



Meridian Solar Farm

EN010169

Volume 5

Consultation

**5.1 Appendix L: Additional
Targeted Consultation
Materials and Applicant's
Response**

APFP Regulation 5(2)(q)

Infrastructure Planning (Applications:
Prescribed Forms and Procedure)
Regulations 2009

March 2026

Contents

1. Introduction	2
1.1. Consultation	2
1.2. Approach to Feedback	2
2. Additional Targeted Consultation – Materials	3
2.1. Example Letter (Issued to Statutory Consultees)	3
2.2. Order Limits Extension Plan	6
3. Comments Relating to the Additional Targeted Consultation Received under Section 47	7
4. General Feedback	28
5. Comments Relating to the Additional Targeted Consultation Received under Section 42	30
5.1. Borough Council of King's Lynn & West Norfolk	30
5.2. Cowbit Parish Council	31
5.3. Deeping Parish Council	32
5.4. Environment Agency	32
5.5. Fenland District Council	33
5.6. Forestry Commission	33
5.7. Historic England	34
5.8. Lincolnshire County Council	35
5.9. Moulton Parish Council	42
5.10. National Highways	43
5.11. Natural England	44
5.12. National Grid Electricity Transmission PLC	45
5.13. North Kesteven District Council	47
5.14. Northern Gas	47
5.15. Peterborough City Council	47
5.16. South Holland District Council	48
5.17. South Holland Internal Drainage Board	62

1. Introduction

1.1. Consultation

- 1.1.1. The additional targeted consultation was held between 8 January and 5 February 2026, and related to the inclusion of additional land within the Scheme boundary to facilitate the grid connection into the proposed Weston Marsh Substation B.
- 1.1.2. A total of 77 responses to the additional targeted consultation were received. This appendix provides a schedule of responses received to the Applicant's targeted consultation from consultees engaged under Section 47 and Section 42 of the PA2008.
- 1.1.3. This appendix also provides copies of the materials issued (see Section 2).

1.2. Approach to Feedback

- 1.2.1. In reporting and responding to the feedback received, the Applicant has adopted the following approach:
 - Comments received under Section 47 of the PA 2008 that relate directly to the inclusion of land consulted upon, or raise key themes relevant to the targeted consultation, but which do not refer to the inclusion of land are reproduced verbatim in Section 3.
 - General feedback that did not relate specifically to the targeted changes have been summarised separately in Section 4.
 - Responses received under Section 42 of the PA 2008 are provided verbatim in Section 5.

2. Additional Targeted Consultation – Materials

2.1. Example Letter (Issued to Statutory Consultees)



8 January 2026

Dear Consultee,

Meridian Solar Farm Development Consent Order

Additional targeted consultation: 8 January – 5 February 2026

Planning Inspectorate reference: EN010169

We are writing to you regarding the Meridian Solar Farm (33th "Scheme"), which is a proposed solar farm and overhead line connection to the national grid that would generate around 750 MW of electricity and connect to the National Electricity Transmission System (NETS).

We previously held a Statutory Consultation on the Scheme between 24 April and 8 June 2025. We also held a targeted consultation on a number of localised changes to the Scheme, which took place between 24 September and 22 October 2025.

Since that consultation, we have continued to work closely with National Grid Electricity Transmission (NGET) regarding the proposed Weston Marsh substations they are developing as part of their Grimsby to Walpole project, which will be our point of connection to the NETS. As a result of ongoing collaboration and updated information from NGET, our previous assumptions about the location and configuration of the Weston Marsh substations need to be updated to reflect their latest plans. This requires the inclusion of additional land within the Scheme boundary to facilitate our grid connection to the new Weston Marsh Substation B location. Further information on NGET's plans, including more detail about the Weston Marsh Substation can be found at their website for the Grimsby to Walpole project here:

www.nationalgrid.com/the-great-grid-upgrade/grimsby-to-walpole

We are consulting you in your capacity as a prescribed consultee under Section 42(1)(a) of the Planning Act 2008 ("the Act") and the Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009 ("the Regulations 2009"). We would like to invite your feedback on the inclusion of the additional land in this location. Please refer to the materials enclosed with this letter showing the land.

The Scheme

The Scheme is being promoted by Meridian Solar Farm Limited, a subsidiary of Downing Renewable Developments. The Scheme is proposed to be located on land to the north of Crowland and east of Spalding, and is located within the administrative boundaries of Lincolnshire County Council and South Holland District Council.

The Scheme would comprise the construction, operation (including maintenance) and decommissioning of photovoltaic (PV) solar panels of overhead line connection into National Grid's planned Weston Marsh substation B. The Scheme will also include associated infrastructure, including co-located battery energy storage systems (BESS) and inter-array connections to link together the land parcels where the solar panels are located. The BESS is associated development to ensure that energy can be stored when it is generated and not demanded. The BESS will have a direct relationship with the solar PV panels and it will support the operation of this by storing electricity produced during times of peak capacity until it is needed.

The Scheme comprises a generating station of more than 100 MW and the installation of two above ground electric lines greater than two kilometres in length. The Scheme therefore qualifies as a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP) under sections 14(1)(a), 14(1)(b), 15(2) and 16 of the Act. A Development Consent Order ("DCO") application for the Scheme (the "DCO Application") will be made by the Applicant to the Secretary of State for Energy Security and Net Zero (the "Secretary of State") via the Planning Inspectorate, who will appoint an Examining Authority to examine the DCO Application on behalf of the Secretary of State. After examination, the Examining Authority will make its recommendation on the Application to the Secretary of State, who will make the final decision on whether or not to grant the DCO.

Scope of the targeted consultation

We are proposing to include the land shown on the enclosed plan to facilitate our overhead line connection to National Grid's planned Weston Marsh Substation B. As noted above, National Grid has recently updated its plans for the Weston Marsh Substation, requiring changes to the overhead line design we previously consulted on.

The Weston Marsh Substation will be consented and delivered separately by National Grid and is not included within the scope of the Meridian Solar Farm Development Consent Order application.

Construction of the overhead line would take place within the area shown on the enclosed plan. Infrastructure within this land would include pylons and the overhead line itself. The full extent of the fields has been included to allow flexibility during detailed design, including consideration of the nearby Grimsby to Walpole project, which is proposing another overhead line through this area. The Meridian Solar Farm overhead line is proposed to run generally parallel to the Grimsby to Walpole route.

Information on the construction, operation and decommissioning of the Scheme was presented in the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR), which was prepared for our Statutory Consultation in 2025. The relevant documents are available on our website here: <https://meridiansolarfarm.co.uk/>

The inclusion of these fields within the Scheme for the overhead line extension is expected to result in effects similar to those already assessed for the remainder of the grid connection corridor in the PEIR. These may include:

- Potential landscape and visual effects from the construction, operation and decommissioning of the overhead line.
- Potential construction traffic effects arising from the construction of the overhead line on surrounding roads and Public Rights of Way. Operational traffic effects for the maintenance of the line will be negligible.
- Potential noise and vibration effects and air quality (such as dust) effects arising from construction traffic, and operational noise effects from the overhead line.
- Potential cultural heritage effects, including direct impacts on below-ground heritage from the construction of pylons or on the setting of neighbouring heritage features.
- Potential effects on local ecology and biodiversity receptors from the construction of the works or the presence of the overhead line.

The application will assess and report on likely significant effects for all of the above matters in detail. However, we would appreciate any feedback you may have on your land, interests, local features or any other comments you may wish to make about the potential impacts from this change.

Responding to the consultation

Responses to this additional targeted consultation must be received by 11:59pm on 5 February 2025 and should be submitted in writing either via email (enquiries@meridiansolar.co.uk) or by post (by writing: FREEPOST DOWNING MERIDIAN – no stamp needed).

All responses should be made in writing, state the grounds of the response or representation, indicate who is making the response or representation, and provide an address to which any correspondence relating to the response or representation may be sent.

Responses to this targeted consultation will be considered alongside feedback received during the stage two consultation and subsequent targeted consultation, and will inform the further development of the Scheme and DCO Application. All responses will be documented in the consultation report that will be one of the factors taken into consideration by the Secretary of State when deciding whether the DCO Application can be accepted for Examination. Therefore, in providing any comment, it should be borne in mind that the substance of your comment may be communicated to others as part of that consultation report.

However, we will request that personal details are not placed on the public record. Personal details will be held securely in accordance with the relevant data protection legislation and will be used solely in connection with the consultation process and the development of the Scheme and, except as noted above, will not be disclosed to any third parties.

The Development Consent Order process

Information about the Act and DCOs can be found on the Planning Inspectorate's National Infrastructure Planning website: <https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/>

If you have any questions about this letter, the Scheme or consultation, please do not hesitate to contact enquiries@meridiansolar.co.uk or 0800 652 6120.

Yours faithfully,



Head of NSIP Projects
Downing Renewable Developments

Enc. Overview Plan

3. Comments Relating to the Additional Targeted Consultation Received under Section 47

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
ALC grade of additional land	As you are already aware, our prime concern has always been the loss and use of good Grade 1 agricultural land, desperately needed for growing the type of crops that we do in this area. And now with the latest extension to the boundary even more land being utilised ! The industrialisation that comes with this project is in contradiction to government policy on food security and goes against this policy by using good agricultural land. To use good agricultural land for these purposes is absolute sacrilege !	N	<p>The Applicant confirms that the siting of infrastructure within the Scheme layout has considered a full suite of environmental constraints, and ALC grades have fed into this consideration. The mitigation hierarchy has been applied by considering opportunities to avoid higher grade soils, where practicable. However, as the potential for the Scheme to result in permanent impacts on soils is limited (refer to Section 5.8 of ES Chapter 5: Agriculture and Soils (Doc Ref. 6.1) and large areas of the Site comprise BMV agricultural land, it has not been possible to avoid the use of BMV land for works involving soil handling in all instances. Where BMV land could not be avoided, impacts would be mitigated through the soil management measures set out within the OSMP (Doc Ref. 7.14). Further information is provided within ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution (Doc Ref. 6.1).</p> <p>National planning policy also recognises that utility-scale solar development will, in many cases, be located on agricultural land due to the scale of land required and the need to be close to suitable grid infrastructure. The Applicant therefore considers that reasonable alternatives to the selected Site were appropriately assessed and that the chosen location represents a suitable and balanced option in planning and environmental terms.</p>
	This project is typical sadly of the types of projects due to hit Lincolnshire and there is no evidence that you have tried to find lesser quality land.	N	<p>The Applicant confirms that BMV land has been avoided wherever practicable. Where BMV land could not be avoided, impacts would be mitigated through the soil management measures secured in the SMP, which will be prepared in accordance with the OSMP (Doc Ref. 7.14) and secured by way of Requirement in the Draft DCO (Doc Ref. 3.1).</p> <p>Further information is provided within ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution (Doc Ref. 6.1) and Appendix D: Site Selection Report of the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 7.1).</p>
Meridian Solar Farm Project Team	<p>Subject: Formal Objection to Meridian Solar Farm Proposal – Misuse of BMV Land and Inadequate consultation</p> <p>I am writing to formally register my strongest possible objection to the proposed Meridian Solar Farm. As a resident of South Holland in Lincolnshire, I am deeply concerned by the developer's continued pursuit of a project that prioritises industrial infrastructure over the UK's primary food-producing land.</p>	N	<p>The Applicant confirms that BMV land has been avoided wherever practicable. Where BMV land could not be avoided, impacts would be mitigated through the soil management measures secured in the SMP, which will be prepared in accordance with the OSMP (Doc Ref. 7.14) and secured by way of Requirement in the Draft DCO (Doc Ref. 3.1).</p> <p>Further information is provided within ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution (Doc Ref. 6.1). Furthermore, the Scheme presents less than 1% of agricultural land available in Lincolnshire.</p>
	<p>3. Failure to Prioritise Lower-Quality Land</p> <p>National Policy Statement EN-3 clearly dictates that developers should seek to use poorer quality land in</p>	N	<p>The Applicant confirms that the siting of infrastructure within the Scheme layout has considered a full suite of environmental constraints, and ALC grades have fed into this consideration. The mitigation hierarchy has been applied by considering opportunities to avoid higher grade soils, where practicable. However, as the potential for the Scheme to</p>

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	preference to BMV land. The Meridian proposal fails this "sequential test." There has been no evidence provided that alternative, lower-grade sites have been meaningfully considered, suggesting this site was chosen for its proximity to the grid at the expense of our agricultural heritage.		<p>result in permanent impacts on soils is limited (refer to Section 5.8 of ES Chapter 5: Agriculture and Soils (Doc Ref. 6.1) and large areas of the Site comprise BMV agricultural land, it has not been possible to avoid the use of BMV land for works involving soil handling in all instances.</p> <p>Where BMV land could not be avoided, impacts would be mitigated through the soil management measures secured in the SMP, which will be prepared in accordance with the OSMP (Doc Ref. 7.14) and secured by way of Requirement in the Draft DCO (Doc Ref. 3.1). Further information is provided within ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution (Doc Ref. 6.1).</p>
	<p>3. Failure to Prioritise Lower-Quality Land</p> <p>National Policy Statement EN-3 clearly dictates that developers should seek to use poorer quality land in preference to BMV land. The Meridian proposal fails this "sequential test." There has been no evidence provided that alternative, lower-grade sites have been meaningfully considered, suggesting this site was chosen for its proximity to the grid at the expense of our agricultural heritage.</p>	N	<p>The Applicant notes this comment but confirms that the siting of infrastructure within the Scheme layout has considered a full suite of environmental constraints, and ALC grades have fed into this consideration. The mitigation hierarchy has been applied by considering opportunities to avoid higher grade soils, where practicable. However, as the potential for the Scheme to result in permanent impacts on soils is limited (refer to Section 5.8 of ES Chapter 5: Agriculture and Soils (Doc Ref. 6.1) and large areas of the Site comprise BMV agricultural land, it has not been possible to avoid the use of BMV land for works involving soil handling in all instances.</p> <p>Where BMV land could not be avoided, impacts would be mitigated through the soil management measures secured in the SMP, which will be prepared in accordance with the OSMP (Doc Ref. 7.14) and secured by way of Requirement in the Draft DCO (Doc Ref. 3.1). Further information is provided within ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution (Doc Ref. 6.1).</p>
	We don't consider these proposals should be near us especially when there is swatches of brown land in UK that could be used instead of Grade A Farmland	N	The Applicant confirms that BMV land has been avoided wherever practicable. Where BMV land could not be avoided, impacts would be mitigated through the soil management measures secured in the SMP, which will be prepared in accordance with the OSMP (Doc Ref. 7.14) and secured by way of Requirement in the Draft DCO (Doc Ref. 3.1). Further information, including with regard to the consideration of alternative Sites, is provided within ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution (Doc Ref. 6.1).
	The proposed development is on grade 1 land of which there is only a tiny percentage in the UK. Grade 1 land of which a large % is in Lincolnshire, This Grade 1 land is highly productive for food production and should be protected under current planning rules.	N	The Applicant confirms that BMV land has been avoided wherever practicable. Where BMV land could not be avoided, impacts would be mitigated through the soil management measures secured in the SMP, which will be prepared in accordance with the OSMP (Doc Ref. 7.14) and secured by way of Requirement in the Draft DCO (Doc Ref. 3.1). Further information, including with regard to the consideration of alternative Sites, is provided within ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution (Doc Ref. 6.1).
Loss or additional loss of BMV land	<p>1. Loss of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) Land</p> <p>The proposed site occupies land classified as Grade 1 and 2, representing the highest tier of "Best and Most Versatile" agricultural land. In the context of national food security, the</p>	N	The independent National Food Strategy Review shows that solar farms do not in any way present a risk to the UK's food security. The Scheme would allow agricultural activities to continue as solar farms help farmers to diversify and improve their agricultural operations.

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	<p>conversion of this high-yield acreage into an industrial solar site is a direct contradiction of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). This land is a finite national resource; covering it with 1.8 million solar panels for 40 years is not "temporary" use, but a generational loss of productive soil."</p>		<p>Solar farms can still be used for grazing and support UK farmers to continue food production on other parts of their land.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Scheme presents less than 1% of agricultural land available in Lincolnshire.</p> <p>Currently solar farms occupy less than 0.1% of the UK's land. To meet the government's net zero targets, solar farms would account for approximately 0.4 - 0.6% of UK land.</p> <p>The Applicant further notes that siting of infrastructure within the Scheme layout has considered a full suite of environmental constraints, and ALC grades have fed into this consideration. The mitigation hierarchy has been applied by considering opportunities to avoid higher grade soils, where practicable. However, as the potential for the Scheme to result in permanent impacts on soils is limited (refer to Section 5.8 of ES Chapter 5: Agriculture and Soils (Doc Ref. 6.1) and large areas of the Site comprise BMV agricultural land, it has not been possible to avoid the use of BMV land for works involving soil handling in all instances. Where BMV land could not be avoided, impacts would be mitigated through the soil management measures secured in the SMP, which will be prepared in accordance with the OSMP (Doc Ref. 7.14) and secured by way of Requirement in the Draft DCO (Doc Ref. 3.1). Further information is provided within ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution (Doc Ref. 6.1).</p>
	<p>1. Loss of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) Land</p> <p>The proposed site occupies land classified as Grade 1 and 2, representing the highest tier of "Best and Most Versatile" agricultural land. In the context of national food security, the conversion of this high-yield acreage into an industrial solar site is a direct contradiction of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). This land is a finite national resource; covering it with 1.8 million solar panels for 40 years is not "temporary" use, but a generational loss of productive soil."</p>	N	<p>The independent National Food Strategy Review shows that solar farms do not in any way present a risk to the UK's food security. The Scheme would allow agricultural activities to continue as solar farms help farmers to diversify and improve their agricultural operations. Solar farms can still be used for grazing and support UK farmers to continue food production on other parts of their land.</p> <p>The Applicant further notes that siting of infrastructure within the Scheme layout has considered a full suite of environmental constraints, and ALC grades have fed into this consideration. The mitigation hierarchy has been applied by considering opportunities to avoid higher grade soils, where practicable. However, as the potential for the Scheme to result in permanent impacts on soils is limited (refer to Section 5.8 of ES Chapter 5: Agriculture and Soils (Doc Ref. 6.1) and large areas of the Site comprise BMV agricultural land, it has not been possible to avoid the use of BMV land for works involving soil handling in all instances. Where BMV land could not be avoided, impacts would be mitigated through the soil management measures secured in the SMP, which will be prepared in accordance with the OSMP (Doc Ref. 7.14) and secured by way of Requirement in the Draft DCO (Doc Ref. 3.1). Further information is provided within ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution (Doc Ref. 6.1).</p>
	<p>The inclusion of additional BMV land, of which the actual size has not been provided, within the Project boundary to accommodate revised grid connection infrastructure</p>	N	<p>The Applicant confirms that consultation has been undertaken in accordance with the PA 2008, which allows for a bespoke and proportionate approach to further consultation. The targeted consultation focused specifically on the inclusion of land within the Scheme boundary to facilitate connection into Weston Marsh Substation B. On this basis, the</p>

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	represents a material change to the proposals with insufficient information provided.		Applicant considers the consultation approach to be appropriate and consistent with relevant legislation and guidance.
	I am writing to formally register my strongest possible objection to the proposed Meridian Solar Farm. As a resident of South Holland in Lincolnshire, I am deeply concerned by the developer's continued pursuit of a project that prioritises industrial infrastructure over the UK's primary food-producing land.	N	The independent National Food Strategy Review shows that solar farms do not in any way present a risk to the UK's food security. The Scheme would allow agricultural activities to continue as solar farms help farmers to diversify and improve their agricultural operations. Solar farms can still be used for grazing and support UK farmers to continue food production on other parts of their land. Currently solar farms occupy less than 0.1% of the UK's land. To meet the government's net zero targets, solar farms would account for approximately 0.4 - 0.6% of UK land.
	that this proposal is taking away Grade A farmland which should be used to feed the UK which we are not comfortable with. We don't want to see people without food. which could be produced here at Wragg Marsh.	N	The Applicant, as above, confirms that the independent National Food Strategy Review shows that solar farms do not in any way present a risk to the UK's food security. The Scheme would allow agricultural activities to continue as solar farms help farmers to diversify and improve their agricultural operations. Solar farms can still be used for grazing and support UK farmers to continue food production on other parts of their land.
	But as food producer/farmer I do know that building this sort of infrastructure on grade one land is crazy. Food security has never been more important and with what's going on in the world I would have thought that even the slightly demented Mr Milliband could see that and stop this madness before it goes any further.	N	The Applicant, as above, confirms that the independent National Food Strategy Review shows that solar farms do not in any way present a risk to the UK's food security. The Scheme would allow agricultural activities to continue as solar farms help farmers to diversify and improve their agricultural operations. Solar farms can still be used for grazing and support UK farmers to continue food production on other parts of their land.
	The land here is Best and Most Versatile (BMV) land and your proposal will take more of this prime, double cropping land, out of production. This will impact agriculture and threaten the country's food security.	N	The Applicant notes that siting of infrastructure within the Scheme layout has considered a full suite of environmental constraints, and ALC grades have fed into this consideration. The Applicant further notes that the independent National Food Strategy Review shows that solar farms do not in any way present a risk to the UK's food security. The Scheme would allow agricultural activities to continue as solar farms help farmers to diversify and improve their agricultural operations. Solar farms can still be used for grazing and support UK farmers to continue food production on other parts of their land.
	Build your substations and solar farms close to the centres of population that apparently need this if we really do need them. Lincolnshire certainly doesn't need this aberration. I understand why the greedy developers are targeting this area, its flat and the population is sparse so less people to complain but when the grade land has been concreted over it will never return. As the old saying goes "they've stopped making it"	N	The Applicant further notes that siting of infrastructure within the Scheme layout has considered a full suite of environmental constraints, and ALC grades have fed into this consideration. The mitigation hierarchy has been applied by considering opportunities to avoid higher grade soils, where practicable. However, as the potential for the Scheme to result in permanent impacts on soils is limited (refer to Section 5.8 of ES Chapter 5: Agriculture and Soils (Doc Ref. 6.1) and large areas of the Site comprise BMV agricultural land, it has not been possible to avoid the use of BMV land for works involving soil handling in all instances. Where BMV land could not be avoided, impacts would be mitigated through the soil management measures secured in the SMP, which will be prepared in accordance with the OSMP (Doc Ref. 7.14) and secured by way of

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
			Requirement in the Draft DCO (Doc Ref. 3.1). Further information is provided within ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution (Doc Ref. 6.1). The UK Government has identified through its energy policy, most recently in the National Policy Statement (NPS) EN-1 ¹ and NPS EN-3 ² , that there is a critical national priority (CNP) for the provision of nationally significant low carbon infrastructure in the UK, including solar technology. Developing the Scheme at its proposed size will be an important contribution to meeting this need.
Scope of additional targeted consultation and materials	Some residents of the area have not even been notified, and some have been notified late of these proposals – they have not had sufficient time so soon after the announcement of National Grid's Weston Marsh Substation B proposed site to consider these new proposals. The total lack of transparency where all residents of the area should have the chance to comment and the developers have failed to engage in conversation with interested persons.	N	The Applicant confirms that properties within an identified mailing zone and effected landowners were notified of the additional targeted consultation. Due to postal delays, a number of letters were reissued. Should any consultees notified after the commencement of the additional targeted consultation have required additional time to respond, they were encouraged to contact the Community Relations Team to discuss appropriate arrangements through additional wording included in the reissued letters.
	The inclusion of additional BMV land, of which the actual size has not been provided, within the Project boundary to accommodate revised grid connection infrastructure represents a material change to the proposals with insufficient information provided.	N	The Applicant confirms that consultation has been undertaken in accordance with the PA 2008, which allows for a bespoke and proportionate approach to further consultation. The targeted consultation focused specifically on the inclusion of land within the Scheme boundary to facilitate connection into Weston Marsh Substation B. On this basis, the Applicant considers the consultation approach to be appropriate and consistent with relevant legislation and guidance.
	For these reasons we are requesting that you go 'back to the table' and reissue a more informative and properly advertised consultation making sure that all landowners, affected residents and other people and parties are given the chance to have their say. These proposals should proceed no further until this has been done.	N	The Applicant maintains that information issued for the consultation provided adequate time for community involvement, adequate information and invited participation. The Applicant considers that the consultation approach to be appropriate and consistent with relevant legislation and guidance.
	These proposals are not just a minor adjustment to your plans but are considered to be significant and paramount due to other developments going on in that area.	N	The Applicant disagrees with this comment and considers that the consultation approach to be appropriate and consistent with relevant legislation and guidance.

¹ DESNZ (2025). Overarching NPS for Energy (NPS EN-1). Available at: <https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/6915ba42bc34c86ce4e6e726/overarching-national-policy-statement-for-energy-en-1-web-accessible.pdf> [Accessed 28/11/2025]

² DESNZ (2025). NPS for Renewable Energy Infrastructure (NPS EN-3). Available at: <https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/6915b78bbc34c86ce4e6e71f/national-policy-statement-for-renewable-energy-infrastructure-en-3-web-accessible.pdf> [Accessed 28/11/2025]

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	<p>The change to the proposal is extensive, I have no belief this consultation was completed according to legal requirements. It has only just been publicised by impacted consultees to demonstrate the scale of the change to an original proposal. Meridian solar, along with many other projects, appears to be planning to expand original proposals while trying to hide its impacts to communities by low key, targeted consultations with outreach hidden from the majority of interested parties.</p>	N	<p>The Applicant confirms that consultation has been undertaken in accordance with the PA 2008, which allows for a bespoke and proportionate approach to further consultation. The targeted consultation focused specifically on the inclusion of land within the Scheme boundary to facilitate connection into Weston Marsh Substation B. On this basis, the Applicant considers the consultation approach to be appropriate and consistent with relevant legislation and guidance.</p> <p>The Applicant also considers that relevant parties were notified of the consultation, as set out within the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 5.1).</p> <p>In terms of the Scheme's footprint, as shown in ES Figure 3-1: Targeted Consultation Changes Since Statutory Consultation (Doc Ref. 6.2), the overall area of the Scheme has been reduced between statutory consultation and DCO submission. For comparison, the total area of the Site within the Order limits for the DCO submission is 1,511ha, whereas the total area of the Site within the draft Order limits in the PEIR was 2,121ha. As such the inclusion of additional land consulted on is not considered to represent a substantial expansion of the overall development.</p>
	<p>I am concerned that as this has been considered to be a "targeted" consultation, vast numbers of residents and stakeholders who have an interest in this project have not been given the opportunity to engage in this part of the process. I was both surprised and disappointed to hear that the Meridian Action Group (MAG), had not been made aware of this new consultation by Meridian</p>	N	<p>The Applicant disagrees with this comment and considers the consultation approach to be appropriate and consistent with relevant legislation and guidance. Relevant parties were notified of the consultation, as set out within the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 5.1).</p>
	<p>Please accept this as a formal request for the Meridian Action Group (MAG) to be included in the process as a statutory consultee, and that all information as part of the process is sent to MAG as a matter of course.</p>	N	<p>The Applicant does not consider that Meridian Action Group meets the requirements to be consulted as a statutory consultee; however, it remains open to continued engagement and has committed to sharing information where appropriate and relevant.</p>
	<p>I was both surprised and disappointed to hear that the Meridian Action Group (MAG), had not been made aware of this new consultation by Meridian. Please accept this as a formal request for the Meridian Action Group (MAG) to be included in the process as a statutory consultee, and that all information as part of the process is sent to MAG as a matter of course.</p>	N	<p>The Applicant does not consider that Meridian Action Group meets the requirements to be consulted as a statutory consultee; however, it remains open to continued engagement and has committed to sharing information where appropriate and relevant.</p>
	<p>Members of South Holland District Council were not notified of this targeted consultation until 19th January, 11 days after the consultation had begun, removing substantial time from the already short timeframe of 8th January – 5th February. It is also important to note that those that may have been notified about this consultation had a further reduced window due to a</p>	N	<p>The Applicant refutes the claim that Members of South Holland District Council were not notified of the additional targeted consultation prior to the date referenced. Letters were issued to Members by email ahead of the commencement of the additional targeted consultation, and the Council received both an email and a hard copy letter.</p>

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	<p>complete broadband outage in the area due to cable theft for a 5-day period.</p> <p>Meaningful public consultation must be inclusive, proportionate to the scale of change, and accessible. Limiting engagement at this stage undermines confidence in the process and risks prejudicing community trust.</p>		<p>The Applicant also notes that requests for extensions of time to respond to the targeted consultation have been accommodated throughout the consultation process, in order to encourage meaningful participation.</p> <p>With regard to the reported broadband outage, the Applicant notes that this was not in proximity to the proposed change being consulted upon.</p>
	<p>I consider the information provided to be insufficient to be able to fully understand and assess the cumulative impacts of this proposal alongside the nearby Grimsby to Walpole project, as well as the multiple other projects feeding into the substations which form part of that particular project, particularly given the intention for the overhead lines to run broadly parallel</p>	N	<p>The Applicant disagrees with this comment. It considers that the information provided during the additional targeted consultation was adequate and appropriate for that stage in the process.</p> <p>The Applicant also confirms that consultees were invited to contact the Community Relations Team by phone or email throughout the targeted consultation period to discuss the Scheme in more detail or seek clarification.</p>
	<p>The awareness of this additional Consultation has been extremely limited. Most residents only became aware of this additional consultation in mid January.</p>	N	<p>The Applicant also considers that relevant parties were notified of the consultation, as set out within the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 5.1).</p>
	<p>I am writing to formally object to the way in which the additional targeted consultation has been carried out, in relation to Meridian Solar's proposed connection to the proposed, and as yet undetermined plans for the Weston Marsh Substations.</p> <p>Whilst I note that this consultation is only in relation to updated information from the National Grid Electricity Transmission, I have significant concerns regarding both the changes themselves and the manner in which the consultation has been conducted.</p>	N	<p>The Applicant remains confident that the consultation was carried out in an appropriate and proportionate manner. The Applicant continues to engage with National Grid Electricity Transmission in respect of the proposed Weston Marsh Substation and will determine the most appropriate course of action should the substation proposals change in the future.</p>
	<p>I am writing to formally object to the way in which the additional targeted consultation has been carried out, in relation to Meridian Solar's proposed connection to the proposed, and as yet undetermined plans for the Weston Marsh Substations.</p> <p>Whilst I note that this consultation is only in relation to updated information from the National Grid Electricity Transmission, I have significant concerns regarding both the changes themselves and the manner in which the consultation has been conducted.</p>	N	<p>The Applicant remains confident that the consultation was carried out in an appropriate and proportionate manner. The Applicant continues to engage with National Grid Electricity Transmission in respect of the proposed Weston Marsh Substation and will determine the most appropriate course of action should the substation proposals change in the future.</p>
	<p>I am concerned that as this has been considered to be a "targeted" consultation, vast numbers of residents and</p>	N	<p>The Applicant confirms that consultation has been undertaken in accordance with the PA 2008, which allows for a bespoke and proportionate approach to further consultation. The</p>

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	stakeholders who have an interest in this project have not been given the opportunity to engage in this part of the process.		targeted consultation focused specifically on the inclusion of land within the Scheme boundary to facilitate connection into Weston Marsh Substation B. On this basis, the Applicant considers the consultation approach to be appropriate and consistent with relevant legislation and guidance. Further details of the approach and justification for the approach are set out in the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 5.1).
	Members of various local councils affected by the project were not informed in suitable time frame. South Holland District Council were not notified of this targeted consultation until 19 th January, 11 days after the consultation had begun, removing substantial time from the already short timeframe of 8 th January - 5 th February. It is also important to note that those that may have been notified about this consultation had a further reduced window due to a complete broadband outage in the area due to cable theft for a 5-day period. Meaningful public consultation must be inclusive, proportionate to the scale of change, and accessible. Limiting engagement at this stage undermines confidence in the process and risks prejudicing community trust.	N	The Applicant refutes the claim that Members of local councils were not notified of the additional targeted consultation prior to the date referenced. Members received email notification ahead of the commencement of the targeted consultation, and councils were issued with both a hard copy letter and an email inviting their participation in the additional targeted consultation. The Applicant also notes that requests for extensions of time to respond to the targeted consultation have been accommodated throughout the consultation process, in order to encourage meaningful participation. With regard to the reported broadband outage, the Applicant notes that this was not in proximity to the proposed change being consulted upon.
	I consider the information provided to be insufficient to and very poorly presented with no overall complete current planned connection route being shown. Meaning I and other members of the public are unable to fully understand and assess the cumulative impacts of this proposal alongside the nearby Grimsby to Walpole project, as well as the multiple other projects feeding into the substations.	N	The Applicant considers that the information provided during the additional targeted consultation was adequate and appropriate for that stage in the process. The Applicant also confirms that consultees were invited to contact the Community Relations Team by phone or email throughout the targeted consultation period to discuss the Scheme in more detail or seek clarification.
	2. Objection to the "Targeted Consultation" and Expansion I am specifically alarmed by the recent inclusion of additional land in the latest consultation phase. It appears the developer is expanding the footprint further onto high-quality agricultural plots. Furthermore, the "targeted" nature of this consultation has lacked transparency, leaving many affected residents with insufficient time or notification to review the technical impacts of new substation boundaries and cable routes.	N	In terms of the Scheme's footprint, as shown in ES Figure 3-1: Targeted Consultation Changes Since Statutory Consultation (Doc Ref. 6.2), the overall area of the Scheme has reduced. For comparison, the total area of the Site within the Order Limits for the DCO submission is 1,511 hectares, whereas the total area within the draft Order Limits presented at the PEIR stage was 2,121 hectares. As such, the inclusion of additional land consulted upon does not represent a substantial expansion of the overall development. The Applicant considers that the information provided during the additional targeted consultation was adequate and appropriate for that stage in the process, and that the consultation approach was consistent with relevant legislation and guidance. Further details are provided within the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 5.1).

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	<p>2. Objection to the "Targeted Consultation" and Expansion</p> <p>I am specifically alarmed by the recent inclusion of additional land in the latest consultation phase. It appears the developer is expanding the footprint further onto high-quality agricultural plots. Furthermore, the ""targeted"" nature of this consultation has lacked transparency, leaving many affected residents with insufficient time or notification to review the technical impacts of new substation boundaries and cable routes.</p>	N	<p>In terms of the Scheme's footprint, as shown in ES Figure 3-1: Targeted Consultation Changes Since Statutory Consultation (Doc Ref. 6.2), the overall area of the Scheme has reduced. For comparison, the total area of the Site within the Order Limits for the DCO submission is 1,511 hectares, whereas the total area within the draft Order Limits presented at the PEIR stage was 2,121 hectares. As such, the inclusion of additional land consulted upon does not represent a substantial expansion of the overall development.</p> <p>The Applicant considers that the information provided during the additional targeted consultation was adequate and appropriate for that stage in the process, and that the consultation approach was consistent with relevant legislation and guidance. Further details are provided within the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 5.1).</p>
	This means your proposal should be subject to a wider consultation;	N	The Applicant considers that the information provided during the additional targeted consultation was adequate and appropriate for that stage in the process, and that the consultation approach was consistent with relevant legislation and guidance. Further details are provided within the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 5.1).
	There was no discernible publicity for this consultation, even though you have said anyone is welcome to comment;	N	The Applicant considers that relevant parties were notified of the consultation, as set out within the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 5.1).
	Some only found out about this consultation by chance, many days into the start of an already short consultation period;	N	<p>The Applicant considers that relevant parties were notified of the consultation, as set out within the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 5.1), and were provided with a minimum of 28-days to respond.</p> <p>The Applicant also notes that requests for extensions of time to respond to the targeted consultation have been accommodated throughout the consultation process, in order to encourage meaningful participation.</p>
	I am expecting that, if you are serious about consultation, you will begin this process again with publicity and with information about all of the above.	N	The Applicant remains confident in its approach throughout the consultation process. As such, it does not consider it to be necessary to undertake any further rounds of consultation.
	This approach does not meet the standards set out in the Planning Act 2008 or Meridian's own Statement of Community Consultation. All affected residents have a right to be informed and to participate meaningfully in the process.	N	<p>The Applicant does not agree that the approach adopted fails to meet the requirements of the PA 2008 or the commitments set out in the SoCC. The PA 2008 allows for a bespoke and proportionate approach to further consultation where appropriate. The additional targeted consultation focused specifically on the inclusion of land within the Scheme boundary to facilitate the connection into Weston Marsh Substation B, and the Applicant considers the approach taken to be appropriate and consistent with relevant legislation and guidance.</p> <p>Relevant parties were notified of the consultation, as set out in the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 5.1), and were provided with a minimum of 28 days in which to respond.</p>
	<p>I therefore request that Meridian:</p> <p>1. Widens the consultation area to include all affected parties</p>	N	The Applicant considers that the additional targeted consultation was appropriately defined and proportionate to the nature of the additional inclusion of land. The consultation area was identified with reference to the potential new or different effects (in EIA terms) arising from the inclusion of the additional land, together with affected land

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	<p>2. Extends the deadline to allow proper engagement</p> <p>3. Provides clear justification for how the consultation boundary was defined</p>		<p>interests, statutory consultees and community stakeholders. Further details are set out in the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 5.1).</p> <p>Parties were provided with a minimum period of 28 days in which to respond. Where requests for additional time were received, these were considered on a case-by-case basis to facilitate meaningful participation.</p>
	<p>This project must be subject to fair, transparent, and inclusive consultation – not selective engagement.</p>	N	<p>The Applicant considers the consultation undertaken to be fair, transparent, and inclusive and remains confident in its approach throughout the consultation process.</p>
	<p>I object to the way Meridian Solar Farm has handled its additional consultation. The proposed extension to the Weston Marsh substation area affects far more residents than were notified. I was not informed and only became aware through word of mouth.</p>	N	<p>The Applicant considers that relevant parties were notified of the consultation, as set out within the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 5.1).</p>
	<p>The developers have failed to engage in meaningful consultation and should re-consult when more information is readily available for the public to submit informed feedback.</p>	N	<p>The Applicant remains confident that the information issued for the consultation provided adequate information for community involvement and invited participation.</p>
	<p>I am submitting this objection in response to Meridian Solar Farm's "Additional Targeted Consultation" published on 8 January 2026. My concern relates not to the technical content of the proposed changes, but to the legality, adequacy, and fairness of the consultation process itself, which I believe does not comply with the requirements of the Planning Act 2008 or the commitments set out in the project's Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC).</p>	N	<p>The Applicant does not agree that the approach adopted fails to meet the requirements of the PA 2008 or the commitments set out in the SoCC. The Act allows for a bespoke and proportionate approach to further consultation where appropriate. The additional targeted consultation focused specifically on the inclusion of land within the Scheme boundary to facilitate the connection into Weston Marsh Substation B, and the Applicant considers the approach taken to be appropriate and consistent with relevant legislation and guidance.</p> <p>Relevant parties were notified of the consultation, as set out in the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 5.1), and were provided with a minimum of 28 days in which to respond.</p>
	<p>2. Failure to Notify All Affected Parties</p> <p>Meridian has stated that this is a "targeted" consultation. However, notification was sent only to a very small number of households in the immediate vicinity of the newly affected land parcels.</p> <p>This is procedurally inadequate because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed changes extend the land take and alter the project boundary, which has implications beyond the handful of properties notified. • The changes have potential impacts on traffic, construction disturbance, landscape character, cumulative visual effects, drainage, ecology, and agricultural operations across a much wider area. 	N	<p>The Applicant considers that the additional targeted consultation was appropriately defined and proportionate to the nature of the additional inclusion of land. The consultation area was identified with reference to the potential new or different effects (in EIA terms) arising from the inclusion of the additional land, together with affected land interests, statutory consultees and community stakeholders. Further details are set out in the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 5.1).</p>

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residents who are demonstrably affected by these changes were not informed, despite being within the zone of influence. 		
	<p>3. Non-Compliance with the Planning Act 2008</p> <p>Under Sections 42, 47 and 48 of the Planning Act 2008, developers must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consult all persons who may be affected by the development Follow the methodology set out in their own SoCC Ensure that consultation is fair, transparent, and accessible By limiting notification to a small cluster of residents, Meridian has failed to meet the statutory requirement to consult all affected parties. <p>The Planning Inspectorate has repeatedly emphasised that consultation must be proportionate to the scale and impact of the change, not merely convenient for the developer."</p>	N	<p>The Applicant does not agree that the approach adopted fails to meet the requirements of the PA 2008, which allows for a bespoke and proportionate approach to further consultation where appropriate. Further justification is set out in the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 5.1).</p>
	<p>4. Inconsistency with the Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC)</p> <p>Meridian's SoCC commits the developer to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Engage openly with the community Notify affected residents of changes Provide accessible information Ensure meaningful participation <p>Restricting notification to a handful of households is inconsistent with these commitments and undermines the integrity of the consultation process.</p>	N	<p>The Applicant considers that in undertaking the additional targeted consultation, it engaged openly with those affected by the proposed inclusion of land and promoted meaningful participation.</p> <p>The Applicant further notes that Section 7 of the SoCC states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>"If, following the statutory consultation, we consider it is necessary to undertake further localised, targeted or supplementary consultation, this would be undertaken, so far as relevant and proportionate, in accordance with the principles and methods set out in this SoCC."</i>
	<p>5. Risk of Prejudicing the Examination</p> <p>If the developer proceeds on the basis of an inadequate consultation, this risks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prejudicing the rights of affected residents Compromising the fairness of the Examination Triggering a request for the Planning Inspectorate to require reconsultation 	N	<p>The Applicant considers that the additional targeted consultation was appropriately defined and proportionate to the nature of the additional inclusion of land.</p>

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potentially delaying acceptance of the DCO application <p>It is in the interests of both the community and the developer that the consultation is conducted properly.</p>		
	<p>6. Requested Actions</p> <p>I formally request that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Meridian widens the consultation to include all residents and stakeholders affected by the expanded land take and associated impacts. The consultation period is extended to allow meaningful participation by those who were not notified. The Planning Inspectorate is informed of the procedural shortcomings and provided with evidence of how Meridian intends to rectify them. All consultation materials are made available through the same channels used during the statutory consultation, including direct mail, website updates, and public notices. 	N	<p>The Applicant considers that the additional targeted consultation was appropriately defined and proportionate to the nature of the additional inclusion of land. The consultation area was identified with reference to the potential new or different effects (in EIA terms) arising from the inclusion of the additional land, together with affected land interests, statutory consultees and community stakeholders. Further details are set out in the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 5.1).</p> <p>A 28-day consultation period was provided, consistent with the principles set out in the SoCC and relevant guidance. Where requests for additional time were received, these were considered, and extensions were granted on a case-by-case basis to promote meaningful participation</p> <p>All consultation materials were made available on the Scheme website and were issued by email and hard copy to relevant parties as appropriate, further details of which are set out in the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 5.1)</p>
	<p>7. Conclusion</p> <p>The current additional consultation is not legally or procedurally adequate. It fails to notify all affected parties, does not reflect the commitments in the SoCC, and risks undermining the fairness of the DCO process.</p> <p>I therefore request that the consultation be reissued, expanded, and extended to ensure compliance with the Planning Act 2008 and to uphold the principles of transparency and community engagement.</p>	N	<p>The Applicant notes this but has addressed the points raised above and considers the consultation to have been undertaken in line with all relevant legislation and guidance.</p>
	<p>I have not had any contact since I emailed [redacted] the said he had sent my questions to the relevant team!</p>	N	<p>The Applicant responded to enquiries via the project email address and can confirm that all queries received were logged and forwarded to the relevant technical team for consideration and response.</p>
	<p>I am writing to object to the way Meridian Solar Farm has conducted its "Additional Targeted Consultation" (8 January - 5 February 2026).</p> <p>The proposed extension to the Weston Marsh substation area affects a much wider group of residents than those who were notified. Many of us only became aware of the consultation</p>	N	<p>The Applicant considers that the additional targeted consultation was appropriately defined and proportionate to the nature of the additional inclusion of land. The consultation area was identified with reference to the potential new or different effects (in EIA terms) arising from the inclusion of the additional land, together with affected land interests, statutory consultees and community stakeholders. Further details are set out in the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 5.1).</p>

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	because an affected homeowner flagged it up – not because Meridian made any effort to inform the broader community.		
	The proposed extension to the Weston Marsh substation area affects a much wider group of residents than those who were notified. Many of us only became aware of the consultation because an affected homeowner flagged it up – not because Meridian made any effort to inform the broader community.	N	The Applicant considers that the additional targeted consultation was appropriately defined and proportionate to the nature of the additional inclusion of land. The consultation area was identified with reference to the potential new or different effects (in EIA terms) arising from the inclusion of the additional land, together with affected land interests, statutory consultees and community stakeholders. Further details are set out in the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 5.1).
	This approach does not meet the standards set out in the Planning Act 2008 or Meridian's own Statement of Community Consultation. All affected residents have a right to be informed and to participate meaningfully in the process.	N	The Applicant considers that in undertaking the additional targeted consultation, it engaged openly with those affected by the proposed inclusion of land and promoted meaningful participation. The Applicant further notes that Section 7 of the SoCC states: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "If, following the statutory consultation, we consider it is necessary to undertake further localised, targeted or supplementary consultation, this would be undertaken, so far as relevant and proportionate, in accordance with the principles and methods set out in this SoCC."
	I therefore request that Meridian: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Widens the consultation area to include all affected parties" 2. Extends the deadline to allow proper engagement 3. Provides clear justification for how the consultation boundary was defined 	N	The Applicant considers that in undertaking the additional targeted consultation, it engaged openly with those affected by the proposed inclusion of land and promoted meaningful participation. The consultation area was identified with reference to the potential new or different effects (in EIA terms) arising from the inclusion of the additional land, together with affected land interests, statutory consultees and community stakeholders. Further details are set out in the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 5.1).
	This project must be subject to fair, transparent, and inclusive consultation – not selective engagement.	N	The Applicant considers that in undertaking the additional targeted consultation, it engaged openly with those affected by the proposed inclusion of land and promoted meaningful participation.
	This is a serious issue preventing the community from accessing any online information and responding to the consultation adding further weight to our call for a full meaningful targeted consultation on the additional land proposed. We trust that you will seek to do the right thing and to fully involve the community before attempting to move further into the planning the process.	N	With regard to the reported broadband outage, the Applicant notes that this was not in proximity to the proposed change being consulted upon. The Applicant also notes that requests for extensions of time to respond to the targeted consultation have been accommodated throughout the consultation process, in order to encourage meaningful participation.
	I am very disappointed that you are not consulting or listening, you are just pushing through with the idea with no thought for	N	The Applicant does not agree with this comment and notes that the Scheme has evolved at each stage in response to feedback received through consultation and ongoing engagement.

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	<p>the long-term impacts on the villages and the communities that will be affected.</p> <p>Please could you explain why a scheme that will not benefit local people and will be of detrimental to the land is being given so little thought.</p>		
	<p>With regard to the actual requirements for more land there is very little detail on what the land is to be used for. There is a map which has very little detail and the only information about the additional land is this statement:</p> <p>“Construction of the overhead line would take place within this area, and infrastructure within this land would include pylons and the overhead line itself. The full extent of the fields has been included to provide flexibility during detailed design, including consideration of the nearby Grimsby to Walpole project, which is also proposing an overhead line through this area. The Meridian Solar Farm overhead line is intended to run generally parallel to the Grimsby to Walpole route.”</p> <p>When stating “The Meridian Solar Farm overhead line is intended to run generally parallel to the Grimsby to Walpole route.”</p> <p>This statement assumes that the G-W route is definitely going ahead. No decision has been made.</p>	N	<p>The Applicant notes these concerns remains confident that the information issued for the consultation provided adequate time for community involvement and invited participation. The Applicant continues to engage with National Grid Electricity Transmission in respect of the proposed Weston Marsh B Substation and will determine the most appropriate course of action should the substation proposals change in the future.</p>
	<p>Further to our earlier objection that details the lack of meaningful consultation, we at LAND wish to point out that over 2000 local homes have been without internet access for over 7 days during this consultation period following cable thefts.</p>	N	<p>The Applicant remains confident that the information issued for the consultation provided adequate time for community involvement and invited participation.</p> <p>With regard to the reported broadband outage, the Applicant notes that this was not in proximity to the proposed change being consulted upon; however, for extensions of time to respond to the targeted consultation have been accommodated throughout the consultation process, in order to encourage meaningful participation.</p>
	<p>I am writing to formally object to the additional targeted consultation in relation to Meridian Solar's proposed connection to the proposed, and as yet undetermined plans for the Weston Marsh Substations.</p> <p>Whilst I note that this consultation is only in relation to updated information from the National Grid Electricity Transmission, I have significant concerns regarding both the changes themselves and the manner in which the consultation has been conducted</p>	N	<p>The Applicant notes this objection but considers that the additional targeted consultation was appropriately defined and proportionate to the nature of the additional inclusion of land.</p> <p>The Applicant continues to engage with National Grid Electricity Transmission in respect of the proposed Weston Marsh Substation and will determine the most appropriate course of action should the substation proposals change in the future.</p>

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	<p>object to the proposed expansion of the Meridian solar farm on the basis that the developers have failed to detail the land size, use and mitigation.</p> <p>The developers have failed to engage in meaningful consultation and should re-consult when more information is readily available for the public to submit informed.</p>	N	The Applicant considers that the additional targeted consultation was appropriately defined and proportionate to the nature of the additional inclusion of land.
	I object to the proposed acquisition of additional land in connection with the Meridian Solar Farm, and wish to express my serious concern over the lack of transparency, and lack of proper meaningful consultation with the Meridian Action Group.	N	The Applicant considers that the additional targeted consultation was appropriately defined and proportionate to the nature of the additional inclusion of land.
	The 'consultation' has been very restricted to those near to the site but as it's a no through road all residents of Marsh Road use it and everyone should have been consulted. We live here and deserve more detailed information about what your company are proposing. We had no letter! This is a failure in the consultation process. I and my neighbours were not informed and we will see this area from our homes.. The line of pylons will affect many residents in the area so this should have been consulted on much more widely. This is a totally inadequate consultation. This is a failure to follow NSIP guidance to hold meaningful consultation.	N	<p>The Applicant considers that the additional targeted consultation was appropriately defined and proportionate to the nature of the additional inclusion of land.</p> <p>The consultation area was identified with reference to the potential new or different effects (in EIA terms) arising from the inclusion of the additional land, together with affected land interests, statutory consultees and community stakeholders. Further details are set out in the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 5.1).</p>
	<p>Given the statement "The intention for the overhead lines to run broadly parallel" which we had been led to believe had been dismissed by Meridian representatives would indicate another change to the plans around the solar generation site.</p> <p>If this is the case, there been no consultation with those affected in these areas and this consultation has caused further anxieties to those potentially affected. (This being an elderly family member with no internet access or IT skills who has not been catered for in any of your processes).</p>	N	<p>The Applicant confirms that the consultation undertaken was proportionate to the proposed change and consistent with the approach set out in the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 5.1).</p> <p>The Applicant has sought to make consultation as accessible as reasonably practicable, including issuing hard copy correspondence where appropriate and making materials available in alternative formats on request. Details of the consultation methods and accessibility measures are set out in the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 5.1).</p>
	<p>I object to the adequacy of the current targeted consultation and request that the applicant undertakes a broader and more comprehensive consultation exercise, supported by clear, detailed, and accessible information, before progressing further.</p> <p>Please ensure that this objection is formally recorded and taken into account as part of this consultation process.</p>	N	The Applicant considers that the additional targeted consultation was appropriately defined and proportionate to the nature of the additional inclusion of land.

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	Due to the lack of publicity, lack of information detailing the size of the extra land, in addition to what and where any new infrastructure is to be placed, I suggest that the current consultation is suspended and restarted with a new timeline and adequate information to make it worthwhile.	N	The Applicant considers that the additional targeted consultation was appropriately defined and proportionate to the nature of the additional inclusion of land.
	The timing of the start of the consultation, immediately after Christmas is ill timed.	N	The consultation period was scheduled to commence following the Christmas and New Year holiday period, at a point when normal business operations and community activities had resumed. The Applicant considers that this timing allowed consultees an appropriate opportunity to review the materials and provide feedback within the consultation period.
	During this period there had been an internet outage of quite a wide area that would have affected residents ability to stay informed or provide feedback. There still is an issue for some residents, and although not Meridians fault, this must be a consideration, and the consultation window should be extended.	N	With regard to the reported broadband outage, the Applicant notes that this was not in proximity to the proposed change being consulted upon. The Applicant also notes that requests for extensions of time to respond to the targeted consultation have been accommodated throughout the consultation process, in order to encourage meaningful participation.
	Meridian continue to have no regard for the residents living in the communities that they wish to industrialise, despite in their consolation and engagement approach. Consultation objectives Consultation approach statement "ensure that the Scheme is listening to and learning from the people who live in the area" is not happening.	N	The Applicant does not agree with this comment and notes that the Scheme has evolved at each stage in response to feedback received through consultation and ongoing engagement.
	"When stating "" This has required the inclusion of additional land within the Scheme boundary to facilitate our grid connection to the proposed Weston Marsh Substation B."" Again, it is assumed that this Substation will be going ahead. No decision has been made. The information provided in this additional targeted consultation, serves no purpose due to its lack of detail and reasoning that it makes this consultation invalid and clearly demonstrates a tick box exercise by Meridian with no real facts.	N	The Applicant considers that the information provided during the additional targeted consultation was adequate and appropriate for that stage in the process. The Applicant continues to engage with National Grid Electricity Transmission in respect of the proposed Weston Marsh Substation and will determine the most appropriate course of action should the substation proposals change in the future.
	The introduction of new pylons, overhead lines, and associated infrastructure would potentially create significant landscape, visual, heritage, and amenity impacts for affected communities and landowners. In my view, these changes go beyond a minor technical amendment and warrant a more comprehensive and transparent consultation process.	N	The Applicant considers that the information provided during the additional targeted consultation was adequate and appropriate for that stage in the process. The scope and content of the consultation were informed by consideration of any potential changes to likely significant effects (in EIA term) associated with the inclusion of the land being consulted upon.

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	<p>The present consultation sadly provides no essential information that is required for the project to proceed further. No details are given on –</p> <p>The acreage of the new land in the extended boundary</p>	N	<p>The Applicant considers that the information provided during the additional targeted consultation was adequate and appropriate for that stage in the process.</p> <p>Should any consultees notified after the commencement of the additional targeted consultation have required additional time to respond, they were encouraged to contact the Community Relations Team to discuss appropriate arrangements through additional wording included in the reissued letters</p>
	<p>I object to the proposed expansion of the Meridian solar farm on the basis that the developers have failed to detail the land size, use and mitigation.</p> <p>The developers have failed to engage in meaningful consultation and should re-consult when more information is readily available for the public to submit informed feedback.</p>	N	<p>The Applicant considers that the information provided during the additional targeted consultation was adequate and appropriate for the pre-application stage.</p>
	<p>The size of the additional land has not been specified</p>	N	<p>The Applicant remains confident that the information issued for the consultation provided adequate time for community involvement and invited participation.</p>
Additional infrastructure (need for and associated effects)	<p>I am objecting to your current targeted consultation on the following grounds:</p> <p>Your proposal for more land at the proposed site for substations at Weston Marsh, not yet approved, to accommodate infrastructure is more than a minor amendment;</p>	N	<p>In terms of the Scheme's footprint, as shown in ES Figure 3-1: Targeted Consultation Changes Since Statutory Consultation (Doc Ref. 6.2), the overall area of the Scheme has reduced. For comparison, the total area of the Site within the Order Limits for the DCO submission is 1,511 hectares, whereas the total area within the draft Order Limits presented at the PEIR stage was 2,121 hectares. As such, the inclusion of additional land consulted upon does not represent a substantial expansion of the overall development.</p> <p>The Applicant therefore considers the consultation to have been proportionate and in line with relevant legislation and guidance.</p>
	<p>NOISE POLLUTION</p> <p>It is clear from other interconnector substations located in South Lincolnshire, there is a background noise which is generated from the electrical equipment, including pylons.</p> <p>Certainly, a number of the residential properties along Marsh Road will hear this background humming from these pylons and which will only be exacerbated by the proposed Substations. The electrical equipment will undoubtedly affect the quiet enjoyment of these properties. None of the information we saw at the consultation days addressed the levels of noise which pylons, and the Substations, would generate once operating.</p>	N	<p>The Scheme changes consulted on as part of the additional targeted consultation have been assessed within the Environmental Statement. In terms of noise and landscape and visual potential impacts, these have been assessed in ES Chapter 13: Noise and Vibration (Doc Ref. 6.1).</p>
	<p>No matters the direction the pylons connect into the substation there will be a very serious impact on the enjoyment, health and wealth of our clients by locating pylons</p>	N	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the concerns raised regarding potential impacts on neighbouring properties. Throughout the pre-application stage, the Applicant has sought to assess potential effects on residential amenity and to engage with local residents. The</p>

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	<p>in this area. This statement can be multiplied many times over when you consider the cumulative impact of the two substations (or more) and all the overhead powerlines connecting into these. Only minimal and selective information has been made available, and we ask Meridian to provide the data behind the sound generation from these proposed pylons /</p> <p>powerlines as well the data to prove there are no health risks presented by living next to these for the long term. The lack of this information and where the pylons will be located means this consultation is null and void in many senses.</p>		<p>findings of these assessments, together with proposed mitigation measures, are presented in the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.1), including the assessment of operational noise within ES Chapter 13: Noise and Vibration (Doc Ref. 6.1).</p>
	<p>We have received the enclosed consultation and development consent order from Meridian (Planning Inspectorate Reference: EN010169) seeking our feedback to including additional land within the boundary identified for the siting of the Weston Marsh Substation B proposal for connectivity purposes. As the map enclosed shows, the additional land would virtually come right outside our house at Sunnyfield House at Weston Marsh ruining our natural view, our natural view of the countryside, whilst severely impacting the natural habitat and nature that we have around Sunnyfield House in Weston Marsh. We feel that our ability to live our lives in peace. with countryside around us is being destroyed by this proposal. We are both in the latter parts of our lives and we want to live our remaining years in peace.</p> <p>It is also not clear from the consultation what the additional connectivity requirements on this land are. are they solar panels, overhead lines, pylons or other obstruction that will further obstruct our view from our home.</p>	N	<p>The Applicant acknowledges the concerns raised regarding potential impacts on neighbouring properties. Throughout the pre-application stage, the Applicant has sought to assess potential effects on residential amenity and to engage with local residents. The findings of these assessments, together with proposed mitigation measures, are presented in the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.1), including in relation to landscape and visual effects and ecology.</p> <p>Construction of the overhead line would take place within the area identified, with infrastructure comprising pylons and the overhead line itself. The full extent of the fields has been included to provide flexibility during detailed design, including to allow coordination with the nearby Grimsby to Walpole project, which is also proposing an overhead line in this area.</p>
	<p>I have read that you propose making the western marsh substation larger than originally planning was put in for. This is an important area for wildlife .</p> <p>The disruption will have a huge impact on our precious wildlife and on the poor residents who obviously choose to live in the area .</p>	N	<p>The Applicant notes that the Weston Marsh substations being developed as part of NGET's Grimsby to Walpole project are being delivered and consented separately to the Scheme.</p> <p>The Applicant disagrees that the Scheme facilitates the loss and pollution of local wildlife habitats. The impact of the Scheme on wildlife is assessed within ES Chapter 9: Ecology and Biodiversity (Doc Ref. 6.1). The chapter concludes no significant adverse effects are expected. As part of the landscape design for the Scheme, new habitats would be provided to increase biodiversity compared to the existing baseline.</p>

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
			The creation and subsequent management of habitats is set out within the OLEMP (Doc Ref. 7.16), included as part of the DCO Application.
	This proposal is also significantly also impacting our mental and physical health's. We are also worried about the safety of this infrastructure and our nearness to it, as we both have significant disability.	N	<p>The Applicant confirms that the impact of the Scheme on mental wellbeing of local residents has been considered in ES Chapter 10: Human Health (Doc Ref. 6.1), including with relation to the inclusion of land consulted on as part of the additional targeted consultation.</p> <p>The Applicant also notes that, as set out in ES Chapter 10: Human Health (Doc Ref. 6.1), vulnerable groups have been considered in the assessment of likely significant effects, acknowledging that vulnerable groups are likely to be more sensitive to changes.</p>
	This is not acceptable for a project of this scale. The changes involve additional land take and alterations to the red line boundary, which may impact traffic, landscape, ecology, and residential amenity across a wider area. Yet the consultation was limited to a small cluster of properties.	N	<p>The likely significant environmental effects of the Scheme, including those associated with the inclusion of additional land, have been assessed within the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.1), which considers matters such as ecology, landscape and visual effects, and other relevant environmental topics.</p> <p>The Applicant is satisfied that the consultation approach adopted in relation to the additional land was proportionate and appropriate to the nature of the proposed changes and the potential environmental effects identified.</p>
	The infrastructure to be accommodated, its size and positioning has not been specified	N	<p>Construction of the overhead line would take place within this area, and infrastructure within this land would include pylons and the overhead line itself. The full extent of the fields has been included to provide flexibility during detailed design, including consideration of the nearby Grimsby to Walpole project, which is also proposing an overhead line through this area.</p> <p>The Design Parameters (Doc Ref. 7.4) document, submitted as part of the DCO Application, sets out the design parameters for Scheme.</p>
	No details of the proposed pylons, cabling etc., compounds, access routes and haul roads, height and design of any infrastructure	N	<p>Construction of the overhead line would take place within this area, and infrastructure within this land would include pylons and the overhead line itself. The full extent of the fields has been included to provide flexibility during detailed design, including consideration of the nearby Grimsby to Walpole project, which is also proposing an overhead line through this area.</p>
	The non explained about what infrastructure is going to be put on the field next to me Pylons? What would be needed by yourself to install?	N	<p>Construction of the overhead line would take place within this area, and infrastructure within this land would include pylons and the overhead line itself. The full extent of the fields has been included to provide flexibility during detailed design, including consideration of the nearby Grimsby to Walpole project, which is also proposing an overhead line through this area.</p>
	The non explained about what infrastructure is going to be put on the field next to me Pylons? What would be needed by yourself to install?		<p>Construction of the overhead line would take place within this area, and infrastructure within this land would include pylons and the overhead line itself. The full extent of the fields has been included to provide flexibility during detailed design, including</p>

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	<p>PYLONS:</p> <p>There is a complete lack of detail as to where pylons will be located adjacent to the substation and the exact location of the connection. We would appeal to Meridian to ensure the pylons are as far away as possible from residential properties. Although substation B is likely to be located adjacent to my client's property, the powerlines may end up being even closer and even if they are not, they will be adding to the cumulative hugely negative impact in this location.</p>	N	<p>consideration of the nearby Grimsby to Walpole project, which is also proposing an overhead line through this area.</p> <p>The precise siting of pylons within the connection corridor will be informed by detailed surveys, technical constraints, environmental considerations and engineering requirements, and will be located within the parameters shown in the submitted plans.</p> <p>In developing the Scheme, the Applicant has sought, where reasonably practicable, to minimise impacts on residential amenity, including through routeing and design refinement. The assessment of likely significant effects, including cumulative effects, is presented in the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.1).</p>
<p>Effects associated with construction (relating to additional land or additional infrastructure)</p>	<p>This is a regular hacking area for us and our horses so would have a huge impact while building.</p>	N	<p>ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access (Doc 6.1) includes an assessment of the impact on the Scheme on Road Safety which concludes no significant effects are expected with the implementation of measures contained within the OCTMP (Doc. Ref. 7.13).</p>
	<p>Public Highway – Road Widening</p> <p>There is no detail regarding access for installing these pylons. All the proposed road widening outlined by National Grid is still at consultation stage so there is no certainty with regards to any of this. With the additional infrastructure for Meridian, this would only add to the impact of increased traffic. As we have previously stated to National Grid, it would be far better to bring in a new haul road from the A17 following the route of existing farm tracks or if this is not possible, there is an alternative route where a diversion could be taken off Stonegate and then follow an existing north/south farm track.</p> <p>This would significantly reduce the number of temporary roads and the number of temporary road improvements on Stonegate and Marsh Road as well as mean the construction traffic is taken off the Public Highway as quickly as possible.</p> <p>We have been informed at previous consultation events concerning different Utility projects that a huge number of lorry movements will be required every day in order import the stone, materials and equipment to the substation sites. This would be enhanced further by Meridian having a severely negative impact on the quiet enjoyment of residential properties in this area and will undoubtedly over burden single track roads with poor foundations.</p>	N	<p>All proposed construction, operational and decommissioning accesses are shown in ES Figure 2-5: Construction, Operational and Decommissioning Accesses (Doc Ref. 6.2) and listed in Table 2-2 of ES Chapter 2: The Scheme (Doc Ref. 6.1).</p> <p>As stated within ES Chapter 2: The Scheme (Doc Ref. 6.1) within the Grid Connection Route, a temporary construction haul route would follow the alignment to enable construction works.</p> <p>The likely significant effects of the Scheme on traffic has been assessed within ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access (Doc Ref. 6.1) which concludes that no significant effects are anticipated, subject to the implementation of the mitigation measures set out in the OCTMP (Doc Ref. 7.13).</p> <p>In terms of the concern regarding the impact of noise on residential properties, this has been assessed in ES Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration (Doc Ref. 6.1). No significant effects are expected except during the construction phase at properties along Langary Gate Road during peak construction activity and at a receptor at Broad Gate associated with HDD activities if they are required at night.</p>

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	It will impact much more than the immediate area because of construction traffic, heavy loads movements and enabling cable connections over many miles;	N	The Applicant notes this comment and confirms that ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access (Doc Ref. 6.1) assesses the impact of the Scheme on traffic levels during construction. The assessment concludes that no significant effects are anticipated, subject to the implementation of the mitigation measures set out in the OCTMP (Doc Ref. 7.13).
Additional land (need)	As a resident, within impact from meridians new land is needed! I am very concerned and worried	N	<p>The Applicant notes this comment.</p> <p>The Applicant appreciates that the potential for the Scheme to have adverse effects creates uncertainty and anxiety for local residents. The Applicant is committed to ongoing consultation with the community so that anxieties can be communicated and, as far as possible, addressed throughout all stages of the Scheme.</p> <p>The Applicant confirms that the impact of the Scheme on mental wellbeing of local residents has been considered in ES Chapter 10: Human Health (Doc Ref. 6.1).</p>

4. General Feedback

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
Loss of BMV land	Respondents claimed the proposal of the Scheme on prime agricultural land would threaten food production in the UK	N	<p>The Applicant thanks consultees for providing responses to the targeted consultation. The Applicant notes that these comments raise a general objection to the principle of the Scheme, rather than relating to a specific change on which feedback was sought or a theme specifically relevant to the targeted consultation. As such, a detailed response has not been provided.</p> <p>Responses to the matters raised during the statutory consultation are set out in Appendix H – Section 42 Applicant's Response (Doc Ref. 5.1) and Appendix I – Section 47 Applicant's Response (Doc Ref. 5.1). The Applicant considers that the feedback on the Scheme has been adequately addressed through those responses.</p> <p>The Applicant also notes there will be further opportunities for stakeholders and members of the public to provide their views during the Examination stage of the DCO process.</p> <p>The likely significant effects of the Scheme have been assessed within the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.1) which includes the following chapters:</p> <p>Chapter 1: Introduction Chapter 2: The Scheme Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution Chapter 4: Overview of the EIA Process Chapter 5: Agriculture and Soils Chapter 6: Air Quality Chapter 7: Climate Change Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage Chapter 9: Ecology and Biodiversity Chapter 10: Human Health Chapter 11: Hydrology and Flood Risk Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual Chapter 13: Noise and Vibration Chapter 14: Socio-Economics and Land Use Chapter 15: Traffic and Access Chapter 16: Other Environmental Topics:</p>
Indicative overhead line (general)	Respondents objected to the proposed overhead grid connection, citing concerns about harm to designated heritage assets, loss of high-grade agricultural land, and wider landscape impacts. Respondents also expressed concerns about cumulative effects alongside other electricity infrastructure in the area and suggested that underground cabling would be a more appropriate alternative.	N	
Cultural heritage	Respondents felt the Scheme harmed local heritage and referenced NPPF requirements for Listed Buildings and Scheduled Monuments.	N	
Landscape and visual impact	Respondents complained about the potential impact of the Scheme on the local landscape Respondents referenced the Southeast Lincolnshire Local Plan (SELLP) Policies and claimed the Scheme did not meet the requirements in the Local Plan.	N	
Cumulative impact	Respondents complained of the cumulative impact of several solar developments in Lincolnshire, claiming it was industrialising the landscape. Respondents felt the cumulative impact of all the proposals would be horrendous for residents.	N	
General - objection	Respondents objected to the Scheme. Respondents expressed their support for the response submitted by Meridian Action Group (MAG)	N	
Highways - access	Respondents are concerned about the access to their property as a result of the construction activity, including access for emergency services	N	
Human health	Respondents expressed concerns regarding the impact to human health, as a result of residing next to a solar farm and the associated infrastructure of such scale.	N	
Hydrology	Respondents raised concern regarding the potential flood risks as a result of the solar farms in the area.	N	

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
Property value	Respondents complained the Scheme would result in the devaluation of their property	N	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Electric and Magnetic Fields; • Glint and Glare; • Major Accidents and Disasters; • Materials and Waste. • Chapter 17: Effect Interactions • Chapter 18: Summary of Likely Significant Effects. <p>Proposed mitigation measures are set out in the OCEMP (Doc Ref. 7.10), OOEMP (Doc Ref. 7.11) and ODEMP (Doc Ref. 7.12) and OCTMP (Doc. Ref. 7.13) to limit impacts where practicable.</p> <p>A cumulative effects assessment is presented within each technical chapter of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.1) i.e. Chapter 5 to Chapter 16.</p> <p>In terms of property value, impacts on property prices are not a material consideration under section 104 of the Planning Act 2008, which sets out the matters the Secretary of State must have regard to, which includes the relevant National Policy Statements (NPS), which in this case are NPS EN-1 (Ref 1-17), NPS EN-3 (Ref 1-18) and NPS EN 5. None of these policy documents consider property prices, and this therefore should not be a factor which is considered by the Secretary of State when determining the Application.</p>
Alternatives	Respondents claimed there are alternative sources of energy generation such as wind generation to achieve the energy goals set by the government.	N	

5. Comments Relating to the Additional Targeted Consultation Received under Section 42

5.1. Borough Council of King's Lynn & West Norfolk

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
<p>Borough Council of King's Lynn & West Norfolk</p>	<p>Dear Sirs,</p> <p>Section 42 of the Planning Act 2008 ("the Act"), Regulation 3 of the Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009, and Regulations 11 and 13 of the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 ("the 2017 Regulations"): Meridian Solar</p> <p>Thank you for your letter of 8 January 2026 and for your invitation to respond to your targeted consultation on proposed changes to the Meridian Solar Farm scheme.</p> <p>It is noted that additional land is being included in the Order Limits in order to facilitate an overhead line connection to National Grid's planned Weston Marsh substation B.</p> <p>Given the distance from the boundary of the Borough Council of Kings Lynn and West Norfolk, it is considered that the proposed changes to the scheme will not significantly impact the Council's administrative area.</p> <p>The Council maintains its position that consideration should be given to the routing and control of the transportation of vehicles, equipment and structures during land preparation, construction, and decommissioning. In particular it is expected that controls are put in place to minimise disruption to any roads within or traversing the boundaries of Kings Lynn and West Norfolk, in order to reduce potential traffic and environmental impacts.</p> <p>The Borough Council of Kings Lynn and West Norfolk have no further comments to make at this time.</p> <p>Yours sincerely</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>The Applicant notes this acknowledgement and thanks the Borough Council of King's Lynn & West Norfolk for its response to the additional targeted consultation.</p>

5.2. Cowbit Parish Council

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
Cowbit Parish Council	<p>Good Afternoon</p> <p>Cowbit Parish Council met last night and would like to reiterate their objection to the Meridian Solar installation.</p> <p>Although this particular consultation won't directly impact the village of Cowbit, the construction of the project will cause damage to our roads and properties.</p> <p>Spalding Road has been closed for some months now, due to underground movement which has caused long, deep cracks to open up. The road is to remain closed for the foreseeable future as the cost of repair is thought to be in excess of £4 million. At last night's meeting, we were advised by County Cllr Thomas Sneath, that when it does eventually reopen, it will likely be with a reduced speed and weight limit.</p>	N	<p>The impact of the construction phase of the Scheme has been assessed within the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.1). In terms of damage to roads, as proposed in the OCTMP (Doc Ref. 7.13), a road condition survey will be carried out at several locations during pre-construction, construction and post-construction, to identify any defects that arise to highways assets/verges during the construction phase of the Scheme for reinstatement. This will be secured by the CTMP, which will be prepared in accordance with the OCTMP (Doc Ref. 7.13) and secured by way of Requirement in the Draft DCO (Doc Ref. 3.1).</p> <p>In terms of the concern regarding damage to properties caused by construction traffic, an assessment of traffic vibration this is scoped out of the noise and vibration assessment (ES Chapter 13: Noise and Vibration (Doc Ref. 6.1)) based on DMRB guidance that states if normal road conditions are assumed to be well maintained (smooth and free from irregularities), then traffic induced vibration would not lead to significant adverse effects.</p>
	<p>Cowbit Parish Council also objects to prime agricultural land, for which South Holland is well known for, being used to site 1,000s of solar panels, pylons and power plants.</p> <p>With many regions of the world at war, our country needs to produce more food so that it is less reliant upon imports.</p> <p>Remember, we can eat by candlelight, but we can't eat if there's no food.</p> <p>Yours sincerely</p> <p>For and on behalf of Cowbit Parish Council</p>	N	<p>An assessment of impacts and effects on agriculture and soils is presented within Section 5.8 of ES Chapter 5: Agriculture and Soils (Doc Ref. 6.1). As secured through Requirement 21 of the Draft DCO (Doc Ref. 3.1) and described within ES Chapter 2: The Scheme (Doc Ref. 6.1), all above ground infrastructure associated with the Scheme will be decommissioned at the end of the 40-year operational period. While the duration of operation is long term, the assessment of impacts on agriculture and soils distinguishes between reversible and irreversible land-use change. As no permanent soil sealing is proposed and all infrastructure will be removed, the Scheme does not result in the permanent loss of agricultural land and will not impact food security.</p> <p>The UK Government has identified through its energy policy, most recently in the National Policy Statement (NPS) EN-1³ and NPS EN-3⁴, that there is a critical national priority (CNP) for the provision of nationally significant low carbon infrastructure in the UK, including solar technology. Developing the Scheme at its proposed size will be an important contribution to meeting this need.</p>

³ DESNZ (2025). Overarching NPS for Energy (NPS EN-1). Available at: <https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/6915ba42bc34c86ce4e6e726/overarching-national-policy-statement-for-energy-en-1-web-accessible.pdf> [Accessed 28/11/2025]

⁴ DESNZ (2025). NPS for Renewable Energy Infrastructure (NPS EN-3). Available at: <https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/6915b78bbc34c86ce4e6e71f/national-policy-statement-for-renewable-energy-infrastructure-en-3-web-accessible.pdf> [Accessed 28/11/2025]

5.3. Deeping Parish Council

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
Deeping Parish Council	<p>Dear Downing Meridian,</p> <p>Thank you kindly for the recent additional targeted consultation dated 8 January – 5 February 2026 for the Meridian Solar Farm Development Consent Order; Planning Inspectorate reference EN010169.</p> <p>Further to Deeping St James Parish Council's response dated 19th May 2025 and 14th October 2025; Deeping St James Parish Council would like to continue to object to this proposal at land north of Crowland and east of Spalding, due to loss of high quality arable land.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p>	N	The Applicant notes this objection and thanks Deeping Parish Council for its consultation response.

5.4. Environment Agency

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
Environment Agency	<p>Dear Sir/Madam</p> <p>Meridian Solar Farm Ltd Targeted Consultation Land east of A16 centred around Whaplode Drove, Lincolnshire.</p> <p>Thank you for consulting us on the above, which we received by post 13.01.2026. We have reviewed the changes as described in the consultation letter and accompanying plan ref. MS-WSP-RLB-CHNG-002 dated 06/01/2026.</p> <p>We have no concerns to raise in relation to the changes described.</p> <p>Any changes should be reflected in revised submission documents, including the Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) showing how the scheme has mitigated flood risk to essential infrastructure and any changes in flood risk elsewhere.</p> <p>Yours faithfully</p>	N	<p>The Applicant notes this acknowledgement and thanks the Environment Agency for its consultation response.</p> <p>The Applicant also notes that the flood risk assessment (ES Appendix 11-3: Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) (Doc Ref. 6.3)) has been updated to account for the inclusion of additional land.</p>

5.5. Fenland District Council

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
Fenland District Council	<p>Hello,</p> <p>Thank you for consulting Fenland District Council on the proposed change to your Development Consent Order application.</p> <p>As an adjacent authority, we note that the proposed scheme is in close proximity to the Fenland district and that elements of the accompanying technical assessments extend into, or consider, parts of our administrative area.</p> <p>Having reviewed the proposed change, Fenland District Council can confirm that we have no additional comments to make at this stage. All representations previously submitted during the statutory consultation and the focused consultation remain valid and unchanged.</p> <p>Please continue to keep us informed of any amendments to the anticipated submission timetable for the application, to ensure that we are able to plan accordingly and engage effectively with the examination process, should the application be accepted for examination.</p> <p>Kind regards,</p>	N	The Applicant notes this comment and thanks Fenland District Council for its consultation response.

5.6. Forestry Commission

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
Forestry Commission	<p>Thank you for consulting the Forestry Commission on changes to your project.</p> <p>The proposed changes would not significantly alter our previous comments. Therefore, we have nothing further to add.</p> <p>Best wishes</p>	N	The Applicant notes this comment and thanks the Forestry Commission of its consultation response.

5.7. Historic England

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
Historic England	<p>Additional Targeted Consultation - S42 PIER Response MERIDIAN SOLAR FARM - EN010169</p> <p>Thank you for your letter of 8 January 2026 reconsulting Historic England further to S42 of the Planning Act 2008 - Additional Targeted Consultation (our ref PL00796054)</p> <p>Historic England Advice</p> <p>Having reviewed the additional information provided we wish to highlight the following regarding the scheduled monument of Wykeham Chapel: a moated monastic grange and retreat house (NHLE 1019096) and the associated grade I listed Chapel of St Nicholas (NHLE 1064471). The Meridian connection and the Grimsby to Walpole connection are likely (through visual intrusion) to cause a degree of harm to the significance of these assets within their wider open, agricultural landscape setting.</p>	N	The Applicant confirms that ES Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage (Doc Ref. 6.1) assesses the effects of the Scheme on Wykeham Chapel during construction, operation and decommissioning, including potential cumulative effects associated with other development in the area.
	<p>We note that in the PIER for Meridian a likely significant environmental effect is already identified in respect the Wykeham Chapel designations, hence the latest proposed changes would not introduce a new likely significant effect. However, we note the potentially congested character of the zone to the east of the monument and likely hood that the cumulative impacts and need for separation between lines will heighten visual impacts.</p> <p>On the Grimsby to Walpole scheme the proposed new overhead cable line connecting substation B with the existing overhead cable line to the south is (in the recent SPIER consult on that scheme) is planned to come within approximately 300m of the Wykeham Chapel scheduled monument and Chapel of St Nicholas. Given the presence of the existing overhead line to the east we would like to explore further with you the route and pylon spacing options available to you for your connection.</p>	N	The Applicant has met with Historic England to discuss its response to the consultation including the potential impacts on the Wykeham Chapel. ES Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage (Doc Ref. 6.1) considers the potential impacts of both overhead and underground routing options north of High Road to Weston Marsh B Substation.
	<p>The views from the access route to the Chapel of St Nicholas and beyond to the east, and the views from within the Chapel through the east window are of particular concern.</p>	N	The Applicant Has met with Historic England to discuss the approach to assessing views from the Chapel of St Nicholas. The alignment would be subject to detailed design and the

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	<p>Opportunities for micrositing, including through the rhythm of the pylon placement, should be considered to reduce the impact of the pylons within these views. This will require an integrated approach with the Grimsby to Walpole scheme.</p> <p>We look forwards to continued discussion with you and NGID on how setting effects at this location can best be managed through design.</p>		<p>Applicant notes Historic England's preference for the siting of pylons close to the field boundaries to reduce the prominence of the pylons within these views.</p> <p>The Applicant thanks Historic England for its engagement.</p>

5.8. Lincolnshire County Council

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
Lincolnshire County Council	<p>Dear Sir/Madam,</p> <p>Meridian Solar – Additional targeted consultation: 8 January - 5 February 2026</p> <p>Planning Inspectorate Reference: EN010169</p> <p>Thank you for your letter dated 8 January 2026 inviting Lincolnshire County Council (LCC) to comment as part of an additional targeted consultation exercise that is being carried out to gather feedback on a further change to the Scheme to accommodate additional land within the Scheme boundary to the north. We understand that this change is to facilitate the grid connection to the new Weston Marsh Substation B location.</p> <p>LCC, as host authority, has reviewed the information provided and sets out the comments below in response. The Council previously responded to the Meridian Solar Project Statutory Consultation between 24 April and 8 June 2025 (response dated 06 June 2025) and the further consultation between 24 September and 22 October 2025 (response dated 22 October 2025).</p> <p>Notwithstanding any comments raised in this response, please be advised that LCC's responses to those previous consultations remain valid and should be read alongside the additional comments provided in this letter.</p>	N	The Applicant thanks Lincolnshire County Council for its response to the additional targeted consultation and notes that its previous responses to consultation remain valid.
	Order Limit Extension	N	The Applicant notes this comment.

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	LCC note the extensions to the Meridian Solar Order Limits proposed within the consultation information booklet. Notwithstanding any further details to be provided as part of the application submission, the extensions to the Order Limits do not appear to raise any significant 'new' issues. LCC would refer to comments made within the previous Statutory Consultation and Further Consultation responses, per topic areas. It is noted that the additional land take does not include any County Farms Land.		
	<p>Ecology</p> <p>LCC would highlight the following points in relation to ecology:</p> <p>Where new areas of land have been added to the Order limits, the applicant will need to ensure that appropriate ecological surveys are undertaken to inform the ecological impact assessment and BNG calculations.</p> <p>Where new drain or watercourse crossings are proposed, the applicant will need to ensure that appropriate ecological surveys have been undertaken to identify potential impacts on protected species such as otter and water vole.</p>	N	The Applicant notes this comment and confirms the additional land has been included within the scope of ecology surveys contained within ES 9-1 to 9-12 (Doc Ref. 6.1) and the BNG calculations contained within the Biodiversity Net Gain Report (Doc Ref. 7.9).
	<p>Agricultural Land</p> <p>No further comments to make on this change, please refer to previous comments made in the two aforementioned consultations.</p>	N	The Applicant notes this comment.
	<p>Access and rights of way</p> <p>No further comments to make on this change, please refer to previous comments made in the two aforementioned consultations.</p>	N	The Applicant notes this comment.
	<p>Archaeology</p> <p>Whilst LCC has no objection in principle to the amendment of the redline boundary for Meridan on archaeological grounds, we note that the extension zone brings the scheme infrastructure into close proximity to Wykeham Chapel, a Scheduled Monument and an archaeological site of national significance. We would strongly recommend that the overhead powerline required to facilitate the grid connection at the Weston Marsh substation is routed to the eastern side of the proposed redline boundary extension as far as is practically</p>	N	The Applicant notes these recommendations and confirms that additional land has been appropriately considered within ES Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage (Doc Ref. 6.1). The Applicant has met with Lincolnshire County Council's Historic Buildings and Landscape Officer to discuss its response to the consultation including the potential impacts on the Wykeham Chapel. ES Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage (Doc Ref. 6.1) considers the potential impacts of both overhead and underground routing options north of High Road to Weston Marsh B Substation. The alignment would be subject to detailed design and the Applicant notes Lincolnshire County Council's preference for the siting of pylons close to the field boundaries to reduce the prominence of the pylons within these views.

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	<p>possible. We defer to our Historic Buildings and Landscape officer on comments regarding setting.</p> <p>The area of the proposed redline extension should be subject to the same level of archaeological assessment as has been undertaken for the rest of the scheme. This would consist of the HER data, which has already been done by the Applicant, aerial photographic and LiDAR analysis, geophysical survey and once a route has been identified, archaeological field evaluation of the areas of disturbance. This field evaluation would include pylon bases, works compounds and access tracks. Where the evaluation locates archaeological remains meriting additional intervention, the scope and timing of this would be agreed between LCC, Historic England and the Applicant.</p>		
	<p>Built Heritage</p> <p>The proposed extension to the red line boundary brings the scheme into closer proximity to a cluster of designated heritage assets at Wykeham, comprising:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wykeham Chapel of St Nicholas (Grade I Listed Building, NHLE 1064471) • Wykeham Chapel, moated monastic grange and retreat house (Scheduled Monument, NHLE 1019096) • Gate Pier to Chapel Farmhouse, Weston (Grade II Listed Building, NHLE 1064472) • Chapel Farmhouse, Weston (Grade II Listed Building, NHLE 1147513) <p>While existing vegetation and screening may limit effects, care will be needed to ensure that proposals do not adversely affect key views, glimpses, intervisibility or the wider setting relationships of this heritage group.</p> <p>Similar, proportionate consideration should also be given to Pinchbeck Engine Draining Pump (Grade II Listed Building, NHLE 1146782), even if impacts are ultimately found to be negligible.</p> <p>The extended red line also brings the scheme into closer proximity with a number of non-designated heritage assets, including but not limited to:</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>The Applicant confirms the listed assets have been appropriately considered within ES Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage (Doc Ref. 6.1).</p>

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Marsh Farm (formerly Spalding Marsh Farm), Spalding (MLI122744) Flints Farm, Pinchbeck (MLI122740) Shepherds Farm, Weston (MLI122924) <p>These assets reflect the dispersed historic farmstead character of the area. While impacts are likely to be limited, the applicant should consider whether any of these, either individually or collectively, merit proportionate consideration of group value and rural landscape context.</p>		
	<p>Given the flat and open character of the landscape, this should include consideration of potential wider setting effects (including visibility and intervisibility), rather than focusing solely on immediate surroundings.</p> <p>Any assessment work supporting the boundary extension should therefore:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Address both designated and non-designated heritage assets; Include proportionate consideration of group value and landscape context where relevant; and <p>Consider both immediate and wider setting effects, particularly in relation to visibility in this open landscape.</p>	N	<p>The Applicant confirms the additional land has been considered within ES Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage (Doc Ref. 6.1). The understanding of the wider historic landscape and the setting of heritage assets has been informed by tools such as the ZTV and site visits to determine setting and the extent of intervisibility.</p>
	<p>Hydrology and Flood Risk</p> <p>No further comments to make on this change, please refer to previous comments made in the two aforementioned consultations.</p>	N	<p>The Applicant notes this comment.</p>
	<p>Landscape and Visual</p> <p>AAH Consultants have reviewed the Meridian Solar Farm: Additional Targeted Consultation (8th January – 5th February 2026) on behalf of Lincolnshire County Council, in relation to Landscape and Visual matters. This document contains (post-PIER) changes to the Meridian Solar Farm proposal due to ongoing surveys, design refinements and feedback from the stage 2 consultation. The information reviewed includes Consultee letter 8th January (EN010169) and Redline Boundary Extension Plan 6th January 2026 (MS-WSP-RLB-CHNG-002).</p>	N	<p>The Applicant notes this comment.</p>

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	<p>This review takes into account previous AAH comments (refer to Meridian Solar Farm Technical Memos TMO1: Landscape and Scoping Opinion and TMO2: Initial Viewpoint Comments, TMO3: PIER Comments) TMO4: Targeted Consultation Comments, as well as meetings/discussions held with the Applicant team and any subsequent meeting minutes.</p> <p>The comments provided are intended to assist in guiding the next stage of the development process, refinement of the content of the LVIA chapter, and the overall development proposals. It is not a final review of any of the preliminary findings or initial assessments.</p>		
	<p>Landscape and Visual Comments on Extension to the Redline Boundary</p> <p>Land shown on Plan (MS-WSP-RLB-CHNG-002) included to facilitate the overhead line connection to National Grid's planned Weston Marsh Substation B.</p> <p>1. The location selected to extend the Meridian Solar overhead line connection is characterised by an open landscape of flat fields, drainage ditches and long horizons with scattered boundary vegetation. Tree cover in this area is limited to isolated grouping adjacent to dwellings or defining field edges. Potentially, this is a location sensitive to landscape and visual change. The proposal will introduce large man-made structures with materials, scale and mass uncharacteristic of the location. Presently, there are no overhead lines or pylons on the site - although distant pylons can be seen on the horizon 2km away to the east from Stone Gate.</p>	N	<p>The landscape and visual effects of the Grid Connection Route are summarised within Section 12.8 of ES Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual (Doc Ref. 6.1) and detailed within ES Appendix 12-4: Landscape Assessment (Doc Ref. 6.3) and ES Appendix 12-6: Visual Assessment (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p> <p>As illustrated by viewpoints 27, 30, LCC10 and LCC11 in ES Figure 12-21 (Doc Ref. 6.2) and ES Figure 12-22 (Doc Ref. 6.2), there is an existing 400kV overhead line with steel lattice pylons and a low-voltage overhead with wooden poles that cross the Site south of Stone Gate. The existing 400kV overhead line is to be dismantled as part of the Grimsby to Walpole scheme.</p> <p>The Applicant recognises that it is not possible to screen views of the Grid Connection with planting due to the height of the pylons.</p>
	<p>2. At the time of writing, the exact route and location of the proposed pylons and overhead lines is to be determined. 'Construction of the overhead line would take place within the area shown on the enclosed plan. Infrastructure within this land would include pylons and the overhead line itself. The full extent of the fields has been included to allow flexibility during detailed design' (Consultee letter 8th January (EN010169).</p>	N	<p>The overhead line will be located within the Grid Connection Route shown within ES Figure 2-4: Indicative Grid Connection Corridor Layout Plan (Doc Ref. 6.2), with the precise siting of pylons and structures to be determined at the detailed design stage.</p>
	<p>Therefore, at this stage, only general comments can be made regarding the impact of the overhead line extension on the Landscape and Visual context in this location.</p>	N	<p>The landscape and visual effects of the Grid Connection Route are summarised within Section 12.8 of ES Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual (Doc Ref. 6.1) and detailed within ES Appendix 12-4: Landscape Assessment (Doc Ref. 6.3) and ES Appendix 12-6: Visual Assessment (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p>

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	<p>3. The extension is located 1.8km north east of the town of Spalding in the countryside and consists of several fields, and part-fields, of large arable agricultural land located around the lane called Stone Gate. There are no dwellings within the extension zone, but several properties and buildings are located near to its boundary. On the western boundary, which runs along Wykenham Lane and Marsh Road, these include a private dwelling with the ruins of the Chapel of St Nicolas in its grounds, Cowhirne Cottage, Marsh House Farm and a large plant Nursery called Kinder Garden Plants. On the eastern boundary, which crosses Stone Gate, are located Bass Cottages and Shepards Farm. Many of these properties have intervening shelter belts and garden vegetation which will reduce their visual exposure to the proposed development.</p>		
	<p>5. Two major roads are located in the locality of the proposed extension area. These are the A16 (Spalding ring road) passing the extension area 1km to the south west and the A151 High Road located 1.6km to the south. The A16 is a busy route mostly used by locals and freight; however, it is likely some higher sensitivity receptors, including tourists visiting local historic centres like Crowland also use this route. The traffic noise from the A16 is likely to detract from the extension area's otherwise tranquil and undeveloped character. These routes separate the landscape of the extension area from the adjacent settlements of Spalding and Weston and contribute to the location's sense of isolation. Due to distance and intervening features like embankment vegetation, it is unlikely that views of the proposal from these routes will be of significance.</p>	N	<p>The likely significant effects of the Grid Connection route on views is assessed within ES Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual (Doc Ref. 6.1). In terms of the impact on tourists, this is assessed within ES Chapter 14: Socio-economics and Land Use. In terms of noise, this is assessed in ES Chapter 13: Noise and Vibration (Doc Ref. 6.1).</p>
	<p>Landscape Effects</p> <p>6. The extension area is a sensitive landscape with no existing man-made infrastructure. The proposed development will detract from this locality and conflict with its existing rural character. It will also detract from the setting of the ruins of the Chapel of St Nicolas which are likely to be located adjacent to the proposed structures. However, in the wider landscape, the extension area is influenced by man-made change including the A16, A151 and the edge of Spalding. Development in the extension area will result in change to the landscape setting, but this change is not likely to be significant.</p>	N	<p>The landscape and visual effects of the Grid Connection Route are summarised within Section 12.8 of ES Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual (Doc Ref. 6.1) and detailed within ES Appendix 12-4: Landscape Assessment (Doc Ref. 6.3) and ES Appendix 12-6: Visual Assessment (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p> <p>As illustrated by viewpoints 27, 30, LCC10 and LCC11 in ES Figure 12-21 (Doc Ref. 6.2) and ES Figure 12-22 (Doc Ref. 6.2), there is an existing 400kV overhead line with steel lattice pylons and a low-voltage overhead with wooden poles that cross the Site south of Stone Gate. The existing 400kV overhead line is to be dismantled as part of the Grimsby to Walpole scheme.</p>

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
			<p>The Applicant recognises that it is not possible to screen views of the Grid Connection with planting due to the height of the pylons.</p> <p>In terms of the impact of the Grid Connection Route on the Chapel of St Nicholas, the illustrative design locates the overhead line as far east as practicable, as the alignment also needs to consider potential environmental effects on residential receptors along Stone Gate Road. In addition, pylons have been sited to avoid the field to the east of the Chapel.</p>
	<p>Visual Effects</p> <p>1. The extension area is located in an open landscape, but receptors are limited with no major routeways or PROW through the proposed extension area. The only routeway, with sensitive receptors likely to be affected, is located 500m outside the extension zone (public bridleway Wstn/6/1). This will experience a negative local impact, but many views from this route (those heading south) will be seen with the context of Spalding and associated road infrastructure in the background. Other receptors will be limited to isolated buildings, often with intervening vegetation, or places of work, with low sensitivity. Development in the extension area will result in change to the visual setting, but this change is not likely to be significant.</p>	N	<p>The landscape and visual effects of the Grid Connection Route are summarised within Section 12.8 of this chapter and detailed within ES Appendix 12-4: Landscape Assessment (Doc Ref. 6.3) and ES Appendix 12-6: Visual Assessment (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p> <p>Viewpoint 30 has been added into the assessment to consider effects on the users of Wstn/6/1.</p>
	<p>Mitigation</p> <p>8. The mitigation options in this location are limited due to the flat and open character of the landscape. There are no woodlands in the immediate vicinity and the flatness of the location precludes the use of bunding. Any vegetation added could change the landscape's character from open to enclosed and will need to be targeted at field edges or planting around dwellings to be consistent with the existing setting. Mitigation should be used sparingly to specifically reduce impacts on sensitive receptors which includes the public bridleway Wstn/6/1 and the the ruins of the Chapel of St Nicolas.</p>	N	<p>Appendix 12-4: Landscape Assessment (Doc Ref. 6.3) and ES Appendix 12-6: Visual Assessment (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p> <p>In terms of the impact of the Grid Connection Route on the Chapel of St Nicholas, the illustrative design locates the overhead line as far east as practicable, as the alignment also needs to consider potential environmental effects on residential receptors along Stone Gate Road. In addition, pylons have been sited to avoid the field to the east of the Chapel.</p> <p>Viewpoint 30 has been added into the assessment to consider effects on the users of Wstn/6/1.</p> <p>The Applicant recognises that it is not possible to screen views of the Grid Connection with planting due to the height of the pylons</p>
	<p>Fire safety</p> <p>Lincolnshire's Fire and Rescue Service (LFR) make the following comments on the proposed changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> LFR will need to ensure proposed changes to site layouts, access and egress are inline with minimum standards as outlined in the NFCC guidance 	N	<p>The Applicant notes this comment. The Applicant has engaged with Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue service on the approach to battery safety management.</p>

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	The impact of proposed changes to site layout and specifically BESS units will need to be considered, with assurance offered that national guidance has been adhered to Fire safety.		
	Minerals and waste matters <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • M&W safeguarding - No safeguarding areas or sites are impacted by the proposed additional area. • Waste management - No further comments on those we have already made, since this change does not appear to result in additional waste 	N	The Applicant notes this comment.
	Traffic and Transport No further comments to make on this change, please refer to previous comments made in the two aforementioned consultations.	N	The Applicant notes this comment.
	The Council would be pleased to continue dialogue in relation to the main issues identified in our response above, and in previous consultations, by way of the programmed update meetings or topic-specific meetings as and when required.	N	The Applicant thanks Lincolnshire County Council for its response to the additional targeted consultation and welcomes further engagement, further engagement.

5.9. Moulton Parish Council

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
Moulton Parish Council	Good Morning, In regards to the Meridian Solar project, the parish council has had many residents raising concerns, but more recently these have been due to the fact the new consultation is not long enough, transparent or inclusive. Many residents are only finding out due to word of mouth.	N	The Applicant remains confident in its approach to consultation. The PA 2008 allows for a bespoke and proportionate approach to further consultation where appropriate. The additional targeted consultation focused specifically on the inclusion of land within the Scheme boundary to facilitate the connection into Weston Marsh Substation B, and the Applicant considers the approach taken to be appropriate and consistent with relevant legislation and guidance.
	Residents are clearly not happy with the project as it is with the loss of valuable farmland, extra traffic on the already crumbling roads that Highways have no money to repair. The roads are not fit for purpose as it is.	N	. An assessment of impacts and effects on agriculture and soils is presented within Section 5.8 of ES Chapter 5: Agriculture and Soils (Doc Ref. 6.1). As secured through Requirement 21 of the Draft DCO (Doc Ref. 3.1) and described within ES Chapter 2: The Scheme (Doc Ref. 6.1), all above ground infrastructure associated with the Scheme will be decommissioned at the end of the 40-year operational period. While the duration of operation is long term, the assessment of impacts on agriculture and soils distinguishes between reversible and irreversible land-use change. As no permanent soil sealing is proposed and all infrastructure

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
			<p>will be removed, the Scheme does not result in the permanent loss of agricultural land and will not impact food security.</p> <p>In terms of damage to roads, as proposed in the OCTMP (Doc Ref. 7.13), a road condition survey will be carried out at several locations during pre-construction, construction and post-construction, to identify any defects that arise to highways assets/verges during the construction phase of the Scheme for reinstatement. This will be secured by the CTMP, which will be prepared in accordance with the OCTMP (Doc Ref. 7.13) which is secured by way of Requirement in the Draft DCO (Doc Ref. 3.1).</p>
	We request that the extra land proposed that is needed is put to the public in a more thorough consultation.	N	<p>The Applicant notes this comment but remains confident in its approach throughout the consultation process.</p> <p>The Applicant thanks Moulton Parish Council for its response to the additional targeted consultation.</p>

5.10. National Highways

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
National Highways	<p>Dear Sir or Madam</p> <p>Proposal: Meridian solar farm, a solar farm with capacity of approximately 750 MW situated near Moulton Chapel in Lincolnshire</p> <p>Additional targeted consultation</p> <p>Thank you for providing National Highways the opportunity to comment on the additional targeted consultation for the above. National Highways (formerly Highways England) has been appointed by the Secretary of State for Transport as a strategic highway company under the provisions of the Infrastructure Act 2015 and is the highway authority, traffic authority and street authority for the Strategic Road Network (SRN). The SRN is a critical national asset and as such we work to ensure that it operates and is managed in the public interest, both in respect of current activities and needs as well as in</p>	N	<p>The Applicant thanks National Highways for its response the additional targeted consultation and notes the capacity in which it has provided its response.</p>

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	providing effective stewardship of its long term operation and integrity.		
	In responding to development related consultations, we have regard to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and DfT Circular 01/2022: The Strategic Road Network and the Delivery of Sustainable Development ('the Circular'). The latter document sets out National Highways policy on sustainable development and our approach to proposals which may have an impact on our network.	N	The Applicant notes this comment.
	The SRN in the vicinity of the proposed development is the A47. The targeted consultation concerns proposals to include an additional area of land, to facilitate an overhead line connection to National Grid's planned Weston Marsh Substation B. This is due to National Grid recently updating its plans for the Weston Marsh Substation, requiring changes to the overhead line design, which you previously consulted on.	N	The Applicant notes this comment.
	We provided comments on the original proposals for Meridian Solar Farm in our response of 6 June 2025. This set out the additional information which should be provided regarding the transport assessment of the development. The targeted consultation letter of 8 January 2026 refers to potential construction traffic effects arising from the construction of the overhead line. Where appropriate, these should be reflected in the transport assessment information to be submitted for our review. We hope that the above information is useful with respect of this pre-application consultation.	N	The Applicant notes this comment and confirms that the inclusion of additional land has been appropriately addressed within ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access (Doc Ref. 6.1). The Applicant thanks National Highways for its consultation.

5.11. Natural England

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
Natural England	Hi [redacted] I hope you're getting on okay. I've set out below NE's response to the additional targeted consultation. I discussed this with	N	The Applicant thanks Natural England for its response to the additional targeted consultation.

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	<p>[redacted] prior to the formal consultation going out; our advice is fairly limited & is largely as I set out to [redacted] (see attached).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The additional area should be subject to ALC survey pre-construction to inform micro-siting & soil management. Ideally the full RLB should be surveyed pre-consent, but we note disagreement on this approach from previous engagement. Justification should be provided that the Ornithology Survey scope remains relevant to the extended RLB area, to inform assessment of impacts to SPA birds. Where it is not, either additional survey effort should be undertaken, or other data such as driven transects, habitat mapping data and habitat suitability could be used as a proxy - with suitable justification. Impacts to SPA birds from this area may be relevant from: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss, damage or disturbance to FLL during both construction and operation Collision risk during operation 		<p>Detailed ALC surveys for the Solar Development Area have been undertaken across the Solar Development Areas to inform the assessment presented in ES Chapter 5: Agriculture and Soils (Doc Ref. 6.1). Details of the ALC surveys are presented within ES Appendix 5-2: Agricultural Land Survey – Parcels A&D (Doc Ref. 6.1) and ES Appendix 5-3: Agricultural Land Survey – Parcels B&C (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p> <p>Provisional ALC mapping has been continued to be used for the assessment of the Inter-Array Connections and the Grid Connection Route.</p> <p>At this stage, detailed ALC surveys for the Inter-Array Connections and the Grid Connection Route have not been undertaken due to the current flexibility in design and routeing.</p> <p>A detailed soil survey will be undertaken post-consent once detailed design has been undertaken, as secured through the OSMP (Doc Ref. 7.14), which applies to all parts of the Scheme, including the Solar Development Areas, Inter-Array Connections and the Grid Connection Route. The OSMP ensures that soils are managed and reinstated to avoid long-term degradation of agricultural land quality.</p> <p>Ornithological data, including the location of FLL, has been considered in the development of the Scheme layout plan. Further information on design evolution and the consideration of alternatives is provided within ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution (Doc Ref. 6.1).</p>
	<p>Further surveys with regard to protected species may be required where they have not already been undertaken in this area. The approach for species licensing in the extended area should be confirmed in the ES . Where surveys indicate the need for any licences from NE, a draft application could be submitted to NE in advance of submission (The process for this is set out in PINS Advice Note 11 Annex C). Otherwise, NE refer to our standing advice in the meantime.</p>	N	<p>The Applicant thanks Natural England for its consultation.</p> <p>Ecological survey data has been appropriately considered for the areas of new land added to the Order Limits. Likely significant effects on ecology including within the newly added land have been assessed in ES Chapter 9: Ecology and Biodiversity (Doc Ref. 6.1)</p>

5.12. National Grid Electricity Transmission PLC

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
National Grid Electricity Transmission PLC (NGET)	<p>Dear Sir/Madam,</p> <p>Additional targeted consultation: redline boundary extension</p> <p>I refer to the additional targeted consultation launched on the 8th of January 2026 to 5th February 2026.</p>	N	<p>The Applicant notes this and thanks NGET for its response to the additional targeted consultation.</p>

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	This is a response on behalf of National Grid Electricity Transmission PLC (NGET).		
	As you are aware, the Meridian Solar Project team and NGET's Grimsby to Walpole (G2W) project team have worked collaboratively over recent months to discuss the design of the two Schemes. This current consultation indicates that the Meridian Solar Project team have a preference for a connection to the Weston Marsh B substation. The redline boundary extension presented within this consultation would allow for the construction of the overhead line and associated infrastructure to create a connection at Weston Marsh B substation.	N	The Applicant notes the update from NGET that its design work for Grimsby to Walpole, including the capacity of the two Weston Marsh substations is ongoing. While the Applicant acknowledges that at this stage NGET's indicative designs had provide for Meridian Solar to connect to Weston Marsh A substation, this had not been communicated formally to Meridian Solar in previous consultation feedback or the targeted consultation on the substations held by NGET in November and December 2025. Further, it is noted that Meridian Solar's original connection agreement simply provided for connection to the "Weston Marsh Substation" and did not specify whether there would be multiple substations and if so, which the Scheme would connect to. As outlined in the Grid Connection Statement (Doc Ref 7.5) the Applicant has routed its Grid Connection Corridor to Weston Marsh Substation B to minimise the level of interaction with the other projects in this area, including Grimsby to Walpole, and to avoid approximately 2km of further overhead line or underground cable to connect into the northern substation A. The Applicant has included land surrounding the proposed location of Weston Marsh B Substation to provide sufficient working space to connect once the exact location is confirmed by NGET. The Applicant considers the minimisation of this interaction will also be in the interests of NGET, in the context of minimising the cumulative effects assessed by the Grimsby to Walpole project.
	Through recent collaborative design sessions, NGET has worked with Meridian to jointly develop a design that caters for the needs of both projects. As part of this work, NGET have stated that the current substation arrangements cater for a connection at Weston Marsh A for Meridian. The Meridian Solar Project's existing redline boundary accommodates this connection, and this is reflected within the current G2W design.	N	
	Connection into the Weston Marsh B substation for the Meridian Solar project is not currently included within the G2W design.	N	While noting the information available on the siting of the substations is subject to change, the Applicant is considered it has taken a proportionate approach based on information available at the time of submission, and in the interests of presenting a scheme which minimises both direct and cumulative effects.
	NGET continue to work closely with National Energy System Operator (NESO) to support the implementation of the connections reform. However, we cannot yet comment on the results of NESO's queue outcome notifications. Currently we are committed to continue working collaboratively with Meridian as the design develops. As you may be aware, NGET will be conducting a full restudy of our network as part of the connections reform process, accounting for those customers which have secured Gate 2 or Gate 1 with reservation through the NESO process.	N	The acknowledgment that the parties are working to jointly develop a design which caters for the need of both project and which minimises effects is appreciated. The Applicant and NGET continue to engage in design collaboration, including in respect of the final substation locations. The Applicant does not consider it appropriate to delay and/or further change the Scheme at this stage when the final substation locations remain subject to the noted NESO process as well as consultation and further design refinement by NGET. NGET has not provided a commitment as to the likely timeframes for these updates, including whether it is likely they may be released within the course of the Examination for Meridian Solar. In the event that the Scheme cannot be accommodated at Weston Marsh B Substation, or Weston Marsh B Substation were to move, the Applicant would seek to obtain further planning permission(s) and/or a material change to the DCO to bridge any gap between the current Order Limits and the final location of the substation for connection.

5.13. North Kesteven District Council

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
North Kesteven District Council	Dear Sir, Madam I can confirm that North Kesteven District Council has no comments to make in relation to the proposed Meridian Solar farm at this stage.	N	The Applicant notes this comment and thanks North Kesteven District Council for its response to the additional targeted consultation.

5.14. Northern Gas

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
Northern Gas	Northern Gas Networks do not cover this area. Please use this online tool to find out which gas distribution network you need to contact: https://findmygdn.co.uk/	N	The Applicant notes this and thanks Northern Gas for its response to the additional targeted consultation.

5.15. Peterborough City Council

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
Peterborough City Council	Dear [redacted] Planning enquiry Proposal: Inclusion of additional land within the Scheme boundary to facilitate grid connection to new Weston Marsh Substation B location. Site address: Meridian Solar Farm Further to your enquiry received on 8 January 2026, in respect of the above, the Local Planning Authority makes the following comments: The LPA notes the details of the scheme consultation, sent on 08/01/2026 date. I can advise that the LPA has no comments to make, provided consideration is made of the implications to the highway	N	The Applicant notes this and thanks Peterborough City Council for its response to the additional targeted consultation.

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	<p>network previously raised in comments ref 24/01023/CONSUL dated 13.11.2026.</p> <p>I trust that the above advice is of use however should you have any further queries, please do not hesitate to contact me on the details shown at the top of this letter.</p>		

5.16. South Holland District Council

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
South Holland District Council	<p>Meridian solar farm development consent order, additional targeted consultation February 2026.</p> <p>Planning Inspectorate reference EN 010169</p> <p>The Environmental Protection Team at South Holland District Council have reviewed the information submitted as part of the additional targeted consultation, which comprises a map showing the extent of additional land required for connection into the proposed Western Marsh B substation only.</p>	N	The Applicant notes this comment and thanks South Holland District Council for its response to the additional targeted consultation.
	<p>We have previously commented on a number of earlier stages of consultation for the wider project and have provided feedback on the need for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Detailed and robust construction environmental management plans, particularly in with respect to the potential for dust nuisance to impact on residential receptors. On noise and the need to reduce noise impact as low as reasonably practicable to residential receptors both in the operational and in the construction phases. <p>We have also made comments on air quality and land contamination.</p> <p>The methods employed to date have been satisfactory and provided a similar approach is undertaken when including these additional areas within the scheme we do not have any location specific comments at this stage.</p>	N	The Applicant confirms that the issues raised have been addressed within Appendix H – Section 42 Applicant's Response (Doc Ref. 5.1), Appendix I – Section 47 Applicant's Response (Doc Ref. 5.1) and Appendix K – Targeted Consultation Applicant's Response (Doc Ref. 5.1).
	<p>However, we do consider that there may be a need for additional noise monitoring in this area.</p>	N	The impact of the Scheme has been assessed within ES Chapter 13: Noise and Vibration (Doc Ref. 6.1) No significant effects are expected except during the construction phase at

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
			properties along Langary Gate Road during peak construction activity and at a receptor at Broad Gate associated with HDD activities if they are required at night. No additional noise monitoring is deemed necessary.
	<p>Introduction</p> <p>The targeted consultation between 8th January and 5th February 2026 sought consultee comments on the changes as described within the letter of 8th January and attached overview plan. The change presented is the addition of more land to facilitate the overhead connection to the National Grid. Therefore, it is proposed to use the land shown for additional pylons and overhead line, however the quantum remains unknown.</p> <p>For an inclusive and robust response an internal consultation process has also been undertaken, seeking internal responses from certain officers, parish councils and Councillors.</p> <p>All consultees have the ability to respond direct to the applicant as part of this process however we have presented any responses received to date. Responses after October 22nd will be collated and forwarded.</p>	N	The Applicant notes this comment.
	<p>List of Consultees</p> <p>As part of the internal consultation process, the below consultees were contacted for comment:</p> <p>Internal:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Environmental Protection; 2. Planning Policy; 3. Conservation Assistant (Tree Preservation); 4. Conservation Officer (Heritage); and 5. Senior Ecologist. 	N	The Applicant notes the internal consultees contacted for comment.
	<p>Ward Members:</p> <p>Councillor Sneath, Councillor Casson, Councillor Woolf, Councillor Alcock, Councillor Astill, Councillor Harrison, Councillor Bingham, Councillor Geaney, Councillor King, Councillor Barnes, Councillor Reynolds, Councillor Eldridge, Councillor Worth, Councillor Beal, Councillor Redgate, Councillor Hutchinson, Councillor Carter, Councillor Chapman, Councillor Tennant, Councillor Tyrrell, Councillor Wilkinson,</p>	N	The Applicant notes the Ward Members contacted.

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	Councillor Slade, Councillor Avery, Councillor Sneath, Councillor Taylor, Councillor Chauhan, Councillor Sheard, Councillor Hasan, Councillor Le Sage, Councillor Le Sage, Councillor Ashby, Councillor Gibson, Councillor Scalese, Councillor Whitbourn, Councillor Spencer, Councillor Brewis, Councillor Booth.		
	<p>Parish Councils:</p> <p>Crowland Parish Council, Deeping St Nicholas Parish Council, Cowbit Parish Council, Moulton Parish Council, Weston Parish Council, Donington Parish Council, Fleet Parish Council, Gedney Parish Council, Gedney Hill Parish Council, Gosberton Parish Council, Holbeach Parish Council, Little Sutton Parish Council, Long Sutton Parish Council, Lutton Parish Council, Moulton Parish Council, Pinchbeck Parish Council, Quadring Parish Council, Surfleet & Whaplode Parish Councils, Sutton Bridge Parish Council, Sutton St Edmund Parish Council, Sutton St James Parish Council, Tydd St Mary Parish Council, Weston Parish Council.</p>	N	The Applicant notes the Parish Councils contacted.
	<p>Planning Policy</p> <p>Whilst the applicant will seek permission for the proposals directly from the Secretary of State for a DCO under section 37 of the Planning Act 2008, subject to the assessment against National Planning Policy Statements (NPS's) there are still a number of local and national planning policies which are considered relevant and should be taken account of as part of the development process. These plans and local knowledge have been formed over several years and have come from a significant evidence base.</p> <p>The South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036 (SELLP) was adopted jointly by South Holland and Boston Borough Council on the 8 March 2019.</p> <p>The relevant policies within the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036 are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy 2 'Development Management' – requires proposals to demonstrate sustainable development considerations have been met through a number of criteria. 	N	The notes the relevant planning policies as listed. The consideration of the NPPF and local planning policies is contained within Appendix C to the Planning Statement (Doc Ref. 7.1).

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy 3 'Design of New Development' – requires development to create distinctive places through the use of high quality and inclusive design, demonstrating compliance with a number of considerations. • Policy 4 'Approach to Flood Risk' – developments must satisfy the sequential test and be supported by a site-specific flood risk assessment covering risk from all sources of flooding including the impacts of climate change. It must be demonstrated that surface water from the development can be managed and will not increase the risk of flooding to third parties. • Policy 28 'The Natural Environment' – Requires the protection, enhancement and management of natural assets, by ensuring all development proposals provide an <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • overall net gain in biodiversity. • Policy 29 'The Historic Environment' - Distinctive elements of the South East Lincolnshire historic environment will be conserved and, where appropriate, enhanced. • Policy 30 'Pollution' Development proposals will not be permitted where, taking account of any proposed mitigation measures, they would lead to unacceptable adverse impacts upon: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ health and safety of the public; ○ the amenities of the area; or ○ the natural, historic and built environment; ○ by way of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ air quality, including fumes and odour; ○ noise including vibration; ○ light levels; ○ land quality and condition; or ○ surface and groundwater quality. • Planning applications, except for development within the curtilage of a dwellinghouse as specified within 		

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	<p>Schedule 2, Part 1 of The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015, or successor statutory instrument, must include an assessment of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ impact on the proposed development from poor air quality from identified sources; ○ impact on air quality from the proposed development; and ○ impact on amenity from existing uses. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Policy 31 'Climate Change and Renewable and Low Carbon Energy' - All development proposals will be required to demonstrate that the consequences of current climate change has been addressed, minimised and mitigated. ● Policy 32 'Community, Health and Wellbeing' - Development shall contribute to the creation of socially-cohesive and inclusive communities; reducing health inequalities; and improving the community's health and well-being. ● Policy 33 'Delivering a More Sustainable Transport Network' - reinforces the national approach to promoting sustainable alternatives to the car through new development, making the best use of, and seek improvements to, existing transport infrastructure and services. Solutions that are based on better promotion and management of the existing network and the provision of sustainable forms of travel are supported. To achieve this, a Transport Assessment and associated Travel Plan will be submitted with proposals. <p>The NPPF was originally implemented in 2012, with the most recent revision being 2019 and an update in 2024. The NPPF sets out the UK Government's planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied.</p> <p>The NPPF does not contain specific policies for NSIPs (for which particular considerations apply, determined in accordance with the decision-making framework set out in the</p>		

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	<p>Planning Act 2008 and relevant NPSs) but may be considered as a relevant consideration as below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paragraph 124 - Planning policies and decisions should promote an effective use of land in meeting the need for homes and other uses, while safeguarding and improving the environment and ensuring safe and healthy living conditions. Strategic policies should set out a clear strategy for accommodating objectively assessed needs, in a way that makes as much use as possible of previously-developed or 'brownfield' land. Footnote 49 of the NPPF states except where this would conflict with other policies in this Framework, including causing harm to designated sites of importance for biodiversity. • Paragraph 125 - Planning policies and decisions should: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ encourage multiple benefits from both urban and rural land, including through mixed use schemes and taking opportunities to achieve net environmental gains – such as developments that would enable new habitat creation or improve public access to the countryside; ○ recognise that some undeveloped land can perform many functions, such as for wildlife, recreation, flood risk mitigation, cooling/shading, carbon storage or food production; ○ give substantial weight to the value of using suitable brownfield land within settlements for homes and other identified needs, and support appropriate opportunities to remediate despoiled, degraded, derelict, contaminated or unstable land; ○ promote and support the development of under-utilised land and buildings, especially if this would help to meet identified needs for housing where land supply is constrained and available sites could be 		

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	<p>used more effectively (for example converting space above shops, and building on or above service yards, car parks, lock-ups and railway infrastructure)48; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ support opportunities to use the airspace above existing residential and commercial premises for new homes. In particular, they should allow upward extensions where the development would be consistent with the prevailing height and form of neighbouring properties and the overall street scene, is well-designed (including complying with any local design policies and standards), and can maintain safe access and egress for occupiers. ● Paragraph 161 - The planning system should support the transition to a low carbon future in a changing climate, taking full account of flood risk and coastal change. It should help to: shape places in ways that contribute to radical reductions in greenhouse gas emissions, minimise vulnerability and improve resilience; encourage the reuse of existing resources, including the conversion of existing buildings; and support renewable and low carbon energy and associated infrastructure. ● Paragraph 170 - Inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk (whether existing or future). Where development is necessary in such areas, the development should be made safe for its lifetime without increasing flood risk elsewhere. ● Paragraph 187 - Planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, sites of biodiversity or geological value and soils (in a manner commensurate with their statutory status 		

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	<p>or identified quality in the development plan);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, and the wider benefits from natural capital and ecosystem services – including the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land, and of trees and woodland; ○ maintaining the character of the undeveloped coast, while improving public access to it where appropriate; ○ minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures; ○ preventing new and existing development from contributing to, being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by, unacceptable levels of soil, air, water or noise pollution or land instability. Development should, wherever possible, help to improve local environmental conditions such as air and water quality, taking into account relevant information such as river basin management plans; and ○ remedying and mitigating despoiled, degraded, derelict, contaminated and unstable land, where appropriate. 		
	<p>Landscape Visual Impact (Terra Loci, Landscape Architects appointed on behalf of the Council)</p> <p>The targeted consultation material has been reviewed and is understood to comprise solely the Red Line Boundary Extension Plan identifying additional land proposed to be included within the Scheme boundary to facilitate the overhead line connection to the proposed Weston Marsh Substation.</p>	<p>N</p>	<p>The targeted consultation materials did not include detailed technical assessments, as their purpose was to present the proposed changes in an accessible format appropriate to that stage of the process. As set out within the targeted consultation materials, the landscape and visual baseline and effects identified within the PEIR were considered to remain applicable for the revised design.</p> <p>The potential landscape and visual effects associated with the inclusion of additional land have been fully assessed within the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.1), including ES Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual (Doc Ref. 6.1), supported by ES Appendix 12-4: Landscape Assessment and ES Appendix 12-6: Visual Assessment (Doc Ref. 6.3). The</p>

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	<p>The Terra Loci Landscape Architect comments are summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Missing Data: The proposal lacks supporting information on land use, landscape character, and visual receptors. • Increased Impact: Because pylons and overhead lines have notable visual impacts, extending the boundary will likely increase the geographical scale and extent of these effects. • Lack of Justification: It is currently unclear if the extension was designed to minimize landscape damage or if baseline conditions were properly considered • No further supporting information has been provided alongside the plan in relation to land use, land classification, landscape character, visual receptors, or an updated assessment of landscape and visual effects arising specifically from the proposed extension to the Order Limits. 		<p>assessment has been undertaken on a reasonable worst-case basis and demonstrates that the nature of effects is consistent with those identified across the wider grid connection corridor. Further information on how the Applicant has considered the landscape and visual baseline conditions in developing the Scheme proposals is set out within ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution (Doc Ref. 6.1).</p> <p>The Applicant has also engaged with relevant local planning authorities throughout the design and assessment process, including in relation to landscape and visual matters.</p>
	<p>Sir John Hayes CBE MP</p> <p>In a formal objection dated 17th January 2026, Sir John Hayes CBE MP opposes the expansion of the Meridian Solar scheme into his constituency, South Holland and the Deepings. The full letter is appended to this response. The summary of the grounds for objection is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agricultural Impact: the "permanent loss of 106.9 hectares of soil" taking Grade 1 "Best and Most Versatile" farmland out of food production threatens national food security. • Ecological Risks: The project poses a collision risk to birds (such as whooper swans) and threatens the habitats of bats, great crested newts, and hedgerow species. • Infrastructure & Noise: Concerns over the ability of single-track rural roads to handle construction traffic and warns of "significant" long-term noise pollution from the proposed substation. 	N	<p>The Applicant thanks Sir John Hayes CBE MP for responding to the additional targeted consultation.</p> <p>An assessment of impacts and effects on agriculture and soils is presented within Section 5.8 of ES Chapter 5: Agriculture and Soils (Doc Ref. 6.1). As secured through Requirement 21 of the Draft DCO (Doc Ref. 3.1) and described within ES Chapter 2: The Scheme (Doc Ref. 6.1), all above ground infrastructure associated with the Scheme will be decommissioned at the end of the 40-year operational period. While the duration of operation is long term, the assessment of impacts on agriculture and soils distinguishes between reversible and irreversible land-use change. As no permanent soil sealing is proposed and all infrastructure will be removed, the Scheme does not result in the permanent loss of agricultural land and will not impact food security.</p> <p>The likely significant effects of the Scheme on ecology have been assessed within ES Chapter 9: Ecology and Biodiversity (Doc Ref. 6.1) which concludes no significant adverse effects are expected. Mitigation measures have been included to limit the impact of OHL on local wildlife. For example, bird diverters have been specified where there is an elevated bird collision risk, as set out within the OOEMP (Doc Ref 7.11) and the Design Parameters (Doc Ref. 7.4). In terms of the impact of the Scheme on habitats, mitigation measures presented within the DCO Application during construction to ensure that impacts are avoided on important habitats where practicable. For instance, the OCEMP (Doc Ref. 7.10) outlines</p>

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local Governance: Sir John contends the project should be decided by the South Holland District Council at a local level rather than as a national infrastructure project Public Sentiment: A survey of over 1,000 residents revealed "strong opposition," with the loss of prime farmland cited as the primary concern 		<p>measures for the protection of habitats, including avoidance of spills, silting, and containment of invasive non-native species. Proposals for habitat creation and enhancement post-construction are set out within the OLEMP (Doc Ref. 7.16). Measures proposed will be implemented through detailed management plans, secured by way of Requirement in the Draft DCO (Doc Ref. 3.1).</p> <p>In terms of the impact of the Scheme on roads, a road condition survey will be carried out at several locations pre-construction, during construction and post-construction, to identify any defects that arise to highways assets/verges during the construction phase of the Scheme for reinstatement.</p> <p>In terms of the comment that the project should be decided at a local level rather than as a national infrastructure project in the UK, projects with a capacity of above 100 MW are considered Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIP). These projects require a Development Consent Order (DCO) in order to be progressed, while projects below the 50 MW threshold secure planning permission via the Town and Country Planning Act (TCPA) administered by a local authority.</p>
	<p>Councillor Eldridge</p> <p>Councillor Eldridge has provided a response dated 2nd February 2026. This full response is appended but a summary of the points raised is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Significant Project Changes: The proposal includes new pylons, overhead lines, and additional Best and Most Versatile (BMV) land without providing specific measurements or sufficient impact assessments. Cumulative Impacts: Concerns remain regarding the combined landscape and environmental effects of this project alongside the nearby Grimsby to Walpole project. Consultation Flaws: The process is criticized for being exclusive rather than inclusive, failing to notify the Meridian Action Group (MAG) and delaying notification to Councillors until 11 days after the start date. Timing and Accessibility: The short consultation window was further restricted by a 5-day regional broadband outage 	N	<p>The Applicant notes this comment but confirms that consultation has been undertaken in accordance with the PA 2008, which allows for a bespoke and proportionate approach to further consultation. The targeted consultation focused specifically on the inclusion of land within the Scheme boundary to facilitate connection into Weston Marsh Substation B. On this basis, the Applicant considers the consultation approach to be appropriate and consistent with relevant legislation and guidance.</p> <p>Further details of the approach and justification for the approach are set out in the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 5.1).</p> <p>The Applicant also notes that requests for extensions of time to respond to the targeted consultation have been accommodated throughout the consultation process, in order to encourage meaningful participation.</p> <p>The Applicant also notes that Councillors were notified by email in advance of the commencement of the additional targeted consultation, and that South Holland District Council received both a hard copy letter and email notification. With regard to the reported broadband outage, the Applicant notes that this was not in proximity to the proposed change being consulted upon.</p>
	Cowbit Parish Council	N	The Applicant thanks Cowbit Parish Council for its response to the additional targeted consultation, but notes that these comments do not relate to the inclusion of land on which

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cowbit Parish Council have provided an objection to the development, summarised as follows: • Although this particular consultation won't directly impact the village of Cowbit, the construction of the project will cause damage to our roads and properties. Spalding Road has been closed for some months now, due to underground movement which has caused long, deep cracks to open up. • The road is to remain closed for the foreseeable future as the cost of repair is thought to be in excess of £4 million. At last night's meeting, we were advised by County Cllr Thomas Sneath, that when it does eventually reopen, it will likely be with a reduced speed and weight limit. • Cowbit Parish Council also objects to prime agricultural land, for which South Holland is well known for, being used to sit 1,000s of solar panels, pylons and power plants. 		<p>feedback was sought or a theme specifically relevant to the additional targeted consultation. As such, a detailed response has not been provided.</p> <p>The Applicant does has responded more fully to Cowbit Parish Council's individual submission in Section 5.2 of this Appendix.</p>
	<p>Sutton St Edmund Parish Council</p> <p>St Edmund Parish Council have provided an objection to the development, summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Landscape and Visual Impact: The Council contends the scale of the solar arrays and infrastructure would urbanize a rural agricultural setting, causing significant harm to the open character of the South Holland District. • Loss of Agricultural Land: The project would result in the large-scale, long-term loss of productive agricultural land without demonstrating that lower-grade alternatives were prioritised. • Highways and Infrastructure: There are concerns that sustained HGV movements during construction would place unacceptable pressure on narrow, lightly constructed rural roads that are already sensitive to ground conditions. • Cumulative Impact: The Council states that the cumulative effects of multiple large-scale energy 	N	<p>The Applicant thanks Sutton St Edmund Parish Council for its response to the additional targeted consultation, but notes that these comments do not relate to the inclusion of land on which feedback was sought or a theme specifically relevant to the additional targeted consultation. As such, a detailed response has not been provided.</p> <p>In terms of Landscape and Visual Impact, this has been assessed within ES Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual (Doc Ref. 6.1). The Scheme has been designed to limit the potential visual impact through establishing a sensitively designed layout and appropriate embedded mitigation (e.g. targeted planting) as set out in ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution (Doc Ref. 6.1).</p> <p>An assessment of impacts and effects on agriculture and soils is presented within Section 5.8 of ES Chapter 5: Agriculture and Soils (Doc Ref. 6.1). As secured through Requirement 21 of the Draft DCO (Doc Ref. 3.1) and described within ES Chapter 2: The Scheme (Doc Ref. 6.1), all above ground infrastructure associated with the Scheme will be decommissioned at the end of the 40-year operational period. While the duration of operation is long term, the assessment of impacts on agriculture and soils distinguishes between reversible and irreversible land-use change. As no permanent soil sealing is proposed and all infrastructure will be removed, the Scheme does not result in the permanent loss of agricultural land and will not impact food security.</p>

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	<p>developments in the wider area have not been satisfactorily assessed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residential Amenity and Safety: Concerns were raised regarding noise, "glint and glare," and the potential fire risks associated with battery storage infrastructure in a rural area with extended emergency response times. Duration of Development: While described as temporary, the Council argues the several-decade lifespan of the project represents a long-term change to land use and character that has not been adequately addressed. 		<p>In terms of the impact of the Scheme on roads this has been assessed in ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access (Doc Ref 6.1) which concludes no significant effects with implementation of the measures within the OCTMP (Doc Ref 7.13). The measures proposed include a road condition survey to be carried out at several locations pre-construction, during construction and post-construction, to identify any defects that arise to highways assets/verges during the construction phase of the Scheme for reinstatement.</p> <p>In terms of the cumulative impact of multiple large-scale energy developments, a cumulative assessment has been included within each technical chapter of the Environmental Statement (Chapter 5 to 16).</p> <p>The likely significant effects of the Scheme on noise have been assessed within ES Chapter 13: Noise and Vibration (Doc Ref. 6.1). No significant effects are expected except during the construction phase at properties along Langary Gate Road during peak construction activity and at a receptor at Broad Gate associated with HDD activities if they are required at night.</p> <p>A Glint and Glare assessment is contained within ES Chapter 16: Other Environmental Topics (Doc Ref. 6.1) which considers the impact of the Proposed Development on local receptors. The assessment concludes no significant effects.</p> <p>Details relating to emergency planning in the event of a fire (including how the Fire Service will access the BESS area) is contained within the OBSMP (Doc Ref. 7.18).</p> <p>As secured through Requirement 21 of the Draft DCO (Doc Ref. 3.1) and described within ES Chapter 2: The Scheme (Doc Ref. 6.1), all above ground infrastructure associated with the Scheme will be decommissioned at the end of the 40-year operational period. Whilst the lifespan is long term it is temporary and reversible.</p> <p>Proposed mitigation measures are set out in the OCEMP (Doc Ref. 7.10), OOEMP (Doc Ref. 7.11) and ODEMP (Doc Ref. 7.12) and OCTMP (Doc. Ref. 7.13) to limit impacts where practicable. Measures proposed will be implemented through detailed management plans, secured by way of Requirement in the Draft DCO (Doc Ref. 3.1).</p>
	<p>Public Objection- [REDACTED]</p> <p>Further to the enclosed consultation from Meridian (Planning Inspectorate Reference: EN010169) seeking our feedback to including additional land within the boundary identified for the siting of the Weston Marsh Substation B proposal for connectivity purposes. Could I please ask that South Holland Council object to this proposal, noting the reasons we have outlined and that this land if taken will result in the loss of Grade A farmland if it is allowed to go ahead. We plan to fully oppose this proposal.</p>	N	<p>ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution (Doc Ref. 6.1) and the Design Approach Document (Doc Ref. 7.3) describe the reasonable alternatives considered and the iterative design evolution process undertaken for the Grid Connection Route, including the assessment of alternative alignments, tower designs, and the potential for partial undergrounding.</p> <p>The Applicant further notes that the selection of an overhead line as the preferred technology for the grid connection has been informed by national policy contained in the National Policy Statement for Electricity Networks (EN-5) which states that, outside of nationally designated landscapes, overhead lines should be the strong starting presumption for electricity networks in general, unless these would give rise to particularly significant landscape and visual effects.</p>

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	The deadline for objections is the 5th February. We have also sent this proposal to No Pylons Lincolnshire and asked them for their support in also objecting		
	<p>Assessment of Targeted Consultation</p> <p>Landscape Impacts</p> <p>The targeted consultation material has been reviewed and is understood to comprise solely the Red Line Boundary Extension Plan identifying additional land proposed to be included within the Scheme boundary to facilitate the overhead line connection to the proposed.</p>	N	The Applicant notes this comment.
	<p>Weston Marsh Substation.</p> <p>No further supporting information has been provided alongside the plan in relation to land use, land classification, landscape character, visual receptors, or an updated assessment of landscape and visual effects arising specifically from the proposed extension to the Order Limits.</p> <p>In the absence of this information, it is not possible to identify whether the inclusion of additional land would give rise to any new or materially different landscape or visual effects beyond those already considered within the scope of the PEIR. However, it is noted that the proposed extension would increase the geographical extent over which pylons and overhead line infrastructure could be located.</p>	N	<p>The Applicant notes that updated information is presented within the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.1).</p> <p>The potential landscape and visual effects associated with the Scheme, including the grid connection infrastructure and Order Limits, have been assessed within ES Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual (Doc Ref. 6.1), with detailed assessments provided in ES Appendix 12-4: Landscape Assessment and ES Appendix 12-6: Visual Assessment (Doc Ref. 6.3). The location and extent of the Order Limits, including areas of flexibility, are also shown on the Works Plans (Doc Ref. 2.3) and assessed on a reasonable worst-case basis within the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.1).</p>
	<p>Given that the overhead line element of the Scheme has already been identified as having the potential for notable landscape and visual effects, the extension of the Order Limits introduces the potential for those effects to occur over a wider area and to affect additional landscape and visual receptors. As such, while no new categories of effects can be identified on the basis of the material provided, there is a reasonable expectation that the scale and extent of effects previously identified could increase.</p> <p>The lack of accompanying assessment material limits the ability to understand how the extended Order Limits have been informed by landscape and visual considerations, or whether opportunities to constrain or minimise effects have been explored. It is therefore important that the Environmental Statement clearly demonstrates how the extended Scheme</p>	N	<p>The landscape and visual effects of the Grid Connection Route are summarised within Section 12.8 of this chapter and detailed within ES Appendix 12-4: Landscape Assessment (Doc Ref. 6.3) and ES Appendix 12-6: Visual Assessment (Doc Ref. 6.3).</p> <p>As illustrated by viewpoints 27, 30, LCC10 and LCC11 in ES Figure 12-21 (Doc Ref. 6.2) and ES Figure 12-22 (Doc Ref. 6.2), there is an existing 400kV overhead line with steel lattice pylons and a low-voltage overhead with wooden poles that cross the Site south of Stone Gate. The existing 400kV overhead line is to be dismantled as part of the Grimsby to Walpole scheme.</p> <p>The Applicant recognises that it is not possible to screen views of the Grid Connection with planting due to the height of the pylons.</p>

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	<p>boundary has been fully incorporated into the landscape and visual assessment, including confirmation that baseline conditions, sensitivity of receptors, and the nature and extent of effects have been appropriately considered across the full extent of the Scheme.</p>		
	<p>Other Matters</p> <p>With alterations to the order limits, it is considered important that all construction environmental management plans are updated to include the new areas and the proposed works within them, and their potential to impact on local residents.</p> <p>It is considered that whilst alterations have been proposed, the changes made do not appear to resolve the issues raised during the previous consultations.</p> <p>The Community Engagement to date is considered to show a lack of transparency and has provided limited opportunity for residential comments. We would welcome better engagement across the district in order to allow concerns to be raised and discussed appropriately.</p>	N	<p>The inclusion of additional land and the potential environmental effects associated with the proposed works have been appropriately considered within the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.1). Where relevant, environmental management plans will also reflect the inclusion of this land for activities proposed during construction, operation and decommissioning.</p> <p>The Applicant also notes that consultation undertaken since the statutory consultation has focused specifically on proposed changes to the Scheme. Feedback received throughout the pre-application stage has been reviewed and incorporated where appropriate, as set out in Appendix H – Section 42 Applicant's Responses (Doc Ref. 5.1), Appendix I – Section 47 Applicant's Responses (Doc Ref. 5.1) and Appendix K – Targeted Consultation Applicant's Responses (Doc Ref. 5.1).</p> <p>The Applicant considers that each stage of consultation has been undertaken in accordance with the requirements of relevant legislation and guidance.</p>
	<p>Concluding Remarks</p> <p>Whilst we appreciate many stakeholders will comment directly to the Applicant on the project, we wanted to provide a robust and inclusive response by giving all internal stakeholders the opportunity to comment that may not be fully aware of the proposals.</p> <p>The proposed amendments to the project are not considered minor refinements and instead provide detail of an unsupported expansion of the development scope. The sensitive setting of the site does not have the capacity to accommodate the magnitude of development proposed. The intensification of significant development areas such as the battery storage at Weston Marsh, alongside the absence of further impact assessment or suggested mitigating measures, for landscape visual impacts, amenity noise, vibration or light impacts are also a concern. Uncertainty remains about many aspects of the proposal.</p> <p>Until further information is put forward such as mitigation strategies, and details of the impacts of the development, the full effects on South Holland District Council cannot be fully</p>	N	<p>The Applicant notes these comments and thanks South Holland District Council for its response and coordination of internal stakeholder feedback. In terms of the Scheme's footprint, as shown in ES Figure 3-1: Targeted Consultation Changes Since Statutory Consultation (Doc Ref. 6.2), the overall area of the Scheme has reduced. For comparison, the total area of the Site within the Order Limits for the DCO submission is 1,511 hectares, whereas the total area within the draft Order Limits presented at the PEIR stage was 2,121 hectares. As such, the inclusion of additional land consulted upon does not represent a substantial expansion of the overall development.</p> <p>The Applicant also notes that the updated information presented within the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.1) appropriately considers the inclusion of land consulted on during the additional targeted consultation. The Applicant thanks all consultees who have provided responses to the additional targeted consultation. The Applicant welcomes continued engagement and thanks the Council for its participation throughout the pre-application process.</p>

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	<p>appreciated and therefore commented upon. It is only when the final submission is made that comments on specific impacts will be made.</p> <p>This advice is based upon the information available at this time. Please note that the advice is given without prejudice to any future comments made by the Local Planning Authority upon the receipt of further information, whether during or before the final submission.</p> <p>We kindly ask that the comments received from stakeholders listed are taken into consideration as you can see there is in part strong feelings about the proposal.</p> <p>If you have any queries, please do not hesitate to contact me on the details provided and I would appreciate it if all future correspondence could be made directly to myself as I have been instructed by the Local planning Authority to act on their behalf until the end of the application process. This will avoid any delays in our response as we have struggled to allow internal consultees sufficient time to get back to us</p>		

5.17. South Holland Internal Drainage Board

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
South Holland Internal Drainage Board	<p>Meridian Solar Farm Development Consent Order – Additional targeted consultation 8 January – 5 February 2026</p> <p>Thank you for consulting South Holland Internal Drainage Board (the Board) on the proposed extended redline boundary for the Meridian Solar Farm (the Scheme) to connect into Weston Marsh Substation B. The Board is responding in its capacity as a prescribed consultee and as a landowner.</p> <p>Comments on proposed changes</p> <p>(i) Planning and consenting</p> <p>The proposed added land is located within the Internal Drainage District (IDD) of the South Holland Internal Drainage Board (IDB), and therefore the Board's Byelaws will apply. Whilst the Board's regulatory process (as set out under the</p>	N	The Applicant notes this comment and the capacity in which South Holland Internal Drainage Board has responded.

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	<p>Land Drainage Act 1991 and the Board's Byelaws) is separate from planning, the ability to implement a planning permission may be dependent on the granting of any required Land Drainage Consents.</p> <p>A map of the South Holland IDD can be found here: https://www.wlma.org.uk/uploads/210-SHIDB_Index.pdf</p> <p>The Board's Byelaws can be viewed at: https://www.wlma.org.uk/uploads/SHIDB_Byelaws.pdf</p> <p>A non-exhaustive list of project works that are likely to require consent under the Board's Byelaws / Land Drainage Act 1991 is set out below:</p>		
	<p>Byelaw 3: Discharge of water to a watercourse (treated foul or surface water) - Discharge of surface water from temporary and permanent access tracks or from attenuation basins or swales into any watercourse</p> <p>Section 23, Land Drainage Act 1991: Alteration of a watercourse - Infilling of watercourse; installation or upgrading of culvert;</p> <p>Byelaw 10: Works within 9 metres of a Board maintained watercourse - Construction of culverts, bridges; cable crossings including trenchless and open cut crossings, access roads, habitat enhancement</p>	N	<p>The Draft DCO (Doc Ref. 3.1) includes standard protective provisions for drainage authorities whose apparatus may be affected by the Scheme. In addition, the Applicant is engaging with South Holland IDB to agree bespoke protective provisions to appropriately protect IDB's assets and rights.</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to engage with South Holland IDB regarding its assets following submission of the DCO Application, to ensure that disruption is minimised as far as reasonably practicable.</p>
	<p>We note (from communication from the Scheme to the Board received on 17th December 2025) that the Scheme is intending to disapply the relevant sections of the Land Drainage Act 1991 and the Board's Byelaws, and replace these with Protective Provisions for drainage authorities. We welcome this proposal and will discuss this matter further with the Scheme separately from this response to the current additional targeted consultation.</p>		<p>The Applicant welcomes this comment.</p>
	<p>Land ownership</p> <p>Thank you for providing the Red Line Boundary Change Plan. We can confirm that the proposed extension area for the Scheme (use of additional land for the Weston Marsh Substation B connection) includes the strip of Board-owned land highlighted in yellow on the map you provided. This strip is identified with the Land Registry as LL214919 (Wykeham</p>	N	<p>The Applicant notes this comment.</p>

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	<p>Drain) and LL324721 (land immediately north of Wykeham Drain between the top of the batter and the highway). The watercourse is known to the Board as R17 Wykeham, with the drain reference DRN208P1701 (south of the Stone Gate road) and DRN208P1702 (East of Stone Gate).</p> <p>Where the applicant is proposing works within the curtilage of the Board's land, the Board will require the applicant to enter into a Deed of Easement or suitable alternative.</p>		
	<p>Habitat enhancement</p> <p>Although not specifically mentioned in relation to the proposed Redline Boundary extension area, we note that the project proposes habitat reinstatement and enhancement at some locations. We would highlight that this type of activity would need to be considered carefully against the Board's need to access and maintain arterial watercourses, including through vegetation cutting. The Board would therefore request involvement in planning of, and the opportunity to comment on, any habitat enhancement within 9m of any Board-maintained watercourses.</p> <p>It is likely that the Board would object to any planting within the 9m strips adjacent to both sides of any Board-maintained watercourse.</p>	N	The Applicant notes this comment.
	<p>Cost recovery</p> <p>The Board will seek recovery of cost for time spent on this additional targeted consultation, in addition to other pre-application costs.</p>	N	The Applicant notes this comment.
	<p>The Board will continue to engage with the Scheme to understand the proposals in relation to watercourses and any other affected drainage assets. We request details of proposed watercourse crossing locations, crossing purpose (e.g. temporary haul road crossings, permanent access crossings, overhead power cable crossings and any underground crossings) and type (e.g. bridge or culvert). We also request a discussion on any proposed surface water or foul water discharges into any watercourse within the South Holland Internal Drainage District.</p> <p>The Board will require detailed drawings to support any application for proposed works that require Board consent (or</p>	N	<p>The Applicant notes this comment and welcomes further engagement regarding the matters raised. The Applicant thanks South Holland Drainage Board for its response to the additional targeted consultation.</p> <p>The FRA includes consideration of the effects on the surface water drainage strategy and sets out measures to ensure that impacts are appropriately mitigated. The Outline Drainage Strategy incorporates sustainable drainage systems and pollution control measures to manage surface water.</p> <p>The FRA is included as ES Appendix 11-3 (Doc Ref 6.3), and the Outline Drainage Strategy is included as ES Appendix 11-4 (Doc Ref 6.3).</p> <p>An indicative crossing schedule has been produced. Refer to ES Appendix 2-1 Indicative Watercourse Crossing Schedule (Doc Ref 6.3).</p>

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	<p>approval under Protective Provisions). Please note that this consenting requirement is outside of and in addition to the overall consent for the Scheme via a Development Consent Order.</p>		<p>As stated in OCEMP (Doc Ref. 7.10) and OLEMP (Doc Ref. 7.16) any enhancement would need the permission of the IDBs and be compatible with their current and future management and maintenance requirements.</p> <p>The Applicant is engaging with South Holland IDB regarding the drafting of bespoke protective provisions, to ensure that the Board's statutory functions, assets and land drainage interests are appropriately protected, and that the Scheme can be implemented without prejudice to effective land drainage management.</p>

