF_002, GNR3_L_005	Respondents expressed general support for the use of area 2.	No	Noted.
GNR3_OFF_002, GNR3_E_007	Respondents expressed support for the widening of roads for area 2.	No	Noted.
GNR3_OFF_009, GNR3_E_011	Respondent expressed concern for recreational amenities being impacted by area 2. Includes dog walking, cycling, walking.	No	The Applicant has carried out a PRoW user survey to better understand the assessed qualitative impact of the development on users. This is included within the Socio-economic chapter.
GNR3_L_001	Respondent asks if the road will be closed during works to widen the road.	No	Temporary road closures would be a last resort, with other traffic management measures such as 'Stop-Go' boards and temporary traffic signals preferred.
GNR3_L_001, GNR3_L_005	Respondent expressed concern about the cleaning of HGV and construction road debris. Including mud, dust. Respondent expressed	No	Technical Appendix A5.2 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.2]** sets out measures that include a requirement for wheel-washing prior to entering the road

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	concern for additional mud and debris causing safety hazard for road users.		network and the deployment of road sweepers, if required.
GNR3_E_007	Respondent expressed concern for access in general from Ossington Lane to Great North Road.	No	ES Chapter 14, Traffic and Transport **[EN010162/APP/6.2.14]** and Technical Appendix A14.1: Transport Statement **[EN010162/APP/6.4.14.1]** consider road safety, including this location.
GNR3_E_001	Respondents express concern for damage caused by an increase of traffic at area 2.	No	Technical Appendix A5.2: Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.2]** confirms that prior to construction works commencing, roads to be used for construction will be subject to a condition survey and any remedial measures needed to facilitate the works agreed with the local highway authority and completed. Further interim surveys and post-completion condition surveys will also be conducted and any agreed corrective measures undertaken.
GNR3_E_001	Respondents express concern for increased noise levels near area 2 access route.	No	Potential noise effects, including those on area 2, are assessed in ES Chapter 12, Noise and Vibration **[EN010162/APP/6.2.12]**. Technical Appendix A5.3: Outline Construction

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			Environmental Management Plan **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.3]** provides details of mitigation which can be implemented minimise noise and vibration during construction activities.
GNR3_E_007, GNR3_OFF_011	Respondent expressed concern for vehicle restriction when turning left from Ossington lane onto Great North Road and vice versa. Respondent mentioned residents avoid the route to and from Ossington due to poor visibility and reroute via Carlton on Trent crossing.	No	Alternative access arrangements to the northern area of the Development have been considered and the access strategy presented is considered the most appropriate.
GNR3_OFF_004	Respondent expresses concern for Ossington Lane being overgrown by hedges.	No	Noted.
GNR3_OFF_011	Respondent expressed concern no safety assessment of the junction has been undertaken.	No	ES Chapter 14, Traffic and Transport **[EN010162/APP/6.2.14]** and Technical Appendix A14.1: Transport Statement **[EN010162/APP/6.4.14.1]** consider road safety, including this location.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR3_OFF_004	Respondent suggests a one-way system with traffic only heading west on Ossington lane.	No	Alternative access arrangements to the northern area of the Development have been considered and the access strategy presented is considered the most appropriate.
GNR3_E_007	Respondent expressed concern about the use and safety of temporary traffic lights.	No	The placement and use of temporary traffic signals will be required to comply with the 'Traffic Signs Manual' the guidance document published by the UK Department for Transport.
GNR3_E_006	Respondent expressed safety concerns for crossing the road (not specified) to access the footpath.	No	ES Chapter 14, Traffic and Transport **[EN010162/APP/6.2.14]** assesses transport, traffic, and commuting impacts in detail.
GNR3_E_007	Respondents ask what materials will be used to widen Ossington Lane.	No	Appendix E of the Transport Statement **[EN010162/APP/6.4.14.1]** provides a detail of the proposed material for passing places. It is currently proposed that these will be of a typical asphalt road construction, but final material selection will be agreed with the local highway authority.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR3_OFF_009	Respondent expressed concern for the use of area 2 impacting the school bus route to Tuxford Academy.	No	Technical Appendix A5.2: Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.2]** includes measures to reduce delay to other users, including deliveries being scheduled and not occurring during road peak periods or during school drop off/pick up times. Passing places will also facilitate continued two-way movements.
GNR3_E_010	Respondent expressed concern for the use of Hemplands Lane. Including safety and traffic increase.	No	The use of Hemplands Lane in Sutton on Trent is not included as construction route.
GNR3_L_004	Respondent express concern for the period of diversion of Bridleway 14 being unclear. Respondent express concern for Bridleway 14 being closed during the operational period with the diversion being too long.	No	ES Chapter 14, Traffic and Transport of the **[EN010162/APP/6.2.14]** assesses transport, traffic, and commuting impacts in detail.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR3_L_004	Respondent requests a site meeting to determine the diversion route of BW 14's suitability.	No	The Applicant notes this request for a site meeting to assess the suitability of the proposed diversion of Sutton-on-Trent Bridleway 14 (BW14). Whilst it was not possible to arrange a site visit prior to the submission of the Development Consent Order applicant, the Applicant welcomes continued engagement on this matter and would be happy to discuss the diversion route in more detail post-submission, including the opportunity for a site meeting where appropriate.
GNR3_L_004	Respondent requests mitigation measures on the diversion permissive path route of BW 14.	No	ES Chapter 14, Traffic and Transport **[EN010162/APP/6.2.14]** assesses transport, traffic, and commuting impacts in detail.
GNR3_L_004	Respondent expressed concern for the recreational use of Bridleway 20 in relation to being near a road considered for construction traffic.	No	ES Chapter 18, Recreation **[EN01062/APP/6.2.18]** considers the impact on PROW. Technical Appendix A5.2: Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.2]** sets out that where interaction with non-motorised users is more likely, construction traffic

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			will be required to drive at reduced speeds.
GNR3_L_005	Respondent expressed concern for flooding on Ossington Lane causing negative impacts for HGVs and public traffic.	No	Technical Appendix A5.2: Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.2]** outlines that HGV deliveries will be paused when an 'abnormal incident' has occurred on the network, such as road closures due to accidents or flooding. The CTMP also notes prior to construction works commencing, roads to be used for construction will be subject to a condition survey and any remedial measures needed to facilitate the works agreed with the local highway authority and completed. Further interim surveys and post-completion condition surveys will also be conducted and any agreed corrective measures undertaken.
GNR3_L_005	Respondent expressed safety concern for the right angle bend near Crow Park Farm.	Yes	Concern is noted and the Technical Appendix A5.2: Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.2]** sets out that construction traffic will be required to drive at reduced speeds on this approach.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR3_L_005	Respondent expressed the PRoW B14 diversion is inconsistent in the leaflet and website.	No	The Applicant notes this comment and confirms that the information provided on the Development website during the Targeted Consultation was consistent with the information contained in the Targeted Consultation Information Leaflet. The materials produced as part of the Targeted Consultation are available in Appendix 5.1.9: Targeted Consultation **[EN010162/APP/5.1.9]** to the Consultation Report **[EN010162/APP/5.1].**
GNR3_L_005	Respondent expressed concern for the infringement on PRoW's impacting recreational users.	No	The Applicant has carried out a PRoW user survey to better understand the assessed qualitative impact of the development on users. This is included within the ES Chapter 13, Socio-Economics and Tourism **[EN010162/APP/6.2.13].**
GNR3_OFF_005, GNR3_OFF_006, GNR3_L_002, GNR3_E_013, GNR3_OFF_014, GNR3_L_003, GNR3_E_013, GNR3_E_014, GNR3_E_015,	Respondent expressed concern for an increase of traffic in general.	No	The Applicant notes this comment and confirms that the matter has been considered as part of Technical Appendix A14.1: Transport Statement **[EN010162/APP/6.4.14.1]**, which has

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR3_E_016, GNR3_OFF_017, GNR3_OFF_015			been submitted as part of the Environmental Statement.
GNR3_E_013, GNR3_OFF_014, GNR3_E_014, GNR3_E_015, GNR3_E_016, GNR3_E_011, GNR3_OFF_017, GNR3_OFF_015	Respondent expressed objections to the three access changes in general. One respondent specified safety concerns.	No	The Applicant notes this comment and confirms that the matter has been considered as part of Technical Appendix A14.1: Transport Statement **[EN010162/APP/6.4.14.1]**, which has been submitted as part of the Environmental Statement.
GNR3_E_013, GNR3_OFF_014, GNR3_E_014, GNR3_E_015, GNR3_E_016, GNR3_OFF_017, GNR3_OFF_015	Respondent expressed concern the changes will have on local residents.	No	ES Chapter 14, Traffic and Transport **[EN010162/APP/6.2.14]** considers the changes in traffic levels and assesses the impact.
GNR3_E_013, GNR3_OFF_014, GNR3_E_014, GNR3_E_015, GNR3_E_016, GNR3_OFF_017, GNR3_OFF_015	Respondent expressed concern the changes will have on the environment.	No	The changes on the environment are fully addressed in the Environmental Statement which includes consideration of a wide range of Environmental topics.
GNR3_E_013, GNR3_OFF_014, GNR3_E_014, GNR3_E_015, GNR3_E_016, GNR3_OFF_017, GNR3_OFF_015	Respondent expressed the targeted consultation was inadequate. Includes materials and information provided. Respondent expressed concern for lack of EIA	No	The Applicant notes this comment and confirms that a guidance note outlining the approach to the Targeted Consultation was provided to the relevant local planning authorities – Newark and Sherwood District Council, Nottinghamshire County Council, and Bassetlaw District Council – for oversight.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	information during targeted consultation.		This note is included in Appendix 5.1.9 **[EN010162/APP/5.1.9]** of the Consultation Report. The Applicant considers that a rigorous and proportionate consultation process was undertaken in accordance with relevant statutory guidance and the principles set out in the Statement of Community Consultation. All materials used in the Targeted Consultation were made publicly available and accessible, and communication channels remained open throughout the process to enable stakeholders to request further information, meetings, or clarification where required.
GNR3_E_013, GNR3_OFF_014, GNR3_L_006, GNR3_L_007, GNR3_E_014, GNR3_OFF_015	Respondent expressed concern for PEIR chapter 14 (transport and access) not being amended based on the three access changes.	No	The Applicant notes this comment and confirms that the changes to access arrangements have been considered and assessed within Technical Appendix A14.1: Transport Statement **[EN010162/APP/6.4.14.1]**, which forms part of the Environmental Statement. The Transport and Access assessment has been updated accordingly to reflect the

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			three access changes following the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR).
GNR3_E_013, GNR3_OFF_014, GNR3_E_014, GNR3_OFF_015	Respondent expressed dissatisfaction with the lack of consultation and communication with Egmanton parish Meeting.	No	Egmanton Parish Meeting provided a response to this phase of targeted consultation. With this in mind, the Applicant contacted the parish to acknowledge their feedback, along with a reminder that the Applicant remains on hand to be contacted via the Development communications channels should they have any further questions on 11 June 2025.
GNR3_E_013, GNR3_OFF_014, GNR3_E_014, GNR3_OFF_015, GNR3_L_006	Respondent expressed dissatisfaction there were no public information events for the targeted consultation. Respondent expressed concern that targeted consultation does not align with the Statement of Community Consultation.	No	The Applicant notes this comment and confirms that a guidance note outlining the approach to Targeted Consultation was provided to the relevant local planning authorities – Newark and Sherwood District Council, Nottinghamshire County Council, and Bassetlaw District Council – for oversight. This note is included in Appendix 5.1.9 **[EN010162/APP/5.1.9]** of the Consultation Report. The Applicant considers that a rigorous and

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			proportionate consultation process was undertaken in accordance with relevant guidance. Communication channels remained open throughout the process, and stakeholders were able to request meetings or further engagement as needed.
GNR3_E_013, GNR3_OFF_014, GNR3_E_014, GNR3_OFF_015	Respondent expressed concern for the time frame of targeted consultation being shorter than phase 1 and 2 (4 weeks vs 6 weeks).	No	The Applicant notes this comment and confirms that a guidance note outlining the approach to the Targeted Consultation was provided to the relevant local planning authorities – Newark and Sherwood District Council, Nottinghamshire County Council, and Bassetlaw District Council – for oversight. This note is included in Appendix 5.1.9 **[EN010162/APP/5.1.9]** of the Consultation Report. The Applicant considers that a rigorous and proportionate consultation process was undertaken in accordance with relevant statutory guidance and the principles set out in the Statement of Community Consultation. The Targeted Consultation was held between Thursday 8 May and

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			Friday 6 June 2025, lasting 29 days, which is in excess of the 28-day statutory minimum. All consultation materials were made publicly available and accessible, and communication channels remained open throughout the process to enable stakeholders to request further information, meetings, or clarification where required.
GNR3_L_002, GNR3_L_003	Respondent expressed concern that the Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS) was not mentioned in any targeted consultation material or the EIA.	No	Although not explicitly cited in the Targeted Consultation materials, the Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS) was cited in the draft oLEMP and Chapter 8 Ecology and Biodiversity of PEIR. Early Consultation with Nottinghamshire County Council also included discussion about the emerging LNRS. The recently published Draft LNRS has been considered, and it is envisaged that the published version will influence the final LEMP (Technical Appendix A5.1: Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]**).

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR3_L_006, GNR3_L_007	Respondent expressed concern for no additional Enivronmental Impact Assessment on the changes.	No	The localised additions to the Order Limits will be included in ES Chapter 2, Environmental Impact Assessment **[EN010162/APP/6.2.2]**, for the whole Development.
GNR3_OFF_003	Respondent expressed the targeted consultation materials were biased.	No	The Applicant notes this comment and considers that the consultation materials provided at each stage of the development process were clear, accessible, and transparent, supporting a rigorous and effective consultation process. All consultation materials are available in the appendices to the Consultation Report **[EN010162/APP/5.1]**, which forms part of the Development Consent Order application.
GNR3_E_001, GNR3_OFF_003, GNR3_L_002, GNR3_OFF_010, GNR3_E_010, GNR3_E_011, GNR3_L_003	Respondents express general objections to the Development.	No	The Applicant notes this comment and confirms that general comments received about the Development during the Phase Two Statutory Consultation have been recorded and responded to in Appendix 5.1.11: Section 42 Applicant Response Table **[EN010162/APP/5.1.11]**, which

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			forms part of the Consultation Report **[EN010162/APP/5.1].**
GNR3_E_001, GNR3_E_003, GNR3_OFF_008, GNR3_L_002, GNR3_L_003	Respondents express concern for the use of farmland.	No	The Applicant notes this comment and confirms that comments received during the Phase Two Statutory Consultation in relation to agricultural land and soils have been recorded and responded to in Appendix 5.1.11: Section 42 Applicant Response Table **[EN010162/APP/5.1.11]**, which forms part of the Consultation Report **[EN010162/APP/5.1]**.
GNR3_E_003, GNR3_OFF_008, GNR3_L_002, GNR3_L_003	Respondents express concern about the visual impact of the Development.	No	The Applicant notes this comment and confirms that comments received during the Phase Two Statutory Consultation in relation to landscape and visual impacts have been recorded and responded to in Appendix 5.1.11: Section 42 Applicant Response Table **[EN010162/APP/5.1.11],** which forms part of the Consultation Report **[EN010162/APP/5.1].**
GNR3_E_003, GNR3_OFF_008, GNR3_L_002, GNR3_L_003	Respondents express concern about damage to local ecology and biodiversity.	No	The Applicant notes this comment and confirms that comments received during the Phase Two Statutory Consultation in relation ecology and biodiversity to have been recorded and responded to in

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			Appendix 5.1.11: Section 42 Applicant Response Table **[EN010162/APP/5.1.11]**, which forms part of the Consultation Report **[EN010162/APP/5.1].**
GNR3_E_009, GNR3_L_001, GNR3_OFF_012	Respondent expressed general support for the Development.	No	Noted.
GNR3_E_001, GNR3_L_002, GNR3_L_003	Respondents express concern for the impact the Development may have on food security.	No	The Applicant notes this comment and confirms that comments received during the Phase Two Statutory Consultation in relation to the use of agricultural land and food security have been recorded and responded to in Appendix 5.1.11: Section 42 Applicant Response Table **[EN010162/APP/5.1.11]**, which forms part of the Consultation Report **[EN010162/APP/5.1].**
GNR3_OFF_006, GNR3_L_002, GNR3_L_003	Respondent expressed concern for local wildlife.	No	The Applicant notes this comment and confirms that comments received during the Phase Two Statutory Consultation in relation to ecology and biodiversity have been recorded and responded to in Appendix 5.1.11: Section 42 Applicant Response Table **[EN010162/APP/5.1.11],**

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			which forms part of the Consultation Report **[EN010162/APP/5.1].**
GNR3_E_013, GNR3_OFF_014, GNR3_E_014, GNR3_OFF_015	Respondent expressed concern for the transparency of consultation documents and materials.	No	The Applicant notes this comment and considers that the consultation materials provided at each stage of the development process were clear, accessible, and transparent, supporting a rigorous and effective consultation process. All consultation materials are available in the appendices to the Consultation Report **[EN010162/APP/5.1]**, which forms part of the Development Consent Order application.
GNR3_E_004, GNR3_L_003	Respondents believe solar projects should be installed on residential rooftops, next to motorways etc.	No	The Applicant notes this comment and confirms that comments received during the Phase Two Statutory Consultation in relation to site selection and alternatives have been recorded and responded to in Appendix 5.1.11: Section 42 Applicant Response Table **[EN010162/APP/5.1.11],** which forms part of the Consultation Report **[EN010162/APP/5.1]**.
GNR3_E_005, GNR3_E_006	Respondents support solar energy in principle.	No	Noted.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR3_L_002, GNR3_L_003	Respondent expressed the development does not align with the Draft Nottinghamshire Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS).	No	The Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS) was cited in the draft oLEMP and Chapter 8 Ecology and Biodiversity of PEIR. Early Consultation with Nottinghamshire County Council included discussion about the emerging LNRS. The recently published Draft LNRS has been considered, and it is envisaged that the published version will influence the final LEMP (Technical Appendix A5.1: Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan [**EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1**]).
GNR3_L_002, GNR3_L_003	Respondent expressed concern for the use of materials from China.	No	The Applicant notes this comment and confirms that comments received during the Phase Two Statutory Consultation, including those relating to the origin of the solar panels, have been recorded and responded to in Appendix 5.1.11: Section 42 Applicant Response Table **[EN010162/APP/5.1.11]**, which forms part of the Consultation Report **[EN010162/APP/5.1]**.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR3_L_002, GNR3_L_003	Respondent expressed concern for the cumulative impact of solar development in Nottinghamshire and Lincolnshire.	No	The Applicant notes this comment and confirms that comments received during the Phase Two Statutory Consultation, including those relating to the cumulative impacts of solar developments, have been recorded and responded to in Appendix 5.1.11: Section 42 Applicant Response Table **[EN010162/APP/5.1.11]**, which forms part of the Consultation Report **[EN010162/APP/5.1]**. Further information can be found in Technical Appendix A2.1: Cumulative Assessment Stages 1 and 2, **[EN010162/APP/6.4.2.1]**.
GNR3_L_002, GNR3_L_003	Respondent expressed concern for ecological and habitat areas as shown on the Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS) 'local habitat map' near and within the proposed sites.	No	Many of the habitats mapped in the LNRS are complemented by those proposed by the Development (as set out in Technical Appendix A5.1: Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]**). The creation of woodland, grassland, and riparian corridors, for example, will make a meaningful contribution to addressing the priorities and potential measures outlined in the LNRS Statement of Priorities.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR3_L_002, GNR3_L_003	Respondent expressed concern for SSSI's. Respondent specified Besthorpe Meadows and Eakring and Maplebeck Meadows.	No	SSSIs and other designated sites are identified in Technical Appendix A8.2: Ecology and Biodiversity Designated Sites Baseline **[EN010162/APP/6.4.8.2]**. Effects on SSSIs are assessed in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**.
GNR3_L_002, GNR3_L_003	Respondent general concern for the local economy.	No	The Applicant notes this comment and confirms that comments received during the Phase Two Statutory Consultation, including those relating to impacts to the local economy, have been recorded and responded to in Appendix 5.1.11: Section 42 Applicant Response Table **[EN010162/APP/5.1.11]**, which forms part of the Consultation Report [EN010162/APP/5.1]. Further information can be found in ES Chapter 13, Socio-Economics and Tourism **[EN010162/APP/6.2.13]**.
GNR3_L_002, GNR3_L_003	Respondent expressed concern for the impact the development will have on cultural heritage assets	No	The Applicant notes this comment and confirms that comments received during the Phase Two Statutory Consultation in relation to cultural heritage have been recorded and responded to in Appendix

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	during construction and operation.		5.1.11: Section 42 Applicant Response Table **[EN010162/APP/5.1.11]**, which forms part of the Consultation Report **[EN010162/APP/5.1]**. Further information can be found in the ES Chapter 11, Cultural Heritage and Archaeology **[EN010162/APP/6.2.11]**.
GNR3_L_002, GNR3_L_003	Respondent expressed concern for large scale solar in relation to current scientific research to 'dim the sun'.	No	The Applicant notes this comment and confirms that comments received during the Phase Two Statutory Consultation in relation to climate change and the need for the Development have been recorded and responded to in Appendix 5.1.11: Section 42 Applicant Response Table **[EN010162/APP/5.1.11],** which forms part of the Consultation Report **[EN010162/APP/5.1]**. Further information can be found in the ES Chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15]**.
GNR3_OFF_006	Respondent expressed concern for infringements on areas of recreation.	No	The Applicant notes this comment and confirms that comments received during the Phase Two Statutory Consultation in relation to recreation have been recorded and responded to in Appendix 5.1.11: Section 42 Applicant Response Table

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			[EN010162/APP/5.1.11], which forms part of the Consultation Report **[EN010162/APP/5.1]**. Further information can be found in the ES Chapter 18, Recreation **[EN010162/APP/6.2.18]**.
GNR3_E_004	Respondent expressed concern for increased flooding and run off due to the Development.	No	The Applicant notes this comment and confirms that comments received during the Phase Two Statutory Consultation in relation to hydrology and flood risk have been recorded and responded to in Appendix 5.1.11: Section 42 Applicant Response Table **[EN010162/APP/5.1.11]**, which forms part of the Consultation Report **[EN010162/APP/5.1]**. Further information can be found in the ES Chapter 9, Water Resources **[EN010162/APP/6.2.9]**.
GNR3_E_004	Respondent enquired about compensation for properties flooded due to the Development.	No	The Applicant notes this comment and confirms that, as detailed in Technical Appendix A9.1: Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy **[EN010162/APP/6.4.9.1]** to ensure that the Development does not increase flood risk to surrounding properties. The design of the Development includes appropriate

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			mitigation measures. As no increased risk of flooding has been identified as a result of the Development, compensation is not anticipated to be required.
GNR3_E_004	Respondents express concern for Trent Valley villages flooding due to the Development not increasing dyke ditches.	No	The Applicant notes this comment and confirms that comments received during the Phase Two Statutory Consultation in relation to hydrology and flood risk have been recorded and responded to in Appendix 5.1.11: Section 42 Applicant Response Table **[EN010162/APP/5.1.11]**, which forms part of the Consultation Report **[EN010162/APP/5.1].** Further information can be found in the ES Chapter 9, Water Resources **[EN010162/APP/6.2.9]**.
GNR3_E_005	Respondent stated they are no longer Chair of Caunton PC and have notified the Development of this before.	No	The Applicant confirms that following this, a letter was sent to the new Chair of Caunton Parish Council.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR3_E_007	Respondent asks if the council and police have been consulted for the targeted consultation.	No	The Applicant consulted with Section 42 consultees as part of this Targeted Consultation. Appendix 5.1.7: Section 42 Consultation Materials **[EN010162/APP/5.1.7]** includes a list of the Section 42 consultees for the Development. This includes Nottinghamshire Police and Crime Commissioner, and local authorities identified in accordance with Section 43 of the 2008 Act.
GNR3_OFF_008	Respondent expressed concern for the use of the term 'biodiversity' being used for marketing purposes.	No	The Applicant notes this comment. The use of the term biodiversity reflects the wording and content of the Environmental Statement, which has been informed by relevant legislation, policy, and ecological assessment.
GNR3_L_002	Respondent expressed scepticism of biodiversity net gain.	No	Technical Appendix A8.13: Biodiversity Net Gain **[EN010162/APP/6.4.8.13]** is a recognised good practice and follows government (Defra) guidance.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR3_L_002	Respondent expressed concern for soil damage during cabling.	No	The Applicant notes this comment and confirms that comments received during the Phase Two Statutory Consultation in relation to agricultural land and soils have been recorded and responded to in Appendix 5.1.11: Section 42 Applicant Response Table **[EN010162/APP/5.1.11]**, which forms part of the Consultation Report **[EN010162/APP/5.1]**.
GNR3_L_002	Respondent expressed concern for the impact the development will have on residential life.	No	The Applicant notes this comment and confirms that comments received during the Phase Two Statutory Consultation in relation to impacts on residential life have been recorded and responded to in Appendix 5.1.11: Section 42 Applicant Response Table **[EN010162/APP/5.1.11]**, which forms part of the Consultation Report **[EN010162/APP/5.1]**. Further information can be found in the ESS Chapter 13, Socio-Economics and Tourism **[EN010162/APP/6.2.13]**, and ES Chapter 18, Recreation **[EN010162/APP/6.2.18]**.

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR3_L_002	Respondent believe other site locations should be considered. Ex. Brownfield, industrial areas, rooftops.	No	The Applicant notes this comment and confirms that comments received during the Phase Two Statutory Consultation in relation to site selection and alternatives have been recorded and responded to in Appendix 5.1.11: Section 42 Applicant Response Table **[EN010162/APP/5.1.11],** which forms part of the Consultation Report **[EN010162/APP/5.1]**.
GNR3_L_003	Respondent expressed concern the Proposed Development contravenes the Newark and Sherwood Amended Core Strategy.	No	The Applicant confirms that it has engaged with Newark and Sherwood District Council throughout the development process. Further details of this engagement are provided in the Consultation Report **[EN010162/APP/5.1]** and the Statement of Common Ground between the Applicant and Newark and Sherwood District Council **[EN010162/APP/7.7]**.
GNR3_L_003	Respondent expressed general concern for the Proposed Development's impact on wellbeing and health.	No	The Applicant notes this comment and confirms that comments received during the Phase Two Statutory Consultation in relation to health and wellbeing have been recorded and responded to in Appendix 5.1.11: Section 42 Applicant

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
			Response Table **[EN010162/APP/5.1.11]**, which forms part of the Consultation Report **[EN010162/APP/5.1]**.