Meridian Solar Farm

EN010169

Volume 5

Consultation

5.1 Appendix K: Targeted Consultation 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. Comments Relating to Changes Included as Part of the Targeted Consultation under Section 47 3

3. Comments Relating to Themes Relevant to the Targeted Consultation Received under Section 47 17

4. Response Received from Brown & Co. on Behalf of Clients (x4) 53

5. Response from L.A.N.D 59

6. General Feedback 130

7. Responses from Consultees Engaged under Section 42(a) and Section 42(b) 134

7.1. North East Lincolnshire Council 134
7.2. Environment Agency 134
7.3. Health and Safety Executive 135
7.4. Anglian Water Services Ltd. 137
7.5. Moulton Parish Council 137
7.6. Deeping St Nicholas Parish Council 139
7.7. Cowbit Parish Council 140
7.8. National Highways 142
7.9. The Coal Mining Remediation Authority 147
7.10. Natural England 148
7.11. Crowland Parish Council 149
7.12. South Holland Internal Drainage Board 150
7.13. Network Rail 158
7.14. Fenland District Council 160
7.15. Lincolnshire County Council 161
7.16. Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk 180
7.17. National Grid Electricity Transmission (NGET) 180
7.18. North Lincolnshire Council 185
7.19. South Holland District Council 185
7.20. Historic England 198

1. Introduction

1.1. Consultation

1.1.1. 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 PA 2008. The targeted consultation was held between 24 September and 22 October 2025 and sought feedback on 38 localised changes to the Scheme.

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 a specific change consulted upon are reproduced verbatim in Section 2, reflecting the specific and localised nature of the changes.
- Comments received under Section 47 of the PA 2008 that raise key themes relevant to the targeted consultation, but which do not refer to a particular change, are also presented verbatim in Section 3 and responded to accordingly.
- Individual respondents are not identified in Sections 2 and 3 due to the change-specific and thematic nature of the targeted consultation responses; consultee-specific responses are identified separately where relevant, as below.
- Two long-form submissions received under Section 47 were received during the targeted consultation period and are included in full in Sections 4 and 5.
- More general comments that did not relate specifically to the targeted changes have been summarised separately in Section 6.
- Responses received under Section 42 of the PA 2008 are provided verbatim in Section 7.

2. Comments Relating to Changes Included as Part of the Targeted Consultation under Section 47

Change	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant Response
Change 36 - Extension of the Order Limits along Holbeach Drove Gate to provide safe visibility and facilitate traffic management for construction access	As an example, proposed change 36, 'proposal of extension of the order limits along Holbeach Drove Gate to provide safe visibility and facilitate traffic management for construction access'. Gives a short description, a reason, and effects, but no explanation of where, how, when and for how long? • I wonder why passing bays are needed in Holbeach Drove Gate? I live on this extremely fast and busy road, especially mornings and evenings with constant work traffic. Any proposed construction access along this road would be dangerous. It would also have an immense impact on locals and the wider community as a main access route to the A16. How do you propose to manage this? More information please.	N	As stated in **ES Chapter 2: The Scheme** (Doc Ref 6.1) Holbeach Drove Gate provides access to the Inter-Array Areas. The location is identified as HDG-01 and HDG-02 on **ES Figure 2-5 Construction, Operational and Decommissioning Accesses** (Doc Ref 6.2). The access will be in place for the construction phase only. The requirement for passing bays is to be confirmed at detailed design stage. The **OCTMP** (Doc. Ref. 7.13) provides further information on the proposed construction traffic management during the construction phase which includes the introduction of a temporary speed limit and temporary partial road closure. **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 mitigation measures contained within the **OCTMP** (Doc. Ref. 7.13).
	I live on Holbeach Drove Gate and am particularly concerned at the reference to constructing passing bays on this road. It is a very narrow, rural Fen road built on silt and with dykes on either side for the majority of the road. It would appear that any passing bays would need to be built over the dykes which are there to control flooding in this low lying area. These roads are in a very poor state and are not able to properly accommodate the traffic that already use them – cars, HGV's and agricultural machinery. Many times vehicles have ended up in the dykes when trying to negotiate a large oncoming vehicle. It is of great concern to imagine what our lives will be like with all the construction traffic that is envisaged. We need our roads to enable us to travel to the neighbouring towns for all of our daily needs from shopping to medical appointments and I feel that the construction period may make us prisoners in our own homes	N	The Applicant acknowledges the concern regarding construction traffic on Holbeach Drove Gate, however the traffic movements are expected to be minimal associated with this access point (19 maximum daily movements) as stated within **Annex A** of the **OCTMP** (Doc. Ref. 7.13). In terms of the concern regarding constructing passing bays, this is to be confirmed at detailed design stage. The **OCTMP** (Doc. Ref. 7.13) provides further information on the proposed construction traffic management during the construction phase which includes the introduction of a temporary speed limit and a temporary partial road closure. **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).
	Specific Issue No.36 Order Limit Holbeach Drove Gate We live in the centre of Holbeach Drove, at the junction of Main Road B1166 with the B1165. This is a sharp bend on a tight corner. At the juction there is the local village stores. It is a 3 way junction very busy with traffic.	N	The Order Limits have been extended in this location in the event that traffic management measures are required. No physical works to the lay-by at the junction of Main Road B1166 with the B1165 are proposed.

Change	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant Response
	A number of years ago the junction was reshaped to make it safer. This was achieved through the construction of a small lay-by to the front of our house and that of a neighbour. Your plans do not indicate how this layout might be affected to the Order Limit on Holbeach Drove Gate, if at all. If so we wish to register an objection to a change of the carriageway and the lay-by.		
	What does "Extension of the order limits along Holbeach Drove Gate to provide safe visibility and facilitate traffic management for construction access" actually mean? I want to know exactly how this is going to affect Holbeach Drove Gate. What does the whole project entail.	N	As stated in **ES Chapter 2: The Scheme** (Doc Ref 6.1) the access point on Holbeach Drove Gate is to provide access to the Inter-Array Areas. The location of the proposed access is identified as HDG-01 and HDG-02 on **ES Figure 2-5 Construction, Operational and Decommissioning Accesses** (Doc Ref 6.2). The access will be in place for the construction phase only. In terms of providing safe visibility and facilitating traffic management this could include the introduction of a temporary speed limit and a partial road closure as stated in the **OCTMP** (Doc. Ref. 7.13). There may also be the requirement for the construction of passing bays, however this will be confirmed at detailed design stage.
Change 25 - Relocation of all BESS to the 400kV substation site	Relocation of all BESS to the 400kV substation site The updated proposal to consolidate all BESS units at a single location (25 – Relocation of all BESS to the 400kV substation site) is likely to result in considerable disruption for residents of Peak Hill. Although the rationale provided is to minimize impact on other receptors, this strategy disproportionately places the burden on our community. Increasing the number of batteries at one substation will inevitably lead to higher noise levels due to the expanded cooling systems required. In contrast, distributing the batteries across smaller substations would likely reduce both noise and overall disturbance.	**Y**	The Applicant acknowledges the concern regarding the potential increase in noise impacts as a result of consolidating all BESS units into a single location, however due to the increased distance to residential receptors and screening from existing features such as the A16, no increased noise effects are predicted. The impact of the Scheme (including the BESS) on noise has been assessed within **ES Chapter 13: Noise and Vibration** (Doc Ref. 6.1), the chapter concludes that with the additional mitigation e.g. the use of transformers designed for low noise output and 'low noise' BESS containers which are secured within the **OOEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.11), no significant effects are expected.
	For example by placing all BESS on one site, land will be released in the originally planned location elsewhere in the scheme without explanation of what use that land will be put to.	N	The land will be used to site the 132kV substations. Please refer to **ES Figure 2-2: Indicative Solar Development and Inter-Array Layout Plan** (Doc Ref. 6.2) for further details.
	The proposed increase in land use has not been adequately explained, particularly regarding how released land from the BESS relocation will be used.	N	The land will be used to site the 132kV substations. Please refer to **ES Figure 2-2: Indicative Solar Development and Inter-Array Layout Plan** (Doc Ref. 6.2) for further details.
	The design changes, such as adjusted BESS locations and biodiversity enhancements (e.g., planting buffers), are welcome	N	The landscape and visual impact of the Scheme has been assessed within **ES Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual** (Doc Ref. 6.1) which concludes that significant visual and landscape effects are expected during construction, operation and decommissioning where there are

Change	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant Response
	but inadequate; they fail to address the cumulative visual intrusion across the 1,100-hectare site.		views into the Site. However, as mitigation planting as described in the **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16) matures the magnitude of effect is expected to reduce.
	I object to the proposed increase in land take for the scheme without adequate explanation. By placing all BESS on one site, land will be released in the original location but there is no explanation of what use that land will be put to.	N	The land will be used to site the 132kV substations. Please refer to **ES Figure 2-2: Indicative Solar Development and Inter-Array Layout Plan** (Doc Ref. 6.2) for further details.
	It is right next to a historically important Abbey ruins, which should be protected from a substation development for your company to link to.	N	The impact of the Scheme on the 'Ruins and site of Crowland Abbey' has been assessed within **ES Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage** (Doc Ref. 6.1) which concludes no significant effects are expected during the construction, operation and decommissioning of the Scheme. Proposed measures are set out in the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10), **OOEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.11) and **ODEMO**(Doc Ref. 7.12) to mitigate impacts.
	Substation and Relocation of all BESS (Battery Energy Storage System) The design refinements show a much larger area for the substation and BESS site, with no explanation for the use of the land previously identified for BESS. Despite the documentation stating that: • 'this change is expected to reduce potential noise effects for residential properties across the site by moving all BESS into a single location. With the nearest properties now more than 400m away…' • I would like to request that a new noise and visual impact assessment be conducted at the site location where the BESS is being relocated to, and at Land Parcel C where the sub-station has been relocated from Land Parcel B. I would also like to request further detail in relation to emergency planning in the event of a fire.	N	The land is being used to site the 132kV substations. Please refer to **ES Figure 2-2: Indicative Solar Development and Inter-Array Layout Plan** (Doc Ref. 6.2) for further details. The impact of the Scheme (including the BESS) on noise has been assessed within **ES Chapter 13: Noise and Vibration** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The chapter concludes that, with the additional mitigation measures (e.g. the use of transformers designed for low noise output and 'low noise' BESS containers), no significant effects are expected. These measures are secured within the OEMP, which will be prepared in accordance with the **OOEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.11) and secured by way of a Requirement in the **Draft DCO** (Doc Ref. 3.1). In terms of the landscape and visual impact of the Scheme, this has been assessed within **ES Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual** (Doc Ref. 6.1) which concludes that significant visual and landscape effects associated with the BESS and substations are expected during construction, operation and decommissioning where there are views into the Site. The **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16) sets out the proposed measures for the protection and management of existing and proposed landscape planting. In terms of further details relating to emergency planning in the event of a fire, this is contained within the **OBSMP** (Doc Ref. 7.18).
	BESS - Inadequate information about the relocation reason and fire safeguards. How are the fire service to access the site in varying wind conditions? What areas would be impacted should there be an incident - no information.	N	Justification for the relocation of all the BESS to the On-Site 400kV Substation Compound is outlined within **ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution** (Doc Ref. 6.1). 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).
	The proposed increase in land use has not been adequately explained, particularly regarding how released land from the BESS relocation will be used.	N	The land will be used to site the 132kV substations. Please refer to **ES Figure 2-2: Indicative Solar Development and Inter-Array Layout Plan** (Doc Ref. 6.2) for further details.
	The change for the BESS to be placed in one area, does appear to be sensible but so close to a main busy road seems	N	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).

Change	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant Response
	somewhat risky. If there was a fire the repercussions would be catastrophic.		
Change 30 - Internal reconfiguration of the Scheme layout within Parcel B to avoid areas at higher risk of flooding	There are similar concerns about the proposed reconfiguration of Parcel B. What evidence is for the changed land use classification leading to the reconfiguration?	N	The changed land use classification is based on the results of an Agricultural Land Classification Survey. The survey report is included within **ES Appendix 5-3: ALC Survey for Parcels B & C** (Doc Ref. 6.3).
	Where is the evidence for the downgrading of land at Parcel B? Does the reconfiguration involve a greater or lesser area for solar?	N	The changed land use classification is based on the results of an Agricultural Land Classification Survey. The survey report is included within **ES Appendix 5-3: ALC Survey for Parcels B & C** (Doc Ref. 6.3). The reconfiguration has not resulted in any change to the total area that will be used for solar panels within Parcel B i.e. the total area has remained the same.
	We have similar concerns about the proposed reconfiguration of Parcel B. What evidence is for the changed land use classification leading to the reconfiguration? Does the reconfiguration involve a greater or lesser area for solar? The lack of a full explanation only leads to speculation.	N	The changed land use classification is based on the results of an Agricultural Land Classification Survey. The survey report is included within **ES Appendix 5-3: ALC Survey for Parcels B & C** (Doc Ref. 6.3). The reconfiguration has not resulted in any change to the total area that will be used for solar panels within Parcel B i.e. the total area has remained the same.
	There are similar concerns about the proposed reconfiguration of Parcel B. What evidence is for the changed land use classification leading to the reconfiguration?	N	The changed land use classification is based on the results of an Agricultural Land Classification Survey. The survey report is included within **ES Appendix 5-3: ALC Survey for Parcels B & C** (Doc Ref. 6.3). The reconfiguration has not resulted in any change to the total area that will be used for solar panels within Parcel B i.e. the total area has remained the same. While the reconfiguration of Parcel D results in a net increase of 14.9 ha of land used for solar PV panels, this change arose through the Scheme's design evolution and has been assessed and justified in **ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design** (Doc Ref. 6.1).
	Parcel Reconfigurations MAG also questions the proposed reconfiguration of Parcel B. What evidence supports the change in land use classification? Does the reconfiguration increase or reduce the total solar development area? The lack of clarity invites unnecessary speculation.	N	The changed land use classification is based on the results of an Agricultural Land Classification Survey. The survey report is included within **ES Appendix 5-3: ALC Survey for Parcels B & C** (Doc Ref. 6.3). The reconfiguration has not resulted in any change to the total area that will be used for solar panels i.e. the total area has remained the same.
Change 38 - Extension of the Order Limits at Parcel D and reconfiguration of the panelled areas	The greatest concern is about the proposed reconfiguration of Parcel D removing one area from solar panel use but adding four additional areas of land for solar panels. This means that the is a net gain of 14.9 ha for solar panels. Little explanation is given for this increase.	N	As stated in **ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution** (Doc Ref. 6.1) four additional fields in Parcel D were brought forward for development with solar PV panels, following comments received from landowners during stage two consultation. This included the addition of 33.3 ha. Field D4 (18.4 ha) was however removed from consideration for solar PV, owing to its historic sensitivity, with the option to use this land for habitat enhancement retained instead. Overall, this resulted in a net increase of 14.9 ha of solar PV panels across Parcel D. Additional buffers were also included around properties along Langary Gate Road, where no solar PV panels would be located, in order to avoid impacting on the residential

Change	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant Response
			visual amenity of these properties and to avoid significant glint and glare effects. Crown Estate land previously indicated as inter-array within Parcel D has been removed from the Order Limits.
	Similarly, the reconfiguration of parcels—especially Parcel D—appears to increase the total land for solar panels without clear justification or evidence for these changes.	N	As stated in **ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution** (Doc Ref. 6.1) four additional fields in Parcel D were brought forward for development with solar PV panels, following comments received from landowners during Statutory Consultation. This included the addition of 33.3 ha. Field D4 (18.4 ha) was however removed from consideration for solar PV, owing to its historic sensitivity, with the option to use this land for habitat enhancement retained instead. Overall, this resulted in a net increase of 14.9 ha of solar PV panels across Parcel D. Additional buffers were also included around properties along Langary Gate Road, where no solar PV panels would be located, in order to avoid impacting on the residential visual amenity of these properties and to avoid significant glint and glare effects. Crown Estate land previously indicated as inter-array within Parcel D has been removed from the Order Limits.
	Similarly, the reconfiguration of parcels—especially Parcel D—appears to increase the total land for solar panels without clear justification or evidence for these changes.	N	As stated in **ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution** (Doc Ref. 6.1) four additional fields in Parcel D were brought forward for development with solar PV panels, following comments received from landowners during Statutory Consultation. This included the addition of 33.3 ha. Parcel D4 (18.4 ha) was however removed from consideration for solar PV, owing to its historic sensitivity, with the option to use this land for habitat enhancement retained instead. Overall, this resulted in a net increase of 14.9 ha of solar PV panels across Parcel D. Additional buffers were also included around properties along Langary Gate Road, where no solar PV panels would be located, in order to avoid impacting on the residential visual amenity of these properties and to avoid significant glint and glare effects. Crown Estate land previously indicated as inter-array within Parcel D has been removed from the Order Limits.
	My biggest concern is about the proposed reconfiguration of Parcel D, removing one area from solar panel use but adding four additional areas of land for solar panels. This means that there is a net gain of 14.9 ha for solar panels. Little explanation is given for this increase. No detail is given of the 'historical sensitivity' which leads to the removal of this particular area. Nor is there any justification given for increasing the take of an additional area.	N	As stated in **ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution** (Doc Ref. 6.1) four additional fields in Parcel D were brought forward for development with solar PV panels, following comments received from landowners during Statutory Consultation. This included the addition of 33.3 ha. Parcel D4 (18.4 ha) was however removed from consideration for solar PV, owing to its historic sensitivity, with the option to use this land for habitat enhancement retained instead. Overall, this resulted in a net increase of 14.9 ha of solar PV panels across Parcel D. Additional buffers were also included around properties along Langary Gate Road, where no solar PV panels would be located, in order to avoid impacting on the residential visual amenity of these properties and to avoid significant glint and glare effects. Crown Estate land previously indicated as inter-array within Parcel D has been removed from the Order Limits. In terms of the comment that no detail is given of the 'historical sensitivity', this is set out within Section 8.8. of **ES Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage** (Doc Ref. 6.1) which states that Parcel

Change	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant Response
			D4 is the site of a German Dornier 217 bomber aircraft that crashed during the Second World War. In terms of the projects 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.
	The proposed changes to Langary Gate Road site (Parcel D), removing one area but adding four more is destroying more of our countryside and wildlife where we live with no explanation. No details has been given for the 'historical sensitivity' for the removal of the of the one area	N	As stated in **ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution** (Doc Ref. 6.1) four additional fields in Parcel D were brought forward for development with solar PV panels, following comments received from landowners during Statutory Consultation. This included the addition of 33.3 ha. Field D4 (18.4 ha) was however removed from consideration for solar PV, owing to its historic sensitivity, with the option to use this land for habitat enhancement retained instead. Overall, this resulted in a net increase of 14.9 ha of solar PV panels across Parcel D. Additional buffers were also included around properties along Langary Gate Road, where no solar PV panels would be located, in order to avoid impacting on the residential visual amenity of these properties and to avoid significant glint and glare effects. Crown Estate land previously indicated as inter-array within Parcel D has been removed from the Order Limits. In terms of the comment that no detail is given of the 'historical sensitivity', this is set out within Section 8.8 of **ES Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage** (Doc Ref. 6.1) which states that Parcel D4 is the site of a German Dornier 217 bomber aircraft that crashed during the Second World War.
	Our greatest concern is about the proposed reconfiguration of Parcel D removing one area from solar panel use but adding four additional areas of land for solar panels. This means that the is a net gain of 14.9 ha for solar panels. Little explanation is given for this increase. No detail is given of the 'historical sensitivity' which leads to the removal of this particular area. Nor is there any justification given for increasing the take of an additional area.	N	As stated in **ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution** (Doc Ref. 6.1) four additional fields in Parcel D were brought forward for development with solar PV panels, following comments received from landowners during Statutory Consultation. This included the addition of 33.3 ha. Field D4 (18.4 ha) was however removed from consideration for solar PV, owing to its historic sensitivity, with the option to use this land for habitat enhancement retained instead. Overall, this resulted in a net increase of 14.9 ha of solar PV panels across Parcel D. Additional buffers were also included around properties along Langary Gate Road, where no solar PV panels would be located, in order to avoid impacting on the residential visual amenity of these properties and to avoid significant glint and glare effects. Crown Estate land previously indicated as inter-array within Parcel D has been removed from the Order Limits. In terms of the comment that no detail is given of the 'historical sensitivity', this is set out within Section 8.8 of **ES Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage** (Doc Ref. 6.1) which states that Parcel D4 is the site of a German Dornier 217 bomber aircraft that crashed during the Second World War.
	Our greatest concern is about the proposed reconfiguration of Parcel D removing one area from solar panel use but adding four additional areas of land for solar panels. This means that	N	As stated in **ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution** (Doc Ref. 6.1) four additional fields in Parcel D were brought forward for development with solar PV panels, following comments received from landowners during Statutory Consultation. This included the addition of 33.3 ha. Field D4 (18.4 ha) was however removed from consideration for solar

Change	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant Response
	the is a net gain of 14.9 ha for solar panels. Little explanation is given for this increase.		PV, owing to its historic sensitivity, with the option to use this land for habitat enhancement retained instead. Overall, this resulted in a net increase of 14.9 ha of solar PV panels across Parcel D. Additional buffers were also included around properties along Langary Gate Road, where no solar PV panels would be located, in order to avoid impacting on the residential visual amenity of these properties and to avoid significant glint and glare effects. Crown Estate land previously indicated as inter-array within Parcel D has been removed from the Order Limits. In terms of the projects 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.
	Our greatest concern is about the proposed reconfiguration of Parcel D removing one area from solar panel use but adding four additional areas of land for solar panels. This means that the is a net gain of 14.9 ha for solar panels. Little explanation is given for this increase. No detail is given of the 'historical sensitivity' which leads to the removal of this particular area. Nor is there any justification given for increasing the take of an additional area.	N	As stated in **ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution** (Doc Ref. 6.1) four additional fields in Parcel D were brought forward for development with solar PV panels, following comments received from landowners during Statutory Consultation. This included the addition of 33.3 ha. Field D4 (18.4 ha) was however removed from consideration for solar PV, owing to its historic sensitivity, with the option to use this land for habitat enhancement retained instead. Overall, this resulted in a net increase of 14.9 ha of solar PV panels across Parcel D. Additional buffers were also included around properties along Langary Gate Road, where no solar PV panels would be located, in order to avoid impacting on the residential visual amenity of these properties and to avoid significant glint and glare effects. Crown Estate land previously indicated as inter-array within Parcel D has been removed from the Order Limits. In terms of the comment that no detail is given of the 'historical sensitivity', this is set out within Section 8.8 of **ES Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage** (Doc Ref. 6.1) which states that Parcel D4 is the site of a German Dornier 217 bomber aircraft that crashed during the Second World War. 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.
	The proposed reconfiguration of Parcel D is most worrying as four additional areas for solar panels have been added. These were not included in the original consultations which makes a mockery of any consultation if you can then just add more land when you feel like it. How do we know that you won't add many more areas going forward?	N	As stated in **ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution** (Doc Ref. 6.1) four additional fields in Parcel D were brought forward for development with solar PV panels, following comments received from landowners during Statutory Consultation. This included the addition of 33.3 ha. Field D4 (18.4 ha) was however removed from consideration for solar PV, owing to its historic sensitivity, with the option to use this land for habitat enhancement retained instead. Overall, this resulted in a net increase of 14.9 ha of solar PV panels across Parcel D. Additional buffers were also included around properties along Langary Gate Road, where no solar PV panels would be located, in order to avoid impacting on the residential visual amenity of these properties and to avoid significant glint and glare effects. Crown Estate land previously indicated as inter-array within Parcel D has been removed from the Order Limits.

Change	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant Response
	The increase in land that you have indicated in the documentation, gives little indication as to why it is necessary. In particular the BESS relocation and the alterations to the parcels of land - in particular parcel D. There appears to be an increase in the total land for solar panels, without clear evidence or necessity for these changes.	N	Relocating all the BESS to the On-Site 400kV Substation Compound and the additional fields in Parcel D provides the most technically suitable solution for this Scheme. It reduces construction costs, energy losses and the amount of cabling required, while also increasing the distance between BESS infrastructure and nearby residential properties compared with having the BESS infrastructure at each of the On-Site 132 kV Substation Compounds associated with the Scheme. This change is expected to reduce potential noise effects for residential properties across the Site by moving all BESS into a single location. Further information is provided within **ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution** (Doc Ref. 6.1). As with all elements of the Scheme, any further refinements at detailed design would be informed by surveys, technical information and consultation feedback, and would be undertaken within the assessed design envelope.
	Our greatest concern is about the proposed reconfiguration of Parcel D removing one area from solar panel use but adding four additional areas of land for solar panels. This means that the is a net gain of 14.9 ha for solar panels. Little explanation is given for this increase. No detail is given of the 'historical sensitivity' which leads to the removal of this particular area. Nor is there any justification given for increasing the take of an additional area.	N	As stated in **ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution** (Doc Ref. 6.1) four additional fields in Parcel D were brought forward for development with solar PV panels, following comments received from landowners during Statutory Consultation. This included the addition of 33.3 ha. Field D4 (18.4 ha) was however removed from consideration for solar PV, owing to its historic sensitivity, with the option to use this land for habitat enhancement retained instead. Overall, this resulted in a net increase of 14.9 ha of solar PV panels across Parcel D. Additional buffers were also included around properties along Langary Gate Road, where no solar PV panels would be located, in order to avoid impacting on the residential visual amenity of these properties and to avoid significant glint and glare effects. Crown Estate land previously indicated as inter-array within Parcel D has been removed from the Order Limits. In terms of the comment that no detail is given of the 'historical sensitivity', this is set out within Section 8.8 of **ES Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage** (Doc Ref. 6.1) which states that Parcel D4 is the site of a German Dornier 217 bomber aircraft that crashed during the Second World War. 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.
	Our greatest concern is about the proposed reconfiguration of Parcel D removing one area from solar panel use but adding four additional areas of land for solar panels. This means that the is a net gain of 14.9 ha for solar panels. Little explanation is given for this increase. No detail is given of the 'historical sensitivity' which leads to the removal of this particular area. Nor is there any justification given for increasing the take of an additional area.	N	As stated in **ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution** (Doc Ref. 6.1) four additional fields in Parcel D were brought forward for development with solar PV panels, following comments received from landowners during Statutory Consultation. This included the addition of 33.3 ha. Field D4 (18.4 ha) was however removed from consideration for solar PV, owing to its historic sensitivity, with the option to use this land for habitat enhancement retained instead. Overall, this resulted in a net increase of 14.9 ha of solar PV panels across Parcel D. Additional buffers were also included around properties along Langary Gate Road, where no solar PV panels would be located, in order to avoid impacting on the residential visual amenity of these properties and to avoid significant glint and glare effects. Crown

Change	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant Response
			Estate land previously indicated as inter-array within Parcel D has been removed from the Order Limits. In terms of the comment that no detail is given of the 'historical sensitivity', this is set out within Section 8.8 of **ES Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage** (Doc Ref. 6.1) which states that Parcel D4 is the site of a German Dornier 217 bomber aircraft that crashed during the Second World War. 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.
	Our greatest concern is about the proposed reconfiguration of Parcel D removing one area from solar panel use but adding four additional areas of land for solar panels. This means that the is a net gain of 14.9 ha for solar panels. Little explanation is given for this increase. No detail is given of the 'historical sensitivity' which leads to the removal of this particular area. Nor is there any justification given for increasing the take of an additional area.	N	As stated in **ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution** (Doc Ref. 6.1) four additional fields in Parcel D were brought forward for development with solar PV panels, following comments received from landowners during Statutory Consultation. This included the addition of 33.3 ha. Field D4 (18.4 ha) was however removed from consideration for solar PV, owing to its historic sensitivity, with the option to use this land for habitat enhancement retained instead. Overall, this resulted in a net increase of 14.9 ha of solar PV panels across Parcel D. Additional buffers were also included around properties along Langary Gate Road, where no solar PV panels would be located, in order to avoid impacting on the residential visual amenity of these properties and to avoid significant glint and glare effects. Crown Estate land previously indicated as inter-array within Parcel D has been removed from the Order Limits. In terms of the comment that no detail is given of the 'historical sensitivity', this is set out within Section 8.8 of **ES Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage** (Doc Ref. 6.1) which states that Parcel D4 is the site of a German Dornier 217 bomber aircraft that crashed during the Second World War. 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.
	Our greatest concern is about the proposed reconfiguration of Parcel D removing one area from solar panel use but adding four additional areas of land for solar panels. This means that the is a net gain of 14.9 ha for solar panels. Little explanation is given for this increase. No detail is given of the 'historical sensitivity' which leads to the removal of this particular area. Nor is there any justification given for increasing the take of an additional area.	N	As stated in **ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution** (Doc Ref. 6.1) four additional fields in Parcel D were brought forward for development with solar PV panels, following comments received from landowners during Statutory Consultation. This included the addition of 33.3 ha. Field D4 (18.4 ha) was however removed from consideration for solar PV, owing to its historic sensitivity, with the option to use this land for habitat enhancement retained instead. Overall, this resulted in a net increase of 14.9 ha of solar PV panels across Parcel D. Additional buffers were also included around properties along Langary Gate Road, where no solar PV panels would be located, in order to avoid impacting on the residential visual amenity of these properties and to avoid significant glint and glare effects. Crown Estate land previously indicated as inter-array within Parcel D has been removed from the Order Limits. In terms of the comment that no detail is given of the 'historical sensitivity', this is set out within Section 8.8. of **ES Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage** (Doc Ref. 6.1) which states that Parcel

Change	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant Response
			D4 is the site of a German Dornier 217 bomber aircraft that crashed during the Second World War. 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.
	In direct response to the targeted documents, which are wholly inadequate for us to give a truly meaningful response: We are immensely concerned that parcel D has been increased in area for panels. There is no clear explanation as to why this has been proposed. How will this increase be minimised visually for the residents?	N	As stated in **ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution** (Doc Ref. 6.1) four additional fields in Parcel D were brought forward for development with solar PV panels, following comments received from landowners during Statutory Consultation. This included the addition of 33.3 ha. Field D4 (18.4 ha) was however removed from consideration for solar PV, owing to its historic sensitivity, with the option to use this land for habitat enhancement retained instead. Overall, this resulted in a net increase of 14.9 ha of solar PV panels across Parcel D. Additional buffers were also included around properties along Langary Gate Road, where no solar PV panels would be located, in order to avoid impacting on the residential visual amenity of these properties and to avoid significant glint and glare effects. Crown Estate land previously indicated as inter-array within Parcel D has been removed from the Order Limits. The landscape and visual effects of the Solar Development Area 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). Figure 1 Outline Landscape Masterplan of the **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16) illustrates the landscape mitigation proposals in Parcel D, including buffers around Site boundaries, shrub and tree planting on field boundaries and areas adjacent to residential properties, which have been left undeveloped. The Applicant remains confident that the information issued for the consultation was sufficient to allow meaningful participation.
	The documentation indicates a significant increase in the total land area affected, yet provides little justification for this expansion. In particular, the proposed relocation of the Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) and the changes to several land parcels — especially Parcel D — appear to increase the extent of land designated for solar infrastructure without clear or evidenced necessity.	N	Justification for the relocation of all the BESS to the On-Site 400kV Substation Compound and the additional fields in Parcel D is outlined within **ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution** (Doc Ref. 6.1). 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.
	Similarly, the reconfiguration of parcels—especially Parcel D—appears to increase the total land for solar panels without clear justification or evidence for these changes.	N	Justification for the reconfiguration of parcels including Parcel D is outlined within **ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution** (Doc Ref. 6.1).
	Our most serious concern relates to Parcel D, where one area is being removed from solar use, yet four new areas are being	N	Justification for the additional fields within Parcel D is outlined within **ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution** (Doc Ref. 6.1).

Change	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant Response
	added. This results in a net increase of 14.9 hectares for solar panels. The justification is unclear — no detail has been provided on the "historical sensitivity" behind the removal, nor the rationale for expanding other areas.		In terms of the comment that no detail is given of the 'historical sensitivity', this is set out within Section 8.8. of **ES Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage** (Doc Ref. 6.1) which states that Parcel D4 is the site of a German Dornier 217 bomber aircraft that crashed during the Second World War.
Change 7 - Extension of the Order Limits towards Broad Gate to facilitate works to a third-party asset	Following receipt of the plans for Change No. 7, I was very surprised to find a proposed road/access route running directly through our haulage yard. As I have previously explained to National Grid, this yard is attached to our home and is integral to our daily operations: it is in constant use for vehicle and trailer movements, is fully fenced for security, and contains free-roaming dogs.	N	The concerns regarding haulage operations, safety and residential amenity are acknowledged. The access is proposed to accommodate the undergrounding an existing OHL, rather than a general access point for the Scheme. Access arrangements remain under review and are subject to ongoing engagement and detailed design.
	The plans show the proposed road running less than one meter from our main bedrooms (bungalow), which raises serious safety, security and amenity concerns. Please clarify what the blue-shaded area represents. Will this land be taken out of our use? If so, where are we expected to park and operate our vehicles — specifically 15 trailers, 5 tractor units, and our vans and cars? Will our orchard be removed, and what arrangements are being made for our chickens and other aspects of our property?	N	The Applicant notes that the blue shaded area referenced represents the Order Limits shown during the stage two consultation. The yard referenced would only be used to access the existing 11kV asset. At this stage, this is expected to result in relatively low levels of traffic; however, this will be subject to the Distribution Network Operator's detailed design and construction methodology. Further engagement will be undertaken with the landowner ahead of any works. As set out in **ES Chapter 2: The Scheme** (Doc Ref. 6.1), where works to existing overhead line assets are required, these may include undergrounding using trenched or trenchless crossing methods. At this stage, detailed construction methodologies are not yet confirmed.
	Request for further information: Third part asset (Change 7 refers) When you state: "Extension of the Order Limits towards Broad Gate to facilitate works to a third-party asset". • What is the third party asset? • Please let me know.	N	The third-party asset referred to is an existing National Grid Electricity Distribution (NGED) 11kV overhead line, and the works relate to the interaction between the Scheme and this existing infrastructure.
	Looking at the changes, it would seem that Back Bank will be used as an access road for the connection between C and D. However, all the roads around this area that will be utilised affect us.	N	The Applicant acknowledges the concern regarding impacts to roads during the construction phase. This is assessed within **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref. 6.1) which concludes no significant effects are expected. Mitigation measures are proposed within the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13) to minimise impacts.
	I do not know what volume of traffic you think can be accommodated via back bank whether you have "passing places" or not. Back Bank cannot take HGV full stop. This road is narrow and I would imagine has not got the foundations for	N	The Applicant acknowledges the concern regarding the impact of construction traffic on Back Bank, however as stated in **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref. 6.1) the vehicle movements are likely to be limited to 4 vehicles per hour at peak times only – less at non-peak times - and 13 vehicles in total over a 18 hour weekday (see vehicle numbers for Eaugate Road and Chapel Hill (which are connected to Back Bank) in Table 15-20

Change	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant Response
	HGV and increased volume of traffic, whether a passing place is put in or not. We have lived here for five years and even with the tractor and farm traffic in the harvest period, the vibration and noise levels rise considerably. If your intention is to route your works traffic through this lane it will have a significant impact on not just my families well being but of the other residents of Back Bank. We are a rural community and imagine most of its residents work in and around this community and will not welcome a significant amount of traffic coming through our village.		Construction Traffic Impact – Development Peak Hours in **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref. 6.1)). In terms of the comment regarding the impact of construction traffic on the road condition, as stated within the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13) road condition surveys are proposed pre-construction, during construction and post-construction at Chapel Hill and Eaugate Road (which are connected to Back Bank) to identify defects 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). The impact of construction traffic on noise levels has been assessed at Eaugate Road and Chapel Hill (which are connected to Back Bank) in ES **Chapter 13: Noise and Vibration** (Doc Ref. 6.1) which concludes no significant effects at these locations. In terms of an assessment of traffic vibration this is scoped out of the noise and vibration assessment 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.
	My wife and I received your letter dated 18th September providing some information about proposed changes to "The Scheme" for a proposed solar power facility to be built on land north of Crowland and east of Spalding. We assume this is because you are proposing to use Back Bank, Whaplode Drove as an access route for construction traffic and we live on Back Bank. First, let me say that we support the development of solar power and recognise the important role it will play in efforts to reach net zero. We do have specific concerns about the use of Back Bank for construction traffic and make the following points that we ask you to take action on.	N	As stated in **ES Chapter 2: The Scheme (Doc Ref. 6.1)** access to the inter-array connection between Land Parcels C and D is to be provided via Back Bank, Eaugate Road, Chapel Hill and the B1168 Holbeach Drove Gate. The Applicant acknowledges the concern regarding the impact of construction traffic on Back Bank, however as stated in **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref. 6.1) the vehicle movements are likely to be limited to 4 vehicles per hour at peak times only – less at non-peak times - and 13 vehicles in total over a 18 hour weekday (see vehicle numbers for Eaugate Road and Chapel Hill (which are connected to Back Bank) in Table 15-20 Construction Traffic Impact – Development Peak Hours in **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref. 6.1)). Measures are included within the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13) to mitigate impacts. As stated within the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10) during construction there will be a Community Liaison Officer who will undertake engagement with local communities through a Community Liaison Group in accordance with Requirement 4 of the **Draft DCO** (Doc Ref. 3.1). They will also act as the primary point of contact for queries or complaints throughout construction or commissioning.
	Back Bank is a small country road that was never designed to support heavy traffic. One heavy truck causes the same road damage as approximately 250,000 passenger cars. Put another way, one truck travelling the road once potentially causes a similar amount of damage to an entire year of use by the local residents. This means the local residents will not only have to put up with the noise, disturbance and danger presented by the	N	The Applicant acknowledges the concern regarding the impact of construction traffic on Back Bank, however as stated in **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref. 6.1) the vehicle movements are likely to be limited to 4 vehicles per hour at peak times only – less at non-peak times - and 13 vehicles in total over a 18 hour weekday (see vehicle numbers for Eaugate Road and Chapel Hill (which are connected to Back Bank) in Table 15-20 Construction Traffic Impact – Development Peak Hours in **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref. 6.1)).

Change	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant Response
	use of the road for construction traffic but will also have to put up with a rapidly deteriorating road and disruption and noise from regular repairs. I can only assume that Meridian will foot the bill for all such repairs as otherwise local council tax-payers will also have to pay for these repairs. Meridian should make a clear statement about the volume of traffic, the measures being taken to strengthen the road and commitment to pay for all repairs and remediation work once the project is complete.		In terms of the comment regarding the impact of construction traffic on the road condition, as stated within the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13) road condition surveys are proposed pre-construction, during construction and post-construction at Chapel Hill and Eaugate Road (which are connected to Back Bank) to identify defects 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).
	Like other residents on Back Bank, we chose this property because it was on a quiet country road. There is no information about any limitations on when construction traffic will be able to use Back Bank or where the proposed passing places will be located. Obviously, if such passing places were to be placed close to the house then the level of disturbance would be much worse - and would continue after the construction was complete as the passing place would be used indefinitely into the future. We would like assurances this will not be the case and confirmation construction traffic will be limited to between 8am to 6 pm Monday to Friday. We already notice that ground-borne vibration can be felt in the house if a heavy vehicle passes by. We can imagine the proposed construction traffic may be significantly heavier than vehicles that normally use Back Bank and believe the disturbance from these vehicles will be much worse. We would like a weight limit to be applied to ensure heavy traffic uses alternative access routes. In all sincerity, it feels like using Back Bank as an access route is seriously flawed on grounds of safety and damage to property and infrastructure unless it is to be used only for light traffic and with appropriate mitigation put in place. We look forward to hearing your response.	N	The Applicant acknowledges the concern regarding the impact of construction traffic on Back Bank, however as stated in **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref. 6.1) the vehicle movements are likely to be limited to 4 vehicles per hour at peak times only – less at non-peak times - and 13 vehicles in total over a 18 hour weekday (see vehicle numbers for Eaugate Road and Chapel Hill (which are connected to Back Bank) in Table 15-20 Construction Traffic Impact – Development Peak Hours in **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref. 6.1)). There are propsoed measures included within the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13) to reduce the impact of HGV deliveries which includes timing restrictions which are generally avoiding arrivals or departures on a weekday between 07:00-09:00 and 17:00-18:00, no arrivals or departures on a Saturday before 08:00 or after 13:00; and no arrivals or departures on Sundays or public holidays (apart from in exceptional circumstances). 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). In terms of the requirement for passing places, this will be confirmed at detailed design stage. In terms of an assessment of traffic vibration this is scoped out of the noise and vibration assessment 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.
Change 35 - Extension of the Order Limits along Dog Drove to provide safe visibility for a	I am specifically interested in number 35 as I live in Gothic Farm. What is planned for the area shown in Blue, although the house and Gardens are in white, my fields behind the house are marked in blue, does this mean you want access and plan to run cables over my land as I will not consent to this.	N	The Applicant notes that the blue shaded area referenced represents the Order Limits shown during the stage two consultation. Since the stage two consultation, the Order Limits have been refined , and the fields referenced have subsequently been removed from the Scheme.

Change	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant Response
haul route crossing during construction	If you are planning to do anything in the field immediately to the north of my property I would like to know just what you are planning.		
Change 37 - Extension of the Order Limits along Langary Gate Road and its junction to provide safe visibility, facilitate traffic management, and accommodate overhead service diversions during construction	The Changes to Order Limits Langary Gate Road is a rural single lane road used by dog walkers and horse riders. It is not suitable for the many additional HGVs, vans and cars that will be required for construction of the solar farm. There are various drains and dykes that are needed to prevent flooding so not sure where the proposed passing places would be. Residents need to see a plan of these before construction. How does Meridian plan to make sure the safety of residents using Langary Gate Road for dog walking, horse riding are kept safe during construction?	N	The Applicant acknowledges the concern regarding the impact of construction traffic on Langary Gate Road. The **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13) sets out the Applicant's proposals to manage construction traffic and staff vehicles within the vicinity of the Scheme along the local highway network during the construction period of the works, in order to ensure the safety of residents using Langary Gate Road for dog walking and horse riding. In terms of the proposed passing places, these would be confirmed at detailed design.
Change 15 - Undergrounding of a section of the grid connection and the inclusion of two Cable Sealing End Compounds (CSECs), where the grid connection transitions from overhead line to underground cable.	You make reference to an order on Delgate Bank without specifying the nature of the order (and to avoid doubt I fully understand presumptions of ownership…I still have my old well thumbed copy of Gibson and happy to discuss exceptions such as former toll roads if you wish). The point however is that last year the highway authority spent significant amounts on a major re-surfacing project. Notwithstanding that the road is already breaking up with significant cracks and subsidence. It is my view that the road is not suitable for heavy constructional traffic. There is a history of damage to underground services (mains water) some of which have directly affected my property so I submit this method of access is not appropriate.	N	It is assumed the comment is referring to proposed change 15 which relates to the extension of the Order Limits at Delgate Bank for Undergrounding of a section of the Grid Connection Route and the provision of Cable Sealing End Compounds (CSECs). As stated in **ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution** (Doc Ref. 6.1), access from Delgate Bank would only be needed occasionally for operation and maintenance and therefore would not be used for heavy construction traffic. As stated in the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13) a road condition survey will be carried out at several locations including Delgate Bank 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. 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).

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

Theme	Comment	Scheme change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
Scope of the targeted consultation	We wish to make representations on the Targeted Consultation Document for Meridian Solar. We also wish to point out that this consultation period only came to light via the Meridian Action Group Facebook page, as we were not sent any notification either by post or via email. This is totally unacceptable for such an important issue.	N	The Applicant notes this comment and acknowledges the concern raised regarding notification of the targeted consultation. The targeted consultation was directed towards those considered most likely to be affected by, or to have a direct interest in, the proposed changes, in accordance with the approach set out the Statement of Community Consultation, further details of which are set out in the **Consultation Report** (Doc Ref. 5.1). In addition, wider publicity was provided through updates to the Scheme website on 22 September 2025, confirming that a targeted consultation would be taking place and that further details would be provided once it had commenced. The Applicant considers that the consultation was undertaken in a proportionate and appropriate manner having regard to the nature of the changes being consulted upon.
	Unjustified Use of "Targeted Consultation" Whilst I understand that this consultation is considered by Meridian to be 'targeted', referring to the changes as minor and localised, I don't consider this to be the case. The documentation shows 38 separate amendments which include: • Four additional fields in Parcel D, providing an increase of 14.9 hectares in the solar panel area • Relocation of all BESS to the new substation site north of Queens Bank • A vast number of changes relating to Order Limits with a lack of detail I would suggest that these are major material changes, with new land-take and altered visual and traffic impacts.	N	The Applicant considers that the proposed changes do not constitute fundamental alterations to the Scheme. Furthermore, the changes do not affect the conclusions of the assessments set out in the PEIR, nor do they alter the likely significant environmental effects reported at that stage. It is considered that relocating all the BESS to the On-Site 400kV Substation Compound and the additional fields in Parcel D are localised design refinements as this provides the most technically suitable solution for this Scheme. It reduces construction costs, energy losses and the amount of cabling required, while also increasing the distance between BESS infrastructure and nearby residential properties compared with having the BESS infrastructure at each of the On-Site 132 kV Substation Compounds associated with the Scheme. This change is expected to reduce potential noise effects for residential properties across the Site by moving all BESS into a single location. Accordingly, the Applicant determined that a targeted 28-day statutory consultation, directed towards those considered most likely to be affected by or to have a direct interest in the proposed changes, was appropriate. Further details of the justification for the Applicant's approach are set out in the **Consultation Report** (Doc Ref. 5.1).
	I consider the consultation period of four weeks (24 Sept – 22 Oct 2025) to be too short for the complexity of the 38 proposed amendments and provide feedback. The way this consultation has been conducted, seems to be a ticking exercise for procedural compliance rather than genuine community engagement which is what Meridian has previously claimed to be their ethos.	N	The Applicant considers that the proposed changes do not constitute fundamental alterations to the Scheme. Furthermore, the changes do not affect the conclusions of the assessments set out in the PEIR, nor do they alter the likely significant environmental effects reported at that stage. Accordingly, the Applicant determined that a targeted 28-day statutory consultation, directed towards those considered most likely to be affected by or to have a direct interest in the proposed changes, was appropriate.

Theme	Comment	Scheme change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	I wish to confirm that we both support the MAG submission dated 18th October 2025. We also had not received notification of this previously.	N	The Applicant notes this comment.
	The Distribution of the Targeted Consultation has been sparse, and not all residents affected by the changes have been made aware or notified of their right to feedback on the new design. There has been a lack of information shared with residents, and an assumption by Meridian Solar that residents can find out details for themselves from their website.	N	The targeted consultation was directed towards those considered most likely to be affected by or to have a direct interest in the proposed changes, further details of which are set out in the **Consultation Report** (Doc Ref. 5.1). In addition to updating the Scheme website, the Applicant notes that interested parties were able to contact the Community Relations Team by phone or email throughout the targeted consultation period to discuss the Scheme in more detail or ask questions.
	The Meridian Action Group wish to submit a further response to the targeted consultation. We have previously expressed our dissatisfaction that you have not agreed to meet face-to-face with the MAG Task Force to explain and discuss your proposals for changes to the scheme. We have recently learnt that your company has similarly declined to engage with South Holland District Council. We find your approach to engagement to be at odds with Meridian's published Statement of Community Consultation as reproduced below. This lack of a clear and open response to request to meet leads us to question the rationale behind that decision. It is reasonable to speculate whether Meridian do not wish to delay the process since their priority is to rush through the consent process in order to avoid NESO's intent to produce a Centralised Spatial Energy Plan and Centralised Strategic Network Plan to reform the clean energy supply framework. We seek information on the reason for not carrying out consultation in the manner promised. We look forward to a explanation of your decision not to meet. We also ask that the consultation period be extended so that genuine engagement can be undertaken on the proposed changes. Statement of Community Consultation April 2025 Consultation and Engagement Approach In line with the requirements set out in the Act, along with the guidance in the Planning Inspectorate's Planning Act 2008: Pre-application stage for Nationally Significant Infrastructure	N	The Applicant notes the comments raised by the Meridian Action Group. The Applicant does not agree that it has failed to engage with the Meridian Action Group. The Applicant responded to the issues raised through written correspondence and confirmed that it would be open to further discussion if requested. The Applicant considers that this approach is consistent with the principles of engagement set out in the Statement of Community Consultation. The Applicant also notes the reference to engagement with South Holland District Council. The Applicant has maintained regular engagement with council officers throughout the pre-application process. The Applicant was made aware of a request to meet with district councillors on 21 October 2025, one day prior to the close of the targeted consultation. No earlier request was received; however, had this been the case, the Applicant would have welcomed the opportunity to meet. In addition, the Applicant notes that a recent meeting was held with Weston Parish Council, during which it was confirmed that district councillors who had expressed an interest in attending were welcome to do so. The Applicant does not accept the suggestion that its approach to consultation has been influenced by a desire to avoid future policy or strategic planning reforms. The targeted consultation was undertaken in accordance with the Planning Act 2008 and the Applicant's Statement of Community Consultation, and was focused on consulting on clearly defined changes to the Scheme. The Applicant considers that the targeted consultation period provided a proportionate and appropriate opportunity for engagement on the proposed changes, and no extension of the consultation period is proposed.

Theme	Comment	Scheme change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	Projects, the Applicant will be carrying out meaningful, statutory pre-application consultation and engagement with the local community in the vicinity of the Scheme as well as with statutory consultees, landowners, businesses, parish councils, elected representatives, and wider stakeholders where appropriate. As aligned with our design principles, we will where possible, work with local communities to understand how best to protect and enhance their environment and the local area. The Applicant acknowledges that consultation is an important factor in the development of the Scheme and values the local knowledge provided in consultation responses. Throughout the pre-application process, the Applicant will seek to address feedback as part of design development, where appropriate. Consultation objectives The programme of consultation and engagement has four core objectives: • to share and explain the updated proposals with a wide range of stakeholders and the public, whilst still at an early stage of the process; • to gain insight through listening to the views of local communities and other stakeholders about the updated project proposals, whilst still at an early stage; • to identify potential impacts of the project and take stakeholder and community input into account in developing potential mitigation strategies; and • to provide a robust evidence base for the DCO application, enabling us to demonstrate how community and stakeholder feedback has influenced our considerations where possible. Consultation approach The Applicant wants to ensure that the Scheme is listening to and learning from the people who live in the area as well as wider stakeholders. The Applicant is committed to engaging and consulting with communities and stakeholders at an early stage of the Scheme development process, giving people the opportunity to provide feedback and insight at a formative stage, ahead of more detailed design work being carried out. This commitment includes providing accessible information on		

Theme	Comment	Scheme change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	the project to help inform engagement and gain feedback from stakeholders. In order to maximise the opportunity for a wide range of stakeholders to participate in our programme of consultation and engagement, and to increase the opportunity for local views to influence our considerations, the Applicant has committed to undertake a multi-phase programme.		
	Inadequate opportunity and time to object We were not properly notified of these plans. We only discovered this consultation by accident, when we walked our neighbour's dog along Broadgate and spotted a single stick in the foggy verge. Considering we are directly impacted by your plans, I am surprised that you think this is adequate consultation for such a large project and I am disappointing that you did not write to us directly. This is contrary to the Gunning Principles and I consider that I have not been properly notified. I think an extended consultation period would be appropriate after you write to all affected properties/parties directly to give them a proper chance to consider your plans.	N	The Applicant considers that the targeted 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 a number of localised changes to the Scheme, ensuring that engagement was appropriate to the scale and nature of those changes. On this basis, the Applicant considers the consultation approach to be appropriate and consistent with relevant legislation and guidance.
	I live in the affected area and have found out abput the changes by default. Your promise at previous consultations was to continue to engage and discuss. You have 38 changes to the original proposal and have given a very small window to feedback. Is this deliberate? Small paper signs, on insubstantial stakes, in low footfall areas does not provide notification.	N	The Applicant considers that the consultation directed towards those considered most likely to be affected by or to have a direct interest in the proposed changes was appropriate, further details of which are set out in the **Consultation Report** (Doc Ref. 5.1). As wider publicity, the Applicant updated the Scheme website on 22 September 2025 to confirm that a targeted consultation would be taking place and that further details would be provided once it had commenced. Given the nature of the proposed changes, the Applicant determined that a targeted 28-day statutory consultation, directed towards those considered most likely to be affected by or to have a direct interest in the proposed changes, was appropriate.
	Since then we have received targeted consultation documents for the period 24th September to 22nd October 2025. In the documents you sent there are a great deal of changes, totalling 38 apparently, incorporating major alterations at relatively short notice.	N	The Applicant notes this comment but maintains that adequate notice of the consultation was provided.
	These changes should be subject to a full public consultation.	N	The Applicant considers that the targeted consultation has been undertaken in accordance with the PA 2008, which allows for a bespoke and proportionate approach to further

Theme	Comment	Scheme change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	Meridian Solar's failure to provide clear, thorough, and transparent information to residents shows a disregard for community engagement and a lack of consideration for those whose lives and surroundings will be directly impacted, both during the construction phase and throughout the operation of the final solar farm.		consultation. The targeted consultation focused specifically on a number of localised changes to the Scheme, ensuring that engagement was appropriate to the scale and nature of those changes. On this basis, the Applicant considers the consultation approach to be appropriate and consistent with relevant legislation and guidance.
Consultation (general)	The increase in land for the project is worrying as there is little explanation for this nor why it is being increased at this late stage – it was not included in the earlier consultations	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 been reduced between statutory consultation and DCO submission. The Applicant further notes that it remains confident that information made available during the targeted consultation was adequate and appropriate for that stage in the process.
	I have read the recently received brochure many times and am still struggling with making head nor tail of the content. In plan English what does stage two consultation order limits actually mean? I feel that this brochure has been written in a manner to confuse the reader.	N	The Applicant acknowledges these comments but remains confident that information issued for the consultation provided adequate time for community involvement and invited participation. The Applicant also notes that interested parties were able to contact the Community Relations Team by phone or email throughout the targeted consultation period to discuss the Scheme in more detail or ask questions.
	I have already objected to your proposals in its entirety but to be then sent this additional "change" is wholly unacceptable.	N	The targeted consultation has been undertaken in accordance with relevant guidance and statutory requirements. The submission date for the Application has been moved to March 2026 to accommodate this additional consultation and ensure that consultees have been provided with an appropriate opportunity to review and respond to the proposed changes.
	I find it staggering that you can rail road these kinds of projects without any "real" concern how these sorts of projects ruin peoples lives. The consultations are just a tick box exercise in your companies pursuit for profits.	N	The Applicant notes this comment but disagrees and confirms that at each stage feedback received has helped shape the proposals submitted as part of the DCO Application.
	Given these uncertainties, it is challenging and, I believe, unfair to request feedback on your scheme at this time.	N	The targeted consultation has been undertaken in accordance with relevant guidance and statutory requirements. The submission date for the Application has been moved to March 2026 to accommodate this additional consultation and ensure that consultees have been provided with an appropriate opportunity to review and respond to the proposed changes.
	This development is a textbook case of greenwashing: a glossy, eco-friendly label slapped on a project that, in practice, undermines the very principles it claims to uphold. It's not about sustainability—it's about optics, profit, and political box-ticking.	N	The Applicant does not agree with this comment. The Scheme has been subject to a comprehensive Environmental Impact Assessment, the results of which are presented within the **Environmental Statement** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The Scheme has been designed in accordance with relevant planning policy and environmental legislation, and includes measures to avoid, reduce and mitigate potential environmental effects where practicable.
	The consultation material is poor both in content and format. The colouring on the legend is unclear.	N	The Applicant acknowledges these comments but remains confident that information issued for the consultation provided adequate time for community involvement and invited participation.

Theme	Comment	Scheme change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	In summary as a consultation document the Information Booklet is not fit for purpose.		The Applicant also notes that the maps were uploaded to the Scheme website at A3 following concerns being raised regarding the readability of those included in the information booklet. The Applicant also notes that interested parties were able to contact the Community Relations Team by phone or email throughout the targeted consultation period to discuss the Scheme in more detail or ask questions.
	We wish to make representations on the Targeted Consultation Document for Meridian Solar. We feel that the consultation material is poor both in content and format. The colouring on the legend is unclear. In summary, as a consultation document, the Information Booklet is not fit for purpose.	N	The Applicant acknowledges these comments but remains confident that information issued for the consultation provided adequate time for community involvement and invited participation. The Applicant also notes that the maps were uploaded to the Scheme website at A3 following concerns being raised regarding the readability of those included in the information booklet. The Applicant also notes that interested parties were able to contact the Community Relations Team by phone or email throughout the targeted consultation period to discuss the Scheme in more detail or ask questions
	We are writing in response to the Targeted Consultation on the proposed solar farm in South Holland to record our total opposition to the proposals. Firstly, I would like to put my opinion on record that we believe the Targeted Consultation information booklet is vague, unprecise with maps that are too small and general in nature to offer any meaningful information. Secondly, the booklet does not seem to address any of our previous concerns outlined our correspondence in reply to the Stage 1 & 2 consultations. Therefore, I have resubmitted all our previous objections below:	N	The Applicant acknowledges these comments but remains confident that information made available during the targeted consultation was adequate and appropriate for that stage in the process. The Applicant also notes that interested parties were able to contact the Community Relations Team by phone or email throughout the targeted consultation period to discuss the Scheme in more detail or ask questions. Details of how the Applicant has considered feedback received during the stage two consultation is presented in **Appendix H Section 42 Applicant's Response** (Doc Ref. 5.1) and **Appendix I: Applicant's Response** (Doc Ref. 5.1).
	I am writing to comment on the proposed changes to the Meridian Solar project. I am very concerned that the consultation materials are unclear and incomplete, making it difficult for local residents to properly understand the scale and impact of the revised plans. Overall, the lack of transparency and consultation with affected communities is disappointing. I urge Meridian Solar to provide clearer information and engage meaningfully with local residents before proceeding.	N	The Applicant acknowledges these comments but remains confident that information made available during the targeted consultation was adequate and appropriate for that stage in the process. The Applicant also notes that the maps were uploaded to the Scheme website at A3 following concerns being raised regarding the readability of those included in the information booklet.
	The documents are unclear and do not address any of the objections raised in the first phase.	N	Details of how the Applicant has considered feedback received during the stage two consultation is presented in **Appendix H Section 42 Applicant's Response** (Doc Ref. 5.1) and **Appendix I: Applicant's Response** (Doc Ref. 5.1).

Theme	Comment	Scheme change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	The consultation material is a challenge, to say the least. The plans fail to provide clarity on location and in some cases inadequately provide explanation for the proposed changes.	N	The Applicant acknowledges these comments but remains confident that information made available during the targeted consultation was adequate and appropriate for that stage in the process, and that the reasons for each proposed change were sufficiently explained. The Applicant also notes that interested parties were able to contact the Community Relations Team by phone or email throughout the targeted consultation period to discuss the Scheme in more detail or ask questions.
	As a resident of Langary Gate Road I would like to comment on the recent changes. The consultation information we received through the post was poor in content, format and scale.	N	The Applicant acknowledges these comments but remains confident that information made available during the targeted consultation was adequate and appropriate for that stage in the process. The Applicant also notes that the maps were uploaded to the Scheme website at A3 following concerns being raised regarding the readability of those included in the information booklet.
	With regards booklet for proposed changes to the Meridian solar farm, planning inspectorate ref EN010169. I have not found the drawings in the booklet very clear or informative. I have had to go to your website to get a better understanding of the areas mentioned. Even then, they are difficult to navigate for a lay person. I have concerns that many people are not able to access these details online, either through lack of information technology access or ability for various reasons. This I feel, devalues the consultation process, as to be neither fully reaching, inclusive or informative. As a local resident, given the opportunity to comment on the said proposals, I feel the information is not clear and I found the information raises more questions than it answers. A lot of the information talks of parcels of land in letter forms, A, B, C, D but it is not clear within this booklet which areas this relates to. This should be clearly visible if being used as a reference point. This makes the booklet and information within it invalid for comparison and understanding.	N	The Applicant acknowledges these comments but remains confident that information made available during the targeted consultation was adequate and appropriate for that stage in the process. Interested parties were able to contact the Community Relations Team by phone or email throughout the targeted consultation period to discuss the Scheme in more detail or ask questions, and hard copies of the materials were available free of charge upon request. The Applicant also notes that the maps were uploaded to the Scheme website at A3 following concerns being raised regarding the readability of those included in the information booklet.
	Format and Content of the Information Booklet The consultation material is considered poor both in content and format. The size and scale of the plans, particularly for the Order Limits, fails to provide clarity on location and in some cases inadequately provides an adequate rationale for the proposed change.	N	The Applicant acknowledges these comments but remains confident that information made available during the targeted consultation was adequate and appropriate for that stage in the process. The Applicant also notes that the maps were uploaded to the Scheme website at A3 following concerns being raised regarding the readability of those included in the information booklet.

Theme	Comment	Scheme change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	It was only at the request of MAG, highlighting this weakness, that Meridian uploaded enlarged scale plans.		
	The material you provided was unclear in content and format and very difficult to follow and understand - particularly the small scale of the maps	N	The Applicant acknowledges these comments but remains confident that information made available during the targeted consultation was adequate and appropriate for that stage in the process. The Applicant also notes that the maps were uploaded to the Scheme website at A3 following concerns being raised regarding the readability of those included in the information booklet.
	The lack of transparency and consultation with communities that will be affected by these proposals, is at best very limited. Clearer maps were only uploaded after requests, these maps should have been provided on the onset of the proposal. I urge Meridian Solar to provide clearer information and engage meaningfully with local residents before proceeding.	N	The Applicant acknowledges these comments but remains confident that information made available during the targeted consultation was adequate and appropriate for that stage in the process. The Applicant also considers that the targeted consultation was adequately publicised, with communication directed towards those considered most likely to be affected by or to have a direct interest in the proposed changes. Further details of the justification for the Applicant's approach are set out in the **Consultation Report** (Doc Ref. 5.1).
	I am extremely concerned that the consultation materials produced by yourselves is unclear and incomplete. It is difficult for local communities to understand the sheer scale and impact of these amendments both on individuals and communities.	N	The Applicant acknowledges these comments but remains confident that information made available during the targeted consultation was adequate and appropriate for that stage in the process.
	Distribution of consultation material has been inconsistent. I am aware of many households who received multiple copies of the documentation in the post, whilst others, who would be affected by the changes received nothing. As a councillor representing one of the wards that would be affected by this, I did not receive any communication from Meridian regarding this targeted consultation. I was made aware by a resident when the signage was put up on the 24th September - the start date of the consultation. This is extremely disappointing, particularly as I have been actively engaging with every stage of the process to date and have submitted responses at every stage. I am not aware of any other ward councillors being made aware of this consultation directly from Meridian either. I know that MAG (Meridian Action Group) requested to meet with representatives from Meridian to discuss the document and to have an opportunity to ask questions and seek clarification on matters, which was not granted. I also requested, via the planning consultant acting on behalf of	N	Publicity regarding the consultation was directed towards those considered most likely to be affected by or to have a direct interest in the proposed changes, including those within identified mailing zones, further details of which are set out in the **Consultation Report** (Doc Ref. 5.1). The Applicant apologises that no correspondence was received; however, it confirms that this included Ward Councillors. Some consultees may have received multiple letters, having been consulted as a community member within an identified mailing zone and as a landowner separately. The Applicant does not agree that it has failed to engage with the Meridian Action Group. The Applicant responded to the issues raised through written correspondence and confirmed that it would be open to further discussion if requested. The Applicant also notes the reference to engagement with South Holland District Council. The Applicant has maintained regular engagement with council officers throughout the pre-application process. The Applicant was made aware of a request to meet with district councillors on 21 October 2025, one day prior to the close of the targeted consultation. No earlier request was received; however, had this been the case, the Applicant would have welcomed the opportunity to meet.

Theme	Comment	Scheme change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	SHDC, if councillors could have a briefing session with Meridian, as they have at every other stage of this process, which again has not been facilitated. This lack of engagement goes against what Meridian have said previously at in-person events, that they are willing and eager to engage openly with residents, groups and councillors.		In addition, the Applicant notes that a recent meeting was held with Weston Parish Council, during which it was confirmed that district councillors who had expressed an interest in attending were welcome to do so.
	Request for Re-Consultation and Full Transparency I have requested via the planning consultant acting on behalf of SHDC that the consultation period is extended. I am also formally requesting this directly, and would request that Meridian have full engagement with MAG, councillors and residents. As previously mentioned, I am requesting that an updated environmental, traffic, and landscape assessment is undertaken.	N	The Applicant notes this comment but confirms that that the consultation period was not formally extended. However, individual requests for additional time were considered on a case-by-case basis. The Applicant also considered that it engaged with the Meridian Action Group, Councillors and residents in accordance with the scope of the consultation and all relevant guidance and legislation. Since the PEIR the assessments have been updated and are contained within the **Environmental Statement** (Doc Ref. 6.1). This includes an updated traffic assessment which is provided in **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref. 6.1) and an updated landscape and visual assessment which is provided within **ES Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual** (Doc Ref. 6.1).
	Conclusion The targeted consultation, as currently conducted, fails to meet the standards of transparency, inclusivity and fairness expected for a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project. The additional land-take, relocation of infrastructure, and inadequate engagement is, in my opinion, unacceptable. I therefore object to the proposed amendments and request that Meridian conduct a full public consultation.	N	The Applicant's 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 a number of localised changes to the Scheme, ensuring that engagement was appropriate to the scale and nature of those changes. On this basis, the Applicant considers the consultation approach to be appropriate and consistent with relevant legislation and guidance.
	Format and Content of the Information Booklet The consultation material is considered poor both in content and format. The size and scale of the plans, particularly for the Order Limits, fails to provide clarity on location and in some cases inadequately provides in adequate rationale for the proposed change. It was only at the request of MAG, highlighting this weakness, that Meridian uploaded enlarged scale plans. Even so they are of limited value in understanding the proposed changes.	N	The Applicant's 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 a number of localised changes to the Scheme, ensuring that engagement was appropriate to the scale and nature of those changes. On this basis, the Applicant considers the consultation approach to be appropriate and consistent with relevant legislation and guidance. The Applicant also remains confident that the information issued for the consultation was sufficient to allow community participation. The Applicant also notes that the maps were uploaded to the Scheme website at A3 following concerns being raised regarding the readability of those included in the information booklet.

Theme	Comment	Scheme change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	Having attended various events that are running alongside your latest consultation , it is evident that there are a lot of questions raised by residents and communities that are still to be answered.	N	Details of how the Applicant has considered feedback received during the stage two consultation is presented in **Appendix H Sedction 42 Applicant's Response** (Doc Ref. 5.1) and **Appendix I: Applicant's Response** (Doc Ref. 5.1).
	Firstly, we would like to draw your attention to the documentation that was posted to our property. These were extremely insufficient for us to be able to understand what the changes to the proposals were and what impact it would have for us directly. We would like to express our utter alarm at the fact that these documents were the only reference for us to understand what will in effect be a death sentence for our peaceful life and rural home.	N	The Applicant acknowledges the concerns raised regarding the information provided during the targeted consultation. The Applicant considers that the consultation materials issued were adequate and appropriate for the purpose of consulting on the specific changes proposed, and were intended to provide sufficient information to enable affected parties to understand the nature of those changes and their potential effects. Further detailed information on the Scheme and its impacts remains available within the application and accompanying documents.
	The colour key was not reflected on the maps in the same colours, so certain areas can not be identified.	N	The Applicant acknowledges these comments but remains confident that information made available during the targeted consultation was adequate and appropriate for that stage in the process. The colour key was consistently applied within the consultation materials and corresponding maps to allow areas to be clearly identified. Interested parties were able 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.
	I wish to formally register my concerns regarding the proposed amendments to the Meridian Solar project. After reviewing the consultation materials, I find them to be unclear, incomplete, and insufficient to enable proper understanding of the scale and implications of the proposed changes for both individuals and the wider community.	N	The Applicant notes this comment but considers that the information provided during the targeted consultation was adequate and appropriate for that stage in the process.
	In addition, the consultation process itself has lacked transparency and sufficient community engagement. Key materials, including detailed and clearly legible maps, were only made available following specific requests. Such information should have been provided at the outset to allow for informed participation by those affected. Given these concerns, I urge both Meridian Solar and the relevant planning authorities to ensure that clearer, complete, and accurate information is made available, and that meaningful consultation with local residents is undertaken before any further consideration or approval of the amended proposal.	N	The Applicant notes these comments. The Applicant considers that the information provided during the targeted consultation was adequate and appropriate for that stage in the process, having regard to the purpose of consulting on specific changes to the Scheme rather than the Scheme as a whole. The Applicant further notes that all reasonable requests for additional information were responded to. Consultees were also able to request hard copies of consultation materials or in alternative formats via the dedicated telephone line or email address, and these options were clearly signposted throughout the consultation period.

Theme	Comment	Scheme change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	I am writing to comment on the proposed changes to the Meridian Solar project. I am very concerned that the consultation materials are unclear and incomplete, making it difficult for local residents to properly understand the scale and impact of the revised plans.	N	The Applicant acknowledges these comments but remains confident that information made available during the targeted consultation was adequate and appropriate for that stage in the process. The Applicant also notes that the maps were uploaded to the Scheme website at A3 following concerns being raised regarding the readability of those included in the information booklet.
	Overall, the lack of transparency and consultation with affected communities is disappointing. I urge Meridian Solar to provide clearer information and engage meaningfully with local residents. We have been treated appallingly and the direct impact of these horrific proposals is directly on us, our lifestyles, life choices and our communities.	N	.The Applicant notes these comments. The Applicant considers that the information provided during the targeted consultation was adequate and appropriate for that stage in the process, and that the materials were made available in a range of formats to support engagement. The Applicant does not accept the suggestion consultees were charged for consultation materials. Hard-copy materials were available free of charge upon request, and alternative formats could also be requested via the dedicated telephone line or email address. These options were clearly signposted throughout the consultation period.
	The consultation material provided is poor in both content and format. Online, it's difficult to navigate, and the Glossy Brochure is equally difficult. If a brochure was requested, residents were directed to the website to download. Or charged for a brochure.	N	The Applicant notes these comments. The Applicant considers that the information provided during the targeted consultation was adequate and appropriate for that stage in the process, and that the materials were made available in a range of formats to support engagement. The Applicant does not accept the suggestion consultees were charged for consultation materials. Hard-copy materials were available free of charge upon request, and alternative formats could also be requested via the dedicated telephone line or email address. These options were clearly signposted throughout the consultation period.
	I have recently received a poorly produced information booklet regarding meridian solar's new solar project in my area. I have obviously been sent this information as it is going to affect me. Unfortunately I have spent hours trying to work out how and why I am going to be affected and still haven't got a clue.	N	The Applicant notes these comments but disagrees. It considers that the information provided during the 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.
	Format and Content of the Consultation Materials The consultation documents are considered poor in both format and content. The scale and clarity of the plans — particularly the Order Limits — are inadequate and fail to clearly show locations or justify the proposed changes. Only after MAG raised these issues did Meridian upload enlarged, more legible plans.	N	The Applicant's 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 a number of localised changes to the Scheme, ensuring that engagement was appropriate to the scale and nature of those changes. On this basis, the Applicant considers the consultation approach to be appropriate and consistent with relevant legislation and guidance. The Applicant also remains confident that the information issued for the consultation was sufficient to allow community participation.
	Format and Content of the Information Booklet	N	The Applicant's consultation has been undertaken in accordance with the PA 2008, which allows for a bespoke and proportionate approach to further consultation. The targeted

Theme	Comment	Scheme change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	The consultation material is considered poor both in content and format. The size and scale of the plans, particularly for the Order Limits, fails to provide clarity on location and in some cases inadequately provides in adequate rationale for the proposed change. It was only at the request of MAG, highlighting this weakness, that Meridian uploaded enlarged scale catplans.		consultation focused specifically on a number of localised changes to the Scheme, ensuring that engagement was appropriate to the scale and nature of those changes. On this basis, the Applicant considers the consultation approach to be appropriate and consistent with relevant legislation and guidance. The Applicant also remains confident that the information issued for the consultation was sufficient to allow community participation.
	Having seen the second proposed scheme which appears to be larger than the first (more profit envisaged no doubt) It is impossible to reference specific changes as some of the maps you've produced are illegible therefore the public can't see exactly what is being proposed and just how these proposals will affect them should this ill thought scheme get permission, also jargon used is not fully explained!	N	The Applicant notes this comment but disagrees. It considers that the information provided during the targeted consultation was adequate and appropriate for that stage in the process. The Applicant also notes that the maps were uploaded to the Scheme website at A3 following concerns being raised regarding the readability of those included in the information booklet. In terms of the projects 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 changes introduced during targeted consultation are not considered to represent a substantial expansion of the overall development.
	Alarmingly, the previous consultation documents did not make any substantial reference to the proposed impact of the substation on the residents of Weston, nor on the listed Chapel of St Nicholas in Wykeham.	N	The Applicant notes this comment but remains confident that information issued for the consultation provided adequate time for community involvement and invited participation. The Applicant does not agree that the consultation material failed to reference the potential impacts of the Scheme on residents of Weston or on the listed Chapel of St Nicholas at Wykeham. The potential effects of the Scheme on residential receptors are assessed within ES Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual (Doc Ref. 6.1), and the potential effects on heritage assets, including the Chapel of St Nicholas, are assessed within ES Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage (Doc Ref. 6.1). The Applicant considers that the information made available during the targeted consultation was adequate and appropriate for that stage of the process, having regard to the nature of the proposed changes.
Indicative overhead line	Consequently the route and locations of pylons and structures for the "Meridian Solar" project cannot be predicted.	N	The Applicant notes this comment but confirms that the overhead line will be located within the Grid Connection Route shown as part of the DCO Application, with the precise siting of pylons and structures to be determined at the detailed design stage. Refer to **ES Figure 2-4: Indicative Grid Connection Corridor Layout Plan** (Doc Ref. 6.2) for further details.
	We urge you to reconsider the proposals as a whole and in particular:	N	**ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution** (Doc Ref. 6.1) sets out the Grid Connection Route Site Selection and Design Evolution process.

Theme	Comment	Scheme change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	• Rerouting the southern connection corridor away from existing properties. • Reducing the height of the pylons from 50m to 30m. • Installing the power lines for the connection corridor underground.		The Applicant has undertaken a thorough site selection and overhead line routing process to minimise the impacts of the overhead line on neighbouring properties and the broader area. However, it is not possible to route an overhead line through this region without some proximity to neighbouring properties, and therefore the Applicant has sought to assess the potential effects of the Scheme on neighbouring properties and local resident and mitigate these where possible. The findings of these assessments, together with proposed mitigation, are set out in the **Environmental Statement** (Doc Ref. 6.1), including within **ES Chapter 12**: **Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment** (Doc Ref. 6.1). As stated in **ES Chapter 2: The Scheme** (Doc Ref. 6.1) the pylon heights vary between 44.5m and 58.6m above ground. A 7.4m vertical limit of deviation has also been set. As such, the maximum pylon height above ground would not exceed 66m. The overhead line is constructed to meet statutory clearances as per the Energy Networks Association (ENA/43-8), Technical Specification 43-8, Issue 5 2019, Overhead Line Clearances'. **ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution** (Doc Ref. 6.1) sets out the rationale for the selection of overhead lines as the preferred technology for the Grid Connection.
	Our main objection is that our property is extremely close to the southern section of the overhead line and connection corridor. The perceived associated health risks and visual impact has already had an effect on the value of our property. We have had our house and property on the market for most of this year. Before details of the Meridian Solar project became known, our property was valued at £750,000. Once details of the project, and the proximity of the pylons to our house, were released, our estate agent suggested dropping the price of our property to £695,000. Following the release of the stage two consultation details, they suggested reducing the price even further to £650,000 or even £600,000. Once the Targeted Consultation document was released, we have been told that to sell our property, we would have to reduce it further to £550,000. We have had no alternative but to withdraw it from the market. Therefore, we are facing a loss of £200,000, which we will expect to be compensated for should the solar proposals go ahead.	N	The Applicant acknowledges the concerns raised by the respondent. The Applicant has undertaken a thorough site selection and overhead line routing process to minimise the impacts of the overhead line on neighbouring properties and the broader area. However, it is not possible to route an overhead line through this region without some proximity to neighbouring properties, and therefore the Applicant has sought to assess the potential effects of the Scheme on neighbouring properties and local resident and mitigate these where possible. The findings of these assessments, together with proposed mitigation, are set out in the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.1), including within **ES Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual**. This has included an assessment of potential impacts on human health. **ES Chapter 10: Human Health** (Doc Ref. 6.1) concludes there will be no significant adverse impacts on the health of surrounding communities. 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.
	The reasons that the proposals must not go ahead are almost too many to list. The critical ones being the health risks of electromagnetic fields (EMF) from high-voltage powerlines sited near homes and communities. Studies suggest that portions of the EMF spectrum have radiation emissions that	N	Section 16.3 of **Chapter 16: Other Environmental Topics** (Doc Ref. 6.1) summarises the effects of the Scheme on EMF's. This is supported by an **EMF Compliance Assessment** (Doc Ref. 7.8). No significant effects were identified.

Theme	Comment	Scheme change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	may pose a risk of cancer, while underground cables do not emit EMFs. The risks associated with exposure include leukaemia and brain tumours.		
	To my understanding, this proposal and the National Grid Upgrade are separate projects that should require two separate sets of pylons. Why, then, are the plans provided by Meridian identical to those supplied by National Grid? At consultations, your agents have confirmed separation of the projects but offered no further detail. National Grid's agents have also described the route in this area as undefined because it is a problematic "pinch point" — so why do your plans use the same route? Particularly given that at their consultation, the National Grid agents stated that no other party can use the pylons on the Grimsby/Walpole routing. This proposal appears to disregard both our business operations and our quality of life, seemingly in favour of your financial interests. We request a detailed, written explanation addressing the points above and setting out what measures will be taken to mitigate the impacts on our home, business, livestock and property.	N	The Meridian Solar Farm and Grimsby to Walpole are two separate projects. The Applicant has worked with NGET to develop a design which allows both projects to be delivered within a shared corridor. The two project teams worked collaboratively to find solutions in order to ensure that two overhead lines could be delivered at the points of interaction. This meant that both NSIPs could progress without one posing a delivery risk to the other. The interrelationship between the two projects is also considered within **ES Chapter 17: Effect Interactions** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The Applicant and NGET also discussed the potential for a tee connection to the Grimsby to Walpole overhead line. This would represent the most economic and efficient solution for the Scheme as the Grimsby to Walpole line runs adjacent to the Scheme at Land Parcel D. A tee-in would avoid the requirement for a connection directly into the planned Weston Marsh substation, thus substantially reducing the length of the overhead line required. NGET advised that it would not provide for a tee-in connection and on this basis, only a connection into the future Weston Marsh Substation was considered deliverable for the grid connection
	I have yours of 18th and 23rd ult each with no doubt expensive glossy brochure. There is no point in wasting your or my time going over old ground…these are best dealt with by submission to the planning inspectorate at the appropriate time. I will thus limit this response to three simple points all relating to the proposed transmission line as follows: Earlier on your website you made reference to an alternative shorter and no doubt much cheaper route from the Eastern end of site to link direct to the proposed over head line itself heading east. This would have much less impact on the landscape. At the meeting at Weston village hall you told me that that was still on the agenda but you were awaiting the OK from National Grid. If that was true you should be pursuing that before submission of your application. I note you are happy to underground where forced (that is under the existing 132KV line). There is no reason why the whole 13KM line shouldn't be underground.	N	**ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution** (Doc Ref. 6.1) and the **Design Approach Document** (Doc Ref. 7.3) explains the reasoning (including overhead lines being the strong starting presumption for electricity networks as per paragraph 2.9.31 of EN-5) behind the selection of an overhead line instead of an underground cable for the Grid Connection Route and the Overhead Inter-Array Connection.

Theme	Comment	Scheme change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	Please do not trouble to respond….. I mention these points only as they will also form part of the submission to the Inspectorate.		
	One concern has to be the pylons which will be coming from the site to the connection point at Weston Marsh. Another set on top of the 2 projects also been planned ! Is there any way that these pylons could connect to the grid somewhere further south of us and closer to your project to protect our farmland and disruption to residents? It would also be more beneficial to your project. We have broached this subject already with National Grid and are awaiting updates – we understand that they have been liaising with yourselves.	N	**ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution** (Doc Ref. 6.1) sets out the Grid Connection Route Site Selection and Design Evolution process.
	We also have been made aware of the 'pinch point' at Broadgate, Weston Hills where both yourselves and National Grid are erecting pylons – are pylons planned for ½ National Grid and ½ Meridian – this is how a landowner interprets this ? National Grid has stated that they need as much energy as they can get so is this how they plan to do it ? ? The badly affected landowner is worried about his bungalow and yard, which is used for his business, as it looks as if access will be needed through his property with both National Grid and Meridian wanting/needing the same area. And more pylons so close to his property !! I have spoken to [redacted], the DCO manager for Downing Renewable Developments, after a recent meeting at Weston, who advised me that they are liaising with National Grid over this issue – but the landowner has only had communication with both developers at consultation events – no letters, no notices on his land or near his property, no surveys etc, nothing !! Please, please can someone contact this person and make plans to go and visit him to discuss these proposals. The information sent out with this latest consultation quite honestly is so unclear and difficult to understand and he needs clarification of what is being planned.	N	The Meridian Solar Farm and Grimsby to Walpole are two separate projects. The Applicant has worked with NGET to develop a design which allows both projects to be delivered within a shared corridor. The two project teams worked collaboratively to find solutions in order to ensure that two overhead lines could be delivered at the points of interaction. This meant that both NSIPs could progress without one posing a delivery risk to the other. The interrelationship between the two projects is also considered within **ES Chapter 17: Effect Interactions** (Doc Ref. 6.1).The Applicant also notes that it considers that the information provided during the targeted consultation was adequate and appropriate for that stage in the process.
	The massive pylons proposed are totally wrong, taking up agricultural land and are a complete eyesore. They will be far too close to our property, known as Runnymede, and we totally object to your planned proposals. Underground cables would be far preferable, or better still, why not build tidal generators around our coast?	N	The impact of the Scheme on agricultural land is assessed within **ES Chapter 5: Agriculture and Soils** (Doc Ref. 6.1). **ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution** (Doc Ref. 6.1) and the **Design Approach Document** (Doc Ref. 7.3) explains the reasoning (including overhead lines being the strong starting presumption for electricity networks as per paragraph 2.9.31 of EN-5) behind the

Theme	Comment	Scheme change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
			selection of an overhead line instead of an underground cable for the Grid Connection Route and the Overhead Inter-Array Connection.
	Continued objection As per my response to the National Grid Grimsby to Walpole Transmission Project 'consultation' (reproduced below) I continue to object to your plans to erect overhead powerlines in South Holland. These represent a total disregard for the environment in the greedy pursuit of profit. The powerlines should be placed underground. I note from your revised plans that you now intend to run a very small part of the power lines underground (Change 15 refers). I suggest that now that you have established that this is not a logistical problem, you put them all underground as the only thing stopping you is your greed.	N	**ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution** (Doc Ref. 6.1) and the **Design Approach Document** (Doc Ref. 7.3) explains the reasoning (including overhead lines being the strong starting presumption for electricity networks as per paragraph 2.9.31 of EN-5) behind the selection of an overhead line instead of an underground cable for the Grid Connection Route and the Overhead Inter-Array Connection.
	Bats We have a notable population of bats on our property that are protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act, and your plans to erect pylons would be detrimental to their wellbeing. Putting your power lines underground would be an obvious solution.	N	The impact of the Scheme (including overhead lines) has been assessed within **ES Chapter 9: Ecology and Biodiversity** (Doc Ref. 6.1). With mitigation in place, no significant effects are expected for bats.
Assumed substation location	I have been unable to provide comprehensive feedback on this scheme because National Grid has not yet finalized the position of the Weston Marsh Substation or the associated pylon locations. As such, the proposed route across my land or the land use remains undetermined.	N	The Applicant notes that the Weston Marsh Substation will be consented and delivered separately to the Scheme. The exact location of pylons and overhead lines would be confirmed through detailed design and discussion with affected landowners. The interrelationship between the two projects is also considered within **ES Chapter 17: Effect Interactions** (Doc Ref. 6.1).
	There will be noise coming from the substation, this will disrupt the peace and quiet of our beautiful rural location. There are so many places where there are no houses, or near existing power stations and noisy infrastructure. These areas would be much more suitable for something so noisy and detrimental to health, we would like this to be looked into and the station moved to a more appropriate location. We strongly object to these plans and will not be happy if this substation is placed in the suggested location.	N	The impact of the Scheme (including the BESS) on noise has been assessed within **ES Chapter 13: Noise and Vibration** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The chapter concludes no significant effects after the inclusion of mitigation such as the utilisation of 'low noise' BESS containers. **ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution** (Doc Ref 6.1) sets out the reason for the relocation of the BESS to the On-Site 400kV Substation compound.
	The lack of a final position of the Weston Marsh substation is unacceptable, a 'best guess' is just not good enough. This alone	N	The Applicant notes this comment but remains confident that the level of information made available during the consultation was adequate and appropriate for the Scheme. Should the

Theme	Comment	Scheme change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	should pause the proposal, as it will not only affect the surrounding substation area but may also affect the pylon route connecting to the substation.		plans for the Weston Marsh substation alter, the Applicant would engage with NGET and determine the most appropriate course of action at that time.
	Equally concerning is the absence of a confirmed location for the Weston Marsh substation. Relying on a provisional or "best guess" position is wholly inadequate for a development of this nature. The final siting of the substation will have considerable implications for both the immediate area and the associated pylon route. This uncertainty alone should necessitate a pause in the proposal until definitive information is provided.	N	The Applicant notes this comment but remains confident that the level of information made available during the consultation was adequate and appropriate for the Scheme. Should the Weston Marsh substation not be approved, the Applicant would engage with NGET and determine the most appropriate course of action at that time. It should be noted that the substations are needed for other projects to processed such as Grimsby to Walpole, Outer Dowsing and Ossian.
Construction impacts (non-traffic related)	Let's start with the facts. Various protected species have been spotted in the area, and this development would bulldoze their habitats into oblivion. These are ecosystems we should be preserving, not sacrificing on the altar of corporate virtue-signalling. The proposed track routes for heavy construction traffic are laughably unsuitable—Hulls Drove for example is already collapsing under its own weight. Add convoys of industrial vehicles and we'll be lucky if it doesn't vanish entirely.	N	The impact of the Scheme on protected species has been assessed within **ES Chapter 9: Ecology and Biodiversity** (Doc Ref 6.1), which concludes no significant effects with the implementation of mitigation. In terms of Hull's Drove, measures are included within the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13) to mitigate any adverse impacts during the construction phase. As part of the landscape design for the Scheme, new habitats would be provided to increase biodiversity compared to the existing baseline. This would include converting areas of agricultural land around and beneath the solar PV panels into species rich grassland, providing new tree and shrub planting along field boundaries, and enhancing habitats next to watercourses. The Solar Development Area incorporates approximately 174ha of habitat management areas where no physical infrastructure is proposed. Out of this, over 150ha have been specifically set aside for the enhancement of habitats for farmland birds, such as skylark. The creation and subsequent management of habitats would be implemented in accordance with the LEMP, which is to be prepared in accordance with the **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16) and secured by way of Requirement in the **Draft DCO** (Doc Ref. 3.1).
	Disturbance, disruption and noise during the construction phase including the safety aspect of heavy construction traffic and plant on narrow minor rural roads. Roads which are already in an inadequate state of repair and will be all but destroyed by the traffic influx.	N	**ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref 6.1) details the Applicant's assessment of the likely significant effects of increased traffic levels during construction. In terms of managing construction traffic, the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13) addresses road user safety and how to reduce traffic impacts from the Scheme. 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). The Applicant notes that mitigation measures are summarised in **ES Appendix 15-1 Transport Assessment** (Doc Ref 6.3). **ES Chapter 13: Noise and Vibration** (Doc Ref. 6.1) assesses the likely significant effects of the Scheme on nearby sensitive receptors during construction, operation and decommissioning including from construction traffic. 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.

Theme	Comment	Scheme change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	The result would be a diminished quality of life for residents, including increased noise from construction and operations, reduced natural light, and a sense of enclosure that erodes the area's peaceful, agrarian appeal. Furthermore, glint and heat-island effects would be significant and damaging.	N	**ES Chapter 13: Noise and Vibration** (Doc Ref. 6.1) assesses the likely significant effects of the Scheme on nearby sensitive receptors during construction, operation and decommissioning, including as a result of construction traffic impacts. The CTMP, prepared in accordance with **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13) and secure by way of Requirement in the **Draft DCO** (Doc Ref. 3.1), will control routing, timing and scheduling of vehicle movements to avoid network peak hours, minimise congestion, and reduce associated noise and disturbance at sensitive receptors. The visual impact of the Scheme 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). 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. In terms of the concern that the solar panels cause micro climates, **ES Chapter 7: Climate Change (Doc Ref. 6.1)** assesses the impact of GHG emissions arising as a result of the Scheme on the climate and provides a review of the resilience of the Scheme to projected future climate change impacts. The potential for a microclimate to be created by solar panels is extremely unlikely.
Landscape and Visual impact	Not to mention unsightly structures paving over the countryside that will be forever lost.	N	The Applicant disagrees that the countryside will be forever lost as the Scheme has a 40 year operational life, as defined by requirement in the **Draft DCO** (Doc Ref. 3.1). **ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution** (Doc Ref. 6.1) and the **Design Approach Document** (Doc Ref. 7.3) explains the reasoning (including overhead lines being the strong starting presumption for electricity networks as per paragraph 2.9.31 of EN-5) behind the selection of an overhead line instead of an underground cable for the Grid Connection Route and the Overhead Inter-Array Connection. The discussion in the above documents also considers technical feasibility. environmental constraints, and cost implications. The overhead option was determined to provide a more practicable and deliverable solution within the parameters of the Scheme. As part of the landscape design for the Scheme, new habitats would be provided to increase biodiversity compared to the existing baseline. This would include converting areas of agricultural land around and beneath the solar PV panels into species rich grassland, providing new tree and shrub planting along field boundaries, and enhancing habitats next to watercourses. The Solar Development Area incorporates approximately 174ha of habitat management areas where no physical infrastructure is proposed. Out of this, over 150ha have been specifically set aside for the enhancement of habitats for farmland birds, such as skylark. The creation and subsequent management of habitats would be implemented in

Theme	Comment	Scheme change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
			accordance with the LEMP, which is to be prepared in accordance with the **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16) and secured by way of Requirement in the **Draft DCO** (Doc Ref. 3.1).
	We are told that the pylons used in the southern section of the connection corridor will be 50m in height rather than the usual 30m, which will have an excessive visual impact. We have also been informed that 50m pylons are not required for the voltage produced by the solar development and that 30m would be adequate.	N	The overhead line is constructed to meet statutory clearances as per the Energy Networks Association (ENA/43-8), Technical Specification 43-8, Issue 5 2019, Overhead Line Clearances'.
	Our attached image is an aerial view of Moulton Chapel taken in the 1970s looking southwest across one of the most unspoilt flat landscapes in Britain. The tract of land south and west of the village remains as unchanged today as it has been for centuries. This particular landscape will be seriously impacted by the parcel B and C solar farms and, more critically, the southwestern connection corridor. Pylons and overhead lines would visually pollute this unique area of landscape as they will also impair the same beauty of other areas affected. Lines of towering pylons marching across the fields will have a monstrous visual effect on our flat lands and big skies noted for their vivid sunsets. We must protect this stunning and unique landscape. It is interesting to note that, allegedly, Meridian already seems aware of the negative effect that pylons will have on our area, arguably both in terms of health and visual pollution, because they studiously avoid using the words 'pylons' in their consultation documents and refer to them as 'lattice towers', which sound less contentious. Even the National Grid has the courage of its convictions to call them pylons.	N	The visual impact of the Scheme has been assessed within **ES Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual** (Doc Ref. 6.1) which concludes that significant visual and landscape effects are expected during construction, operation and decommissioning where there are views into the Site. 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). In terms of the overhead lines, **ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution** (Doc Ref. 6.1) and the **Design Approach Document** (Doc Ref. 7.3) explains the reasoning (including overhead lines being the strong starting presumption for electricity networks as per paragraph 2.9.31 of EN-5) behind the selection of an overhead line instead of an underground cable for the Grid Connection Route and the Overhead Inter-Array Connection. The discussion in the above documents also considers technical feasibility, environmental constraints, and cost implications. The overhead option was determined to provide a more practicable and deliverable solution within the parameters of the Scheme.
	Landscape & Visual Impact – The proposed site would significantly alter the visual character of the surrounding landscape and potentially impact neighbouring properties and local amenity.	N	The visual impact of the Scheme has been assessed within **ES Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual** (Doc Ref. 6.1), which concludes that significant visual and landscape effects are expected during construction, operation and decommissioning where there are views into the Site. 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).
	The area is cherished for its open, pleasant rural setting, which supports local wellbeing, tourism, and community cohesion. The proposed solar farm would transform this into a semi-industrial landscape dominated by rows of 3-4 metre-high	N	The visual impact of the Scheme has been assessed within **ES Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual** (Doc Ref. 6.1) which concludes that significant visual and landscape effects are

Theme	Comment	Scheme change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	panels, security fencing, inverters, and overhead lines—permanently altering views from homes, roads, and public footpaths. This breaches National Policy Statement EN-3's emphasis on minimising landscape and amenity impacts and contravenes the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, 2024) paragraph 180, which requires protection of rural character.		expected during construction, operation and decommissioning where there are views into the Site. 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). The **Planning Statement** (Doc Ref 7.1) assesses the Scheme against relevant policies including NPS EN-3.
Access	I also have concerns about every-day access for emergency services, such as police, fire engines and ambulances. There would be so much chaos to the change in access, road closures, potential traffic controls, extra heavy vehicles, confusion from road users. So many roads impacted at the same time for such a large project, over a long period, ever changing road and traffic controls and conditions.	N	**ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref 6.1) details the Applicant's consideration of the effects of increased traffic levels (including for emergency services) during construction which concludes no significant effects are expected. In terms of managing construction traffic, the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13) considers road user safety and how to reduce traffic impacts from the Scheme. The Applicant notes that mitigation measures are summarised in **ES Appendix 15-1 Transport Assessment** (Doc Ref 6.3).
HGVs and construction traffic impacts	Ie. Dowsdale Bank, Coxes Drove, Martins Bank, Queens Bank etc etc. I feel that it's unlikely that anybody has visited this area and seen first hand the network of roads that you propose to utilise. The largest road through our area is the B1166 and over the years the size of the lorries has not only increased, forcing oncoming traffic dangerously over to the verges but also increased dramatically in numbers. This road is constantly being resurfaced forcing locals to use the miriad of even more minor roads while repairs are undertaken. Especially in winter time the number of vehicles that end up in the Dykes are already ridiculous.	N	The suitability of the roads proposed has been confirmed by swept path analysis which is required for the AILs transporting materials to the relevant access points of the Scheme as set out in Annex A and B of the **OCTMP** (Doc. Ref. 7.13). **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref 6.1) details the Applicant's consideration of the effects of increased traffic levels during construction which concludes no significant effects are expected. In terms of managing construction traffic, measures are included in the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13). This includes a road condition survey at several locations which will be carried out pre-construction, during construction and post-construction, to identify any defects that arise to highways assets/verges during the construction phase of the 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).
	This miriad of roads are also the roads that you propose to use throughout your project. Let me tell you that Coxes Drove, that no doubt looks a lovely straight, tarmacked road on Google satellite is virtually impassable. The B1166 is closed at the moment (3rd or 4th time this year) and Coxes Drove has so much subsidence along its length that its hard to drive at much more than 10 miles per hour. (I drove along it yesterday) Carrying on along the A16 to Cowbit is an option but adds 10 miles on the journey. It seems that our road (Back Bank. change 33) will be used for access to aid the work between C and D of the project and	N	The suitability of the roads proposed has been confirmed by swept path analysis which is required for the AILs transporting materials to the relevant access points of the Scheme as set out in Annex A and B of the **OCTMP** (Doc. Ref. 7.13). **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref 6.1) details the Applicant's consideration of the effects of increased traffic levels during construction which concludes no significant effects are expected. In terms of managing construction traffic, measures are set out in the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13).

Theme	Comment	Scheme change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	again it is so narrow and "twisty" the thought of lorries up and down is frightening.		
	These roads are regularly blocked by vehicles going into the dykes & having to move over slightly to the soft verges, to allow room for a lorry to pass with the coming traffic! Not so long ago the garage WHBrand had a delivery of cars on one of those huge car transporters! It ended up in the dyke with all the new cars being delivered! Road blocked for sometime to get this cleared away!	N	The suitability of the roads proposed has been confirmed by swept path analysis which is required for the AILs transporting materials to the relevant access points of the Scheme as set out in Annex A and B of the **OCTMP** (Doc. Ref. 7.13). **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref 6.1) details the Applicant's consideration of the effects of increased traffic levels during construction which concludes no significant effects are expected. In terms of managing construction traffic, measures are set out in the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13).
	Furthermore the road infrastructure in these areas will not support heavy construction traffic. These are country lanes that should not be spoilt by being modified to satisfy such an abominable plan which is a folly.	N	**ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref 6.1) details the Applicant's consideration of the effects of increased traffic levels during construction which concludes no significant effects. The suitability of the roads proposed has been confirmed by swept path analysis which is required for the AILs transporting materials to the relevant access points of the Scheme as set out in Annex A and B of the **OCTMP** (Doc. Ref. 7.13). In terms of managing construction traffic, measures are set out in the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13).
	An explanation of the technical feasibility of constructing passing bays on silt land is needed. This also needs to accommodate HGVs, agricultural machinery as well light vans and cars.	N	There are design options to deal with poor ground conditions encountered along an access. These could require a deeper depth of excavation of the top soil/subsoil from the nominal 400mm currently assumed for the import of stone for stone access roads including passing places. The stone access road can also be further reinforced with layers of geotextile membrane, within the depth of stone, to give added load capacity in bearing. Moving the access road &/or passing places within the Order Limits to avoid poor ground areas could also be considered. These options are all part of detailed design by successful contractor and would include limited probing of the ground along access roads at intervals to gain further data on the soil to aid with temporary works design. Unless specifically agreed to, construction access roads are not meant for agricultural machinery and hence not for shared use with landowner/farmer. **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref 6.1) details the Applicant's consideration of the effects of increased traffic levels during construction which concludes no significant effects are expected. In terms of managing construction traffic, measures are set out in the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13).

Theme	Comment	Scheme change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	Our house is a Victorian cottage that no doubt has limited foundations and was certainly not built to withstand heavy vehicles passing within a few metres of its walls. We are very concerned this traffic will cause structural damage to our house. We would like a one-to-one consultation with Meridian to discuss how this risk is going to be managed as we see very limited opportunities for mitigation. The thought of our beautiful, peaceful home slowly falling to pieces around us as the trucks pound past is extremely disturbing.	N	In terms of the concern regarding damage to property, assessments have been carried out to ensure all roads used by HGV's / LGV's are suitable for use to reduce the risk of damage to property. **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref 6.1) details the Applicant's consideration of the effects of increased traffic levels during construction which concludes no significant effects are expected. In terms of an assessment of traffic vibration, this is scoped out of the noise and vibration assessment 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.
	The proposed amendments also raise serious concerns about the impact on local roads. These are narrow, poorly maintained rural routes already under strain, and they are not suitable for heavy construction traffic. The plans offer little detail on how this disruption will be managed.	N	**ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref 6.1) details the Applicant's consideration of the effects of increased traffic levels during construction which concludes no significant effects are expected. In terms of managing construction traffic, measures are set out in the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13).
	There will be major impact on local highways, made clearer by the proposed changes to the Order Limits. These roads are inadequate for use by the vehicles required for the construction of the solar farm. They are in a poor state of repair, with uneven and cracked surfaces; their condition worsened by the drought conditions which have exacerbated their fenland nature and already led to the complete closure of some by Lincolnshire County Council; they are minor or very narrow for passing heavy traffic, they are bounded by, in the majority of cases, by dykes and drains.	N	The suitability of the roads proposed has been confirmed by swept path analysis which is required for the AILs transporting materials to the relevant access points of the Scheme as set out in Annex A and B of the **OCTMP** (Doc. Ref. 7.13). **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref 6.1) details the Applicant's consideration of the effects of increased traffic levels during construction which concludes no significant effects are expected. In terms of managing construction traffic, measures are included in the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13). This includes a road condition survey at several locations which will be carried out pre-construction, during construction and post-construction, to identify any defects that arise to highways assets/verges during the construction phase of the 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).
	Langary Gate Road is not only a peaceful area but also a fragile single track road liable to regular subsidence, even with agricultural machinery and small commercial vehicles along with residents cars. With a significant increase of heavy transport lorries and associated traffic increase, the road will deteriorate significantly as has been witnessed over many years of erosion. Simply adding passing places will not suffice to mitigate the damage caused.	N	The suitability of the roads proposed has been confirmed by swept path analysis which is required for the AILs transporting materials to the relevant access points of the Scheme as set out in Annex A and B of the **OCTMP** (Doc. Ref. 7.13). **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref 6.1) details the Applicant's consideration of the effects of increased traffic levels during construction. The assessment concludes no significant effects are expected. In terms of managing construction traffic, measures are included in the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13). This includes a road condition survey of Langary Gate Road which will be carried out pre-construction, during construction and post-construction, to identify any defects that arise to highways assets/verges during the construction phase of the Scheme for

Theme	Comment	Scheme change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
			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). In terms of the requirement for passing bays, these will be confirmed at detailed design.
	The scale and impact on local highways become clearer from the proposed changes to the Order Limits. These roads are inadequate for use by the vehicles required for the construction of the solar farm. They are in a poor state of repair, with uneven and cracked surfaces; their condition worsened by the drought conditions which have exacerbated their fenland nature; they are minor or very narrow for passing heavy traffic, they are bounded by in the majority of cases by dykes and drains and, as such do not lend themselves to the creation of passing places. - These are rural roads which form the vital daily network to local rural communities. These roads are inadequate for the current volume of traffic comprising HGVs, cars, farming vehicles etc let alone the vehicles required for the construction of a solar farm.	N	The suitability of the roads proposed has been confirmed by swept path analysis which is required for the AILs transporting materials to the relevant access points of the Scheme as set out in Annex A and B of the **OCTMP** (Doc. Ref. 7.13). This includes a road condition survey at several locations which will be carried out pre-construction, during construction and post-construction, to identify any defects that arise to highways assets/verges during the construction phase of the 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). **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref 6.1) details the Applicant's consideration of the effects of increased traffic levels during construction. The assessment concludes no significant effects are expected. In terms of managing construction traffic, measures are set out in the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13).
	I do not agree to the entrance to the area, off the A17. This is a very busy road with cars, vans, HGVs travelling north and south and there are many accidents, and this will exacerbate the problems we already have. It can take 40 minutes to travel to Peterborough from Spalding and extra construction traffic will have a detrimental effect on this for those travelling to work, the very many HGVs delivering to the North of the country and to the South. There are a huge amount of HGV businesses in the area and many factories that will be affected.	N	**ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref 6.1) details the Applicant's consideration of the effects of increased traffic levels during construction, including off the A17. The assessment concludes no significant effects are expected. In terms of managing construction traffic, measures are set out in the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13) to mitigate impacts.
	An explanation of the technical feasibility of constructing passing bays on silt land is needed. The roads also need to accommodate HGVs, agricultural machinery as well light vans and cars. The scale and impact on local highways becomes clearer from the proposed changes to the Order Limits. These roads are inadequate for use by the vehicles required for the construction of the solar farm. They are in a poor state of repair, with uneven and cracked surfaces; their condition worsened by the drought conditions which have exacerbated their fenland nature; they are minor or very narrow for passing heavy traffic,	N	The requirement for passing bays will be confirmed at detailed design. The suitability of the roads proposed has been confirmed by swept path analysis which is required for the AILs transporting materials to the relevant access points of the Scheme as set out in Annex A and B of the **OCTMP** (Doc. Ref. 7.13). **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref 6.1) details the Applicant's consideration of the effects of increased traffic levels during construction. The assessment concludes no significant effects are expected. In terms of managing construction traffic, measures are set out in the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13). This includes a road condition surveys which will be carried out pre-construction,

Theme	Comment	Scheme change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	they are bounded by in the majority of cases by dykes and drains and, as such do not lend themselves to the creation of passing places. These are rural roads which form the vital daily network to local rural communities. These roads are inadequate for the current volume of traffic comprising HGVs, cars, farming vehicles etc let alone the vehicles required for the construction of a solar farm.		during construction and post-construction, to identify any defects that arise to highways assets/verges during the construction phase of the Scheme for reinstatement.
	The local road network is insufficient and in a poor state of repair. The size of large vehicles and the amount of traffic generation proposed during construction will result in the further deterioration of the road network. The existing fen road network is of poor quality and suffers regularly from failure. An audit is required to clarify which roads will need rebuilding from base strata upwards as part of the construction phase of the proposal, as repairs to the running surface will not suffice.	N	The suitability of the roads proposed has been confirmed by swept path analysis which is required for the AILs transporting materials to the relevant access points of the Scheme as set out in Annex A and B of the **OCTMP** (Doc. Ref. 7.13). **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref 6.1) details the Applicant's consideration of the effects of increased traffic levels during construction. The assessment concludes no significant effects are expected. In terms of managing construction traffic, measures are set out in the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13). This includes road condition surveys which will be carried out pre-construction, during construction and post-construction, to identify any defects that arise to highways assets/verges during the construction phase of the 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).
	The impact on local roads, which are predominantly country roads and totally unsuitable for heavy construction traffic. These roads are often narrow and poorly maintained at the best of times, the amendments give no, or very vague, information on how this disruption will be managed.	N	The suitability of the roads proposed has been confirmed by swept path analysis which is required for the AILs transporting materials to the relevant access points of the Scheme as set out in Annex A and B of the **OCTMP** (Doc. Ref. 7.13). **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref 6.1) details the Applicant's consideration of the effects of increased traffic levels during construction. The assessment concludes no significant effects are expected. In terms of managing construction traffic, measures are set out in the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13).
	An explanation of the technical feasibility of constructing passing bays on silt land is needed. The roads also need to accommodate HGVs, agricultural machinery as well light vans and cars The scale and impact on local highways becomes clearer from the proposed changes to the Order Limits. These roads are inadequate for use by the vehicles required for the construction of the solar farm. They are in a poor state of repair, with uneven and cracked surfaces; their condition worsened by the drought conditions which have exacerbated their fenland	N	The requirement for passing bays will be confirmed at detailed design. The suitability of the roads proposed has been confirmed by swept path analysis which is required for the AILs transporting materials to the relevant access points of the Scheme as set out in Annex A and B of the **OCTMP** (Doc. Ref. 7.13). **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref 6.1) details the Applicant's consideration of the effects of increased traffic levels during construction. The assessment concludes no significant effects are expected. In terms of managing construction traffic, measures are set out in the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13).

Theme	Comment	Scheme change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	nature; they are minor or very narrow for passing heavy traffic, they are bounded by in the majority of cases by dykes and drains and, as such do not lend themselves to the creation of passing places. These are rural roads which form the vital daily network to local rural communities. These roads are inadequate for the current volume of traffic comprising HGVs, cars, farming vehicles etc let alone the vehicles required for the construction of a solar farm.		
	Traffic is a huge concern for affected areas with our county roads being very narrow and in places only capable of one vehicle at a time. Plans need to be a lot clearer as to how this is to be managed and what plans are in place for these roads to be brought up to standard or new roads constructed to take the numerous lorries and cars that will be using them. Access roads need to be adequate to cope with the volume of construction traffic together with existing farming and private vehicles.	N	The suitability of the roads (including access roads) proposed has been confirmed by swept path analysis which is required for the AILs transporting materials to the relevant access points of the Scheme as set out in Annex A and B of the **OCTMP** (Doc. Ref. 7.13). **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref 6.1) details the Applicant's consideration of the effects of increased traffic levels during construction. The assessment concludes no significant effects are expected. In terms of managing construction traffic, measures are set out in the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13).
	The roadways planned for use during construction are just not suitable for the heavy traffic proposed, this is going to cause a myriad of disruptions to the residents. We dog walk 3 times a day along our road, there appears to be no plan in place for the construction traffic to give priority to resident pedestrians. There appears to be no plan for traffic control when passing historic, vulnerable houses.	N	The suitability of the roads proposed has been confirmed by swept path analysis which is required for the AILs transporting materials to the relevant access points of the Scheme as set out in Annex A and B of the **OCTMP** (Doc. Ref. 7.13). **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref 6.1) details the Applicant's consideration of the effects of increased traffic levels during construction. The assessment concludes no significant effects are expected. In terms of managing construction traffic, measures are included in the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13) which includes several management measures such as traffic management and monitoring, specific HGV routes and timing restrictions to limit impacts on local communities including historic vulnerable houses. 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). The **Outline PRoW-MP** (Doc Ref. 7.15) sets out the measures to minimise the traffic impacts of the Scheme on pedestrians and cyclists during the construction and decommissioning phases.
	The likely impact on local transport infrastructure has also not been adequately addressed. The local road network comprises primarily narrow, rural lanes that are already in poor condition and entirely unsuitable for the volume and weight of heavy construction traffic anticipated. The consultation documents	N	**ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref 6.1) details the Applicant's consideration of the effects of increased traffic levels during construction. The assessment concludes no significant effects are expected. In terms of managing construction traffic, measures are set out in the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13).

Theme	Comment	Scheme change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	provide either no, or only vague, information on how such disruption will be managed or mitigated.		
	The proposed amendments also raise serious concerns about the impact on local roads. These are narrow, poorly maintained rural routes already under strain, and they are not suitable for heavy construction traffic. The plans offer little detail on how this disruption will be managed.	N	**ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref 6.1) details the Applicant's consideration of the effects of increased traffic levels during construction. The assessment concludes no significant effects are expected. In terms of managing construction traffic, measures are set out in the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13). This includes a road condition surveys which will be carried out pre-construction, during construction and post-construction, to identify any defects that arise to highways assets/verges during the construction phase of the 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).
	Our other major concern is the access road for the development adjacent to our property. The road - Queens Bank is a severely unstable road, with large subsidence areas and extremely uneven. This has worsened since we last put in our objections in June and has since been reported to the highways agency as large cracks have appeared and worsening each week. Construction traffic and heavy goods vehicles will add further extensive pressure and damage to the road, making it almost impassable, along with the farm access road alongside our property, if this is used it will cause major disruption to our living throughout the construction with noise, dust and potential risk of causing damage to the property structure due to heavy presence of vehicles. We completely oppose the use of this roadway along the side of our property and garden and will impact immensely on our privacy.	N	**ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref 6.1) details the Applicant's consideration of the effects of increased traffic levels during construction. The assessment concludes no significant effects are expected. In terms of managing construction traffic, measures are set out in the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13). This includes a road condition survey at Queen's Bank which will be carried out pre-construction, during construction and post-construction, to identify any defects that arise to highways assets/verges during the construction phase of the 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).
	With regard to traffic, an explanation of the technical feasibility of constructing passing bays on silt land is needed. The roads also need to accommodate HGVs, agricultural machinery as well light vans and cars. The scale and impact on local highways becomes clearer from the proposed changes to the Order Limits. These roads are inadequate for use by the vehicles required for the construction of the solar farm. They are in a poor state of repair, with uneven and cracked surfaces; their condition worsened by the drought conditions which have exacerbated their fenland nature; they are minor or very narrow for passing heavy traffic, they are bounded by in the majority of cases by dykes and	N	The requirement for passing bays will be confirmed at detailed design. The suitability of the roads proposed has been confirmed by swept path analysis which is required for the AILs transporting materials to the relevant access points of the Scheme as set out in Annex A and B of the **OCTMP** (Doc. Ref. 7.13). **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref 6.1) details the Applicant's consideration of the effects of increased traffic levels during construction. The assessment concludes no significant effects are expected. In terms of managing construction traffic, measures are set out in the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13).

Theme	Comment	Scheme change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	drains and, as such do not lend themselves to the creation of passing places.		
	These are rural roads which form the vital daily network to local rural communities. In addition to cars and vans, they are heavily used by HGVs and large agricultural machinery. They are not suited to additional use by construction traffic. Clearly, in the original design the road networks of this area have not been considered fully. Nor have the substantial flood risks that effect this area.	N	The suitability of the roads proposed has been confirmed by swept path analysis which is required for the AILs transporting materials to the relevant access points of the Scheme as set out in Annex A and B of the **OCTMP** (Doc. Ref. 7.13). **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref 6.1) details the Applicant's consideration of the effects of increased traffic levels during construction. The assessment concludes no significant effects are expected. In terms of managing construction traffic, measures are set out in the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13). In response to the concern regarding flood risk, this has been considered within **ES Chapter 11: Hydrology and Flood Risk** (Doc Ref. 6.1) which concludes no significant effects are expected.
	The construction phase would involve HGVs of approximately 15.4m length, 3.65m high and 2.5m width which would be using the local highway network. Drivers should expect to see horses anywhere in the vicinity as rightful users of the highway and must adhere to the Highway Code provision for horses to be passed wide (2m away) and slow (10mph maximum) which may mean waiting a reasonable distance behind a horse before passing, particularly the wider vehicles in this area where roads are narrow and often alongside dykes/ditches with no refuge.	N	**ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref 6.1) details the Applicant's consideration of the effects of increased traffic levels during construction. The assessment concludes no significant effects are expected. In terms of managing construction traffic, measures are set out in the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13) to limit impacts to other road users including horse riders. All HGV drivers will adhere to the Highway Code including appropriate passing distances and speeds when travelling in proximity to horses. 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).
	The road is a complete mess already with traffic from Holbeach increasing daily . How many 8 wheelers, cement lorries and extra articulated lorries will be on the road. Stop being so vague and tell us how this is truly going to affect us.	N	**ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref 6.1) details the Applicant's consideration of the effects of increased traffic levels during construction. The assessment concludes no significant effects are expected. This includes maximum construction traffic numbers which are presented in **Table 15-20**. In terms of managing construction traffic, measures are set out in the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13).
	A technical explanation is also needed regarding the feasibility of constructing passing bays on silt land. The roads in question must accommodate HGVs, agricultural vehicles, light vans, and cars. The scale and impact on local highways are now clearer: the affected roads are already in poor condition — cracked, uneven, and unsuitable for heavy construction traffic. Most are narrow,	N	The requirement for passing bays will be confirmed at detailed design. **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref 6.1) details the Applicant's consideration of the effects of increased traffic levels during construction. The assessment concludes no significant effects are expected. In terms of managing construction traffic, measures are set out in **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13). This includes road condition surveys which will be carried out pre-construction, during construction and post-construction, to identify any defects that arise to highways assets/verges during the construction phase of the Scheme for reinstatement. This will be

Theme	Comment	Scheme change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	bordered by dykes and drains, and cannot safely accommodate additional passing places. These rural roads form an essential part of the daily network for local residents, farmers, and businesses. They are already under pressure, and the proposed construction traffic would only worsen the situation.		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).
	An explanation of the technical feasibility of constructing passing bays on silt land is needed. The roads also need to accommodate HGVs, agricultural machinery as well light vans and cars. The scale and impact on local highways becomes clearer from the proposed changes to the Order Limits. These roads are inadequate for use by the vehicles required for the construction of the solar farm. They are in a poor state of repair, with uneven and cracked surfaces; their condition worsened by the drought conditions which have exacerbated their fenland nature; they are minor or very narrow for passing heavy traffic, they are bounded by in the majority of cases by dykes and drains and, as such do not lend themselves to the creation of passing places. These are rural roads which form the vital daily network to local rural communities. These roads are inadequate for the current volume of traffic comprising HGVs, cars, farming vehicles etc let alone the vehicles required for the construction of a solar farm.	N	The requirement for passing bays will be confirmed at detailed design. The suitability of the roads proposed has been confirmed by swept path analysis which is required for the AILs transporting materials to the relevant access points of the Scheme as set out in Annex A and B of the **OCTMP** (Doc. Ref. 7.13). **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref 6.1) details the Applicant's consideration of the effects of increased traffic levels during construction. The assessment concludes no significant effects are expected. In terms of managing construction traffic, measures are set out in the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13).
	In all aspects of your proposal for this solar project, I object. As previously mentioned to you, I have personally seen the devastation caused by the Bicker Fen solar project. The roads have not withstood the increased HGV traffic and is now, in some places, undriveable with a normal road car. Indeed, even with a 4x4 vehicle trying to access my stores there I struggle. Not only this but the impact in wildlife reduction has also been noticed.	N	**ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref 6.1) details the Applicant's consideration of the effects of increased traffic levels during construction. The assessment concludes no significant effects are expected. In terms of managing construction traffic, measures are set out in the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13). This includes road condition surveys which will be carried out pre-construction, during construction and post-construction to identify any defects that arise to highways assets/verges during the construction phase of the 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). In terms of the likely significant effects of the Scheme on wildlife, this has been assessed within **ES Chapter 9: Ecology and Biodiversity** (Doc Ref. 6.1) which concludes no significant effects are likely with mitigation included within the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10), **OOEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.11) and **ODEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.12).

Theme	Comment	Scheme change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	With only one access route along Queens Bank, there will be inevitable disruption to local residents during the construction and decommissioning of the solar farm. The access road - Queens Bank is already in poor condition and severely unstable, with large subsidence areas which are extremely uneven. It is not suitable for construction traffic. The pressure of construction traffic will add further extensive damage to the road making it almost impassable not only for ourselves but the other five properties that reside down Queens Bank. We note there will be localised disturbance during the commissioning and decommissioning stages however there will also be continued disturbance to the access routes and the surrounding properties for the maintenance and repair of the solar farm; further amplifying the noise and privacy disturbance for ourselves and the local communities. The impact on the local infrastructure will be immense. The main route from the A16, the B1166, is already inadequate - narrow, uneven, cracked, bounded by dykes which are frequently the cause of road accidents as vehicles go off road. The road is subjected heavy traffic and has speed limitations which are currently being reduced. It is clearly inadequate for construction traffic of the type required for this project.	N	**ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref 6.1) details the Applicant's consideration of the effects of increased traffic levels during construction. The assessment concludes no significant effects are expected. The impact of the Scheme on noise during the operational phase has been assessed within **ES Chapter 13: Noise and Vibration** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The chapter concludes that with mitigation included within the **OOEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.11), no significant effects are expected. In terms of managing construction traffic, measures are set out in the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13). This includes road condition surveys which will be carried out pre-construction, during construction and post-construction to identify any defects that arise to highways assets/verges during the construction phase of the 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).
	It remains that many of the roads are rural, many have large cracks long distances along, uneven surfaces, large amounts of potholes, not suitable for widening or passing places, with ditches and dykes either side.	N	**ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref 6.1) details the Applicant's consideration of the effects of increased traffic levels during construction. The assessment concludes no significant effects are expected. In terms of managing construction traffic, measures are set out in the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13). This includes road condition surveys which will be carried out pre-construction, during construction and post-construction to identify any defects that arise to highways assets/verges during the construction phase of the 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). The requirement for passing bays would be subject to detail design and ground investigations.
General land take / additional land	The potential inclusion of additional land may lead to pylon and structure placements that could detrimentally affect both my farming business, Slator Brothers (Farms) Ltd, and my leisure business, Fun Farm Ltd.	N	The Applicant notes this comment and welcomes continued engagement with the landowner and their legal representative.
	One major concern is the proposed increase in land take for the scheme, without adequate explanation. For example by placing	N	Justification for the relocation of all the BESS to the On-Site 400kV Substation Compound is outlined within **ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The land will

Theme	Comment	Scheme change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	all BESS on one site, land will be released in the originally planned location elsewhere in the scheme without explanation of what use that land will be put to. The increase in the land take across all the proposed changes might be described as amendment of the Scheme by stealth. Plans for the Order Limits changes are inadequate to readily identify the location and scale of the proposed changes. No indication is given of the area of additional land which will be taken. These changes will cause much disruption to many people, both local residents and road users. No explanation or reason is offered of why land within the Stage 2 Order limits cannot be used instead of additional land take. No indication is given of the total additional land to be taken is given.		be used to site the 132kV substations. Please refer to **ES Figure 2-2: Indicative Solar Development and Inter-Array Layout Plan** (Doc Ref. 6.2) for further details. 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. The Applicant further notes that it remains confident that information made available during the targeted consultation was adequate and appropriate for that stage in the process.
	The initial plans for the Order Limits changes were inadequate to readily identify the location and scale of the proposed changes. No indication is given of the total additional land to be taken due to the Order Limits proposed changes.	N	The Applicant further notes that it remains confident that information made available during the targeted consultation was adequate and appropriate for that stage in the process. 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.
	As a resident of the area under parcel D, I am still very concerned that the scheme is being expanded further and that no limit has been set for future development.	N	The Applicant further notes that it remains confident that information made available during the targeted consultation was adequate and appropriate for that stage in the process. 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. It should be noted that the Scheme is fixed by the DCO application, any future expansion is not permitted by default. Any material change would require a separate statutory process.
	As a resident of the area under parcel D, I am still very concerned that the scheme is being expanded further and that no limit has been set for future development.	N	The Applicant further notes that it remains confident that information made available during the targeted consultation was adequate and appropriate for that stage in the process. 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. It should be noted that the Scheme is fixed by the DCO application, any future expansion is not permitted by default. Any material change would require a separate statutory process.
	Incidentally, with regards to the proposed uptake of additional land, what will be the overall use of this land once the project is	N	Once the Scheme is completed the additional land that was consulted on as part of the targeted consultation will be used to provide access to the Scheme and for solar PV panels

Theme	Comment	Scheme change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	completed? Is this to be used for additional solar panels? Only it is not mentioned that I can see, perhaps this was an oversight?		(within Parcel D). Further information is provided within **ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution** (Doc Ref. 6.1).
	Increase in Land Take A major concern of MAG is the proposed increase in land take for the scheme without adequate explanation. For example by placing all BESS on one site, land will be released in the originally planned location elsewhere in the scheme without explanation of what use that land will be put. We do not object to the proposal to site the BESS in a single location. However, we wish to know how much land this will release elsewhere in the project. The response from Meridian Solar Customer Relations does not adequately answer this point on our query. It is quite simple: the proposed BESS infrastructure equates to a defined area wherever it is located. We just wish to know the land take by BESS in the original location compared to the area now proposed. The issue that is it raises is whether the land released through the proposed changes will be put to other uses, such as solar panels, additional BESS or similar.	N	Once the Scheme is completed the additional land that was consulted on as part of the targeted consultation will be used to provide access to the Scheme and for solar PV panels (within Parcel D). Further information is provided within **ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution** (Doc Ref. 6.1). In terms of the land take by BESS in the original location compared to the area now proposed this is shown on **ES Figure 3-4: Targeted Consultation Changes Since Statutory Consultation** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The land released through relocating the BESS would not be used for solar infrastructure ie. 132kV substation or PV solar panels. Please refer to **ES Figure 2-2: Indicative Solar Development and Inter-Array Layout Plan** (Doc Ref. 6.2) for further details.
	Increase in Land Take A major concern of mine is the proposed increase in land take for the scheme without adequate explanation. For example by placing all BESS on one site, land will be released in the originally planned location elsewhere in themscheme without explanation of what use that land will be put. We do not object to the proposal to site the BESS in a single location. However we wish to know how much land this will release elsewhere in the project. The response from Meridian Solar Customer Relations does not adequately answer this point on our query. It is quite simple: the proposed BESS infrastructure equates to a defined area wherever it is located. We just wish to know the land take by BESS in the original location compared to the area now proposed.The issue that is it raises is whether the land released through the proposed changes will be put to other uses, such as solar panels, additional BESS or similar.	N	Once the Scheme is completed the additional land that was consulted on as part of the targeted consultation will be used to provide access to the Scheme and for solar PV panels (within Parcel D). Further information is provided within **ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution** (Doc Ref. 6.1). In terms of the land take by BESS in the original location compared to the area now proposed this is shown on **ES Figure 3-4: Targeted Consultation Changes Since Statutory Consultation** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The land released through relocating the BESS would not be used for solar infrastructure i.e. 132kV substation or PV solar panels. Please refer to **ES Figure 2-2: Indicative Solar Development and Inter-Array Layout Plan** (Doc Ref. 6.2) for further details.

Theme	Comment	Scheme change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	In summary the increase in the land take across all the proposed changes might be described as amendment of the Scheme by stealth		
	Expanded Land-take and Agricultural Impact The document states that it has been: 'Confirmed through updated surveys that land in Parcel B previously assumed to be Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) Grade 1 is predominantly Grade 3a, with small areas of Grade 2.' Please provide detail of this survey including when it took place. It is worth noting that regardless of this downgrade, Grade 2 and Grade 3a land is still classified as BMV (Best and Most Versatile) land, undisputedly the best in the country. There is no reference to the ALC for the net increase of 14.9 hectares of land being utilised for PV panels in Parcel D. As referred to in my previous correspondence, the National Policy Statement EN-3 and NPPF both advise avoiding BMV land for large-scale solar development. The targeted consultation gives no justification for this additional loss.	N	The changed land use classification is based on the results of an Agricultural Land Classification Survey. The survey report is included within **ES Appendix 5-3: ALC Survey for Parcels B & C** (Doc Ref. 6.3). **ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution** (Doc Ref. 6.1) provides justification for the additional land consulted on as part of the Targeted Consultation. In terms of the comment re. NPS EN-3 and the NPPF and that BMV land should be avoided for large-scale solar, this is addressed in the **Planning Statement** (Doc Ref. 3.1) which explains the Applicant has sought to identify land for development outside of Grade 1 agricultural land as outlined within **Appendix D: Site Selection Report** (Doc Ref. 7.1). Following identification of land for the Order Limits and detailed soil surveys, the Applicant has sought to prioritise development, particularly that which includes hard standing, on areas of lower grade land where possible in line with paragraph 2.10.21 of EN-3. For example, in areas where Grade 1 ALC land was present, solar panels were relocated within the Site to respond to other constraints present such as the presence of Flood Zone 3b with Land Parcel B. Where slithers of Grade 1 ALC land were identified within Land Parcels A and B, it was not considered that their avoidance would provide viable parcels of land for arable use, due to their size and shape. Furthermore, it was not considered possible to relocate the 400kV On-Site Substation and BESS Compound to fully avoid Grade 1 ALC land, as its location is determined by the route of the Grid Connection. Grade 1 ALC land identified within Land Parcel C was excluded from physical development and defined as a habitat management area. **ES Chapter 5: Agriculture and Soils** (Doc Ref. 6.1) assesses the impact of the Scheme on agricultural land, with the **OSMP** (Doc Ref. 7.14) setting out the Scheme's embedded proposed mitigation measures, and principles on how the soils will be managed and protected during construction, operation and decommissioning of the Scheme.
	Extensions of Order Limits The targeted consultation details 34 extensions of Order Limits for various reasons, including providing safe access and visibility and maintenance to name but a few. The number of these extensions implies that the proposals in the statutory consultation were hugely inadequate, and I would like to request that a Traffic Management Plan and vehicular-movement data be provided in relation to these changes.	N	**ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref 6.1) sets out the peak construction numbers associated with the most intensive phase of construction (including vehicle types required, hourly and daily movements). The assessment concludes no significant effects are expected. Mitigation measures are included within the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13) which will be developed into detailed CTMP as secured by Requirement in the **Draft DCO** (Doc Ref. 3.1).
	You have increased the overall acreage of the proposal with no rationale provided. How does this allow objective discussion?	N	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

Theme	Comment	Scheme change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
			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 changes introduced during targeted consultation are not considered to represent a substantial expansion of the overall development. The Applicant further maintains that the information provided as part of the targeted consultation was appropriate for that stage in the process.
	You state that a survey hs reclassified farmland (downgraded). You provide no evidence of the independence of the survey and the land remains BMV. In effect, you are ignoring the guidelines around BMV by increasing your footprint.	N	The changed land use classification is based on the results of an Agricultural Land Classification Survey. The survey report is included within **ES Appendix 5-3: ALC Survey for Parcels B & C** (Doc Ref. 6.3). **ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution** (Doc Ref. 6.1) provides justification for the additional land consulted on as part of the Targeted Consultation.
	We are very concerned about the additional land being grabbed for roadways.	N	**ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution** (Doc Ref. 6.1) provides justification for the additional land consulted on as part of the Targeted Consultation. The Applicant also notes that the justification for the inclusion of land was provided within the targeted consultation information booklet, which is provided in **Appendix J: Targeted Consultation Materials** (Doc Ref. 6.1).
	You are without question taking over far more land than originally proposed which is totally unacceptable. However my wife and I would ultimately prefer that the whole scheme should be cancelled.	N	The Applicant notes this comment. 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 changes introduced during targeted consultation are not considered to represent a substantial expansion of the overall development.
	The size and scale of the plans, particularly for the Order Limits, fail to provide clarity on location and, in some cases, inadequately provide inadequate rationale for the proposed change. There seems to be additional land taken for the development with no clear explanation as to why.	N	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 changes introduced during targeted consultation are not considered to represent a substantial expansion of the overall development. The Applicant further maintains that the information provided as part of the targeted consultation was appropriate for that stage in the process.
	It is evident to residents that this proposed development contains significant flaws. The numerous extensions to the previous design, introduced without adequate transparency or justification, strongly suggest that Meridian are not acting with full openness or accountability.	N	The Applicant maintains that the information provided as part of the targeted consultation was appropriate for that stage in the process. The proposed changes reflect ongoing design refinement informed by more detailed environmental and technical assessments, as well as feedback received from stakeholders.

Theme	Comment	Scheme change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	Increase in Land Take MAG is deeply concerned about the proposed increase in land take without sufficient explanation. For example, relocating all BESS (Battery Energy Storage Systems) units to one site should release land elsewhere, yet no clarification has been given on how that land will now be used. We do not oppose the decision to consolidate the BESS in one location, but we request a clear statement of how much land this releases and what it will be repurposed for. Meridian Solar's Customer Relations response to our query did not answer this point adequately. The matter is simple: the BESS footprint should occupy a defined area regardless of location. We are asking for a comparison between the original and new BESS land allocations. We are concerned this released land may be reassigned to additional solar panels, further BESS facilities, or other development uses. In summary, the overall increase in land take across all proposed amendments appears to represent a significant expansion of the scheme by stealth	N	In terms of the land take by BESS in the original location compared to the area now proposed this is shown on **ES Figure 3-4: Targeted Consultation Changes Since Statutory Consultation** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The land released through relocating the BESS would not be used for solar infrastructure i.e. 132kV substation or PV solar panels. Please refer to **ES Figure 2-2: Indicative Solar Development and Inter-Array Layout Plan** (Doc Ref. 6.2) for further details.
	We believe that the response on land take is inadequate and does not increase our understanding for the following reasons: The A3 maps provided have been useful in understanding the locality of the proposed changes but in respect of calculating the land impacted by the changes are of little value The fact that you are unable to provide the overall change in area at this stage means that the consultation exercise is of nil/limited value. The paragraph about Change 38 largely reflects the information provided in the Information booklet. It does not address my questions, namely what is the reason for the increase in land take ie why is it not a like-for-like swap in area; and what is the historic sensitivity to which is referred.	N	The Applicant notes this comment but believes the information provided, including plans and explanatory text for each change, was proportionate to the nature of the amendments being consulted upon, and sufficient to enable consultees to understand the proposed changes and provide informed feedback at this stage in the process. Should further clarification have been sought, the Applicant would have sought to provide additional information.

Theme	Comment	Scheme change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	The comment about about the red line for the total land being reduced at the time of the application meaningless without comparative information now.		
	As a resident of [redacted], my property is located approximately just 10-20m from the proposed site boundaries. The project, with its expanded footprint would have severe adverse impacts on my home, property value, and the local rural amenity	N	The impact of the Scheme on properties on Langary Gate Road (including Cheviot House) has been assessed within the **Environmental Statement** (Doc Ref. 6.1) which includes assessments on traffic impacts (**ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access**) , noise (**ES Chapter 13: Noise and Vibration**) and amenity (**ES Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual**). Proposed mitigation measures have been set out within the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10), **OOEMP** (Doc Ref 7.11), **ODEMP** (Doc Ref. 12) and **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13) to limit the impact of the Scheme on nearby residents. Impacts on property prices are not a material consideration under section 104 of the PA2008, 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.
Property	With that in mind, our main concerns that we reiterate again are; • Setting a precedent for further land grabs with Mission Creep; • Construction traffic control & speed limits; • Construction noise; • Panels being located close to properties; • Panels located next to our property swapped for biodiverse wildflower meadow; and • BESS located near to our property, to ne at the north point not south.	N	**ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref 6.1) details the Applicant's consideration of the effects of increased traffic levels during construction which concludes no significant effects are expected. In terms of managing construction traffic, measures are included in the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13). This includes road condition surveys which will be carried out pre-construction, during construction and post-construction to identify any defects that arise to highways assets/verges during the construction phase of the 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). The impact of the Scheme (including construction noise) 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 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. The visual impact of the Scheme 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). Proposed mmitigation measures have been set out within the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10), **OOEMP** (Doc Ref 7.11), **ODEMP** (Doc Ref. 12) and **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13) to limit the impact of the Scheme on nearby residents.

Theme	Comment	Scheme change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	We were assured at the open day in Crowland on 21/05/25 that the panels would likely be 100 metres away from our property, but guaranteed that they would be at least 40 meters away, but this is not reflected in the documents	N	The visual impact of the Scheme 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). Figure 1 Outline Landscape Masterplans of the **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16) illustrates the landscape mitigation proposals, including buffers around Site boundaries, shrub and tree planting on field boundaries. In terms of residential properties there is a commitment within the **Design Parameters** (Doc Ref. 7.4) that solar stations will not be placed within 250m of residential properties. Therefore, even though the Order Limits may appear close to your property this doesn't necessarily relate to project infrastructure.
	The 3rd concern we now have is the new location of the panels which appear now to be even closer to our property, offering poor views and possible devaluation to our property which we have just finishing renovating after 4 years of hard work.	N	The visual impact of the Scheme 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). Figure 1 Outline Landscape Masterplans of the **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16) illustrates the landscape mitigation proposals, including buffers around Site boundaries, shrub and tree planting on field boundaries. In terms of residential properties there is a commitment within the **Design Parameters** (Doc Ref. 7.4) that solar stations will not be placed within 250m of residential properties. Therefore, even though the Order Limits may appear close to your property this doesn't necessarily relate to project infrastructure.

4. Response Received from Brown & Co. on Behalf of Clients (x4)

Respondent	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
Brown & CO.	Overground Grid Connection Clear reasoning for the grid connection to be via an overhead line rather than an underground cable installation has not been provided and therefore it seems unjustifiable especially in the context of the majority of private solar schemes opting to install underground cables. Underground cables are generally accepted as being safer and less susceptible to external factors such as extreme weather and accidental damage. In addition, they are less disruptive to the continuation of agricultural operations post-construction as they do not alter the field configuration or permanently render land unusable, a most important factor in these Grade 1 soils. Furthermore, the environmental and ecological impacts of overhead lines, for example through habitat losses and landscape disruption, make underground cabling a better option for protecting nature along, and in the vicinity of, the route. As the project is not publicly funded, reduced construction costs is not sufficient justification for choosing an overhead rather than an underground line.	N	The Applicant notes this comment and thanks Brown & Co. for its response on behalf of its clients. **ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution** (Doc Ref. 6.1) and the **Design Approach Document** (Doc Ref. 7.3) explains the reasoning (including overhead lines being the strong starting presumption for electricity networks as per paragraph 2.9.31 of EN-5) behind the selection of an overhead line instead of an underground cable for the Grid Connection Route and the Overhead Inter-Array Connection. This includes a comparison of potential environmental effects from the construction of an underground cable and an overhead line for the Grid Connection. In terms of ecological impacts an overhead line requires less ground disturbance and potential habitat loss compared to an underground cable, however overhead lines introduce a collision risk for birds. However, it is acknowledged that both overhead and underground impacts on ecological receptors can generally be mitigated through appropriate design and construction environmental management measures. In terms of environmental impacts, the receptors that may experience likely residual significant effects from an overhead line are landscape and visual receptors, and designated heritage assets due to changes to their setting. In relation to an underground cable solution, potential effects on buried archaeological deposits may be extensive depending on the location of the trenching. In summary when reviewed in combination with engineering feasibility, constructability and cost considerations, a 400kV overhead line was taken forward as the preferred option over an underground cable.
	Land Type and Impact on Farming The proposal dissects some of the highest quality, Grade 1 agricultural land with unique soils that are almost unmatched with regard to productivity and cropping potential. These Lincolnshire Fen silts are employed in rotations of high-quality root and vegetable crops as well as nursery crops. Should the project proceed with the overhead line option for the grid connection, the disruption, through reduced cropping area will continue throughout the lifetime of the project, which on this occasion is understood to be decades. Taking prime agricultural land out of production reduces the amount of British produce in the sector and could have wider	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). The effects associated with the Grid Connection Route are not considered to be significant due to the short-term nature of the impacts during the construction stage and the limited land-take required during the operational phase. 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), the Grid Connection infrastructure associated with the Scheme will be decommissioned at the end of the 40-year operational period. The **Outline Soil Management Plan** (Doc Ref. 7.14), submitted with the DCO Application, provides a comprehensive set of measures across the lifetime of the Scheme for the preservation of the soil resource within the Site. **ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution** (Doc Ref. 6.1) and the **Design Approach Document** (Doc Ref. 7.3) explains the reasoning (including overhead lines being the strong starting presumption for electricity networks as per paragraph 2.9.31 of EN-5) behind the

Respondent	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	impacts on the supply chain, especially during the construction period. Similar significant cable schemes in the area including Outer Dowsing, Viking Link, Triton Knoll, Hornsea 1 & 2, Ossian and the proposed Eastern Green Link 3 & 4 are all underground schemes.		selection of an overhead line instead of an underground cable for the Grid Connection Route and the Overhead Inter-Array Connection.
	Proximity to Residential Dwelling Due to the transmission of the electricity generated by the proposed solar farm development being via an overhead line, the extent of the visual impact is significantly greater than an underground installation. Plans within the various documents provided on the project's website show pylons located in the land directly adjacent residential dwellings. This proximity will undoubtedly have a detrimental impact on the marketability and value of the properties, by diminishing attractiveness as well as benefits of those located in private settings in the open countryside. Not only would an electricity pylon/overhead line negatively affect property in terms of its position in the residential marketplace, but it will also impact owner's/occupier's right to quiet enjoyment of their dwellings. Due consideration needs to be given to how such disturbance will be mitigated and/or compensated for; plans for such also need to be shared well in advance of any development taking place to allow householders to understand changes and, where necessary, seek professional advice.	N	The Applicant notes this comment and acknowledges the concern for impacted neighbours. Throughout the pre-application stage the Applicant has sought to assess potential effects to neighbouring properties and consult with local residents. The results of these assessments, along with proposed mitigations, are presented in the **Environmental Statement** (Doc Ref. 6.1. 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.
	Proximity to Ancient Scheduled Monument Although legislation and relevant bodies will govern the requirements for developments in the vicinity of areas of historical importance, the proximity of the overhead line to an Ancient Scheduled Monument is noteworthy. Within the scheduled monument site there is the Grade I listed Wykeham Chapel of St Nicholas and Grade II listed Chapel Farmhouse, all of which is adjacent to the scheme's 'anticipated location for the Weston Marsh substation'. Additional consideration for the suitability of an overhead installation should be taken given the situation of the protected sites in relation to the proposed route corridor.	N	The likely significant effects of the Scheme on Wykeham Chapel and the Grade II listed Chapel Farmhouse have been assessed within **ES Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The illustrative design locates the overhead line as far east as practicable from the Scheduled Monument, 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 Scheduled Monument. Proposed mitigation measures are set out in the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10), **OOEMP (**Doc Ref. 7.11) and **ODEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.12) to limit impacts where practicable.

Respondent	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	Access for Construction Traffic Due to the number and size of projects proposed in the Weston Marsh area, a larger amount of construction traffic would be expected for the 24-to-36-month duration of the installation programme. Accommodation works will allow for such traffic to be able to access the site, but the current size and configuration of access routes means that disruption is inevitable, there are also yet to be any plans for this disturbance and how this would mitigated/compensatable should it affect local businesses.	N	**ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref 6.1) details the Applicant's consideration of the effects of increased traffic levels during construction which concludes no significant effects are expected. The **Outline CTMP** (Doc. Ref. 7.13) provides further information on the proposed construction traffic management during the construction phase. Appropriate routing of vehicles and HGVs will be adopted to minimise impacts where practicable.
	Health and Safety of Overhead Structures The introduction of overhead pylons into active agricultural workspaces presents a serious and unacceptable health and safety risk to farmers, contractors, and landowners. Agricultural operations routinely involve the use of tall and wide machinery — including combines, sprayers, irrigation booms, telehandlers, and tipper trailers — all of which are at risk of coming into contact with or dangerously close proximity to overhead power lines. These risks are heightened during peak periods such as harvest, when time pressures and fatigue increase the likelihood of accidents. According to the Energy Networks Association and the Farm Safety Partnership, two farmers lose their lives each year in the UK due to contact with overhead power lines, with many more suffering life-changing injuries. The Health and Safety Executive (HSE) further warns that contact is not necessary for fatal injury — electricity can arc or "flashover" from a line to a nearby object or person, especially in damp or dirty conditions. This makes even cautious working practices insufficient in many real-world scenarios. The presence of pylons and overhead lines within fields and yards effectively turns the working environment into a high-risk zone. Unlike underground infrastructure, which can be mapped and avoided, overhead lines are exposed to weather, visibility issues, and human error. The psychological burden on farmers — knowing that a momentary lapse in concentration could result in fatal electrocution — is considerable and unjustifiable.	N	The design and operation of the overhead line infrastructure will comply with relevant industry standards and safety requirements, including statutory clearance distances set out in Electricity Networks Association guidance (ENA TS 43-08). Safe systems of work are expected to be implemented by third parties operating near overhead lines to protect equipment, persons and livestock. Guidance is available from the Health and Safety Executive, including Working Safely Near Overhead Electricity Power Lines (AIS8) and GS6 (Look Up, Look Out). This includes, for example, maintaining appropriate separation distances from electrical conductors (such as 30m for irrigators, slurry guns and high-pressure hoses). The Applicant will continue to engage with affected landowners to ensure that the design and operation of the Scheme takes account of existing agricultural practices where practicable.

Respondent	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	Furthermore, the risk is not limited to the landowner alone. Seasonal workers, contractors, and family members are all exposed to these dangers. The long-term presence of such infrastructure within the farmed landscape introduces a permanent and pervasive hazard that cannot be mitigated through signage or training alone. Further clarity has been requested regarding the ability to irrigate crops under the cables between pylons. We understand that the minimum over sail cable height is 7.5m which is significantly lower than that which agricultural irrigators work to (generally being 10-15m). A restriction of irrigation beneath cables will significantly restrict the cropping and yield of the affected area. Given the availability of undergrounding as a viable alternative, the decision to install overhead pylons in working agricultural environments is not only short-sighted but negligent. The health and safety of those who live and work on the land must be prioritised over cost-saving measures, which is currently not the case.	N	In terms of the over sail cable height, as stated in **ES Chapter 2: The Scheme (**Doc Ref. 6.1) a minimum vertical clearance of 8.1m above open ground from the overhead line will be maintained.
	Ecological Impact The installation of overhead pylons and associated concrete foundations will cause irreversible ecological damage. Each pylon requires a substantial footprint, often involving deep concrete bases and access tracks, which permanently remove habitat and fragment the surrounding landscape. These structures disrupt soil profiles, compact subsoils, and eliminate vegetation, leading to long-term degradation of biodiversity and ecosystem function. The route intersects areas of ecological sensitivity, including farmland margins, hedgerows, and wetland corridors — all of which serve as critical habitats for birds, pollinators, and small mammals. Overhead lines pose a well-documented collision risk to birds, particularly species with poor forward vision such as swans, geese, and waders. These risks are exacerbated in low-visibility conditions and along migratory flight paths. In addition, birds of prey and corvids are known to perch on pylons, where they may be electrocuted if they bridge live components.	N	T Whilst the comment falls outside of the scope of the targeted consultation, the likely significant effects of the overhead line 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).

Respondent	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	Beyond direct mortality, the presence of pylons can lead to displacement, where species avoid previously suitable habitats due to visual disturbance, noise, or increased human activity during construction and maintenance. This can have cascading effects on local populations and breeding success. The ecological footprint of overhead infrastructure is not limited to the construction phase. The permanent presence of pylons and access routes introduces ongoing disturbance, soil erosion, and weed colonisation, which further degrade the surrounding environment. Unlike underground cabling, which allows for full reinstatement of surface habitats, overhead pylons represent a permanent loss of ecological value. Given the availability of undergrounding as a viable alternative, the decision to install overhead pylons across ecologically sensitive landscapes is unjustifiable and contrary to national biodiversity and land stewardship objectives.	N	T Whilst the comment falls outside of the scope of the targeted consultation, the likely significant effects of the overhead line 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).
	Anticipated Substation Location We must query the anticipated substation location detailed in the targeted consultation on two counts in particular: The National Grid refined Weston Marsh substation siting zone extends to a total area of some 3000 acres, to be able to reduce this down to an area of some 100 acres is unrealistic and beyond expectation. Brown & Co LLP have made approaches directly to National Grid's agents, Dalcour Maclaren who have confirmed that National Grid have not shared any detailed designs, nor have they agreed to the assumptions that were published. National Grid will shortly be undertaking a targeted consultation in the Weston Marsh area with a view to deciding on the most appropriate substation location. This consultation will cover the refined (purple shaded) zone below. You will note that a proportion of the scheme's anticipated substation area falls outside of National Grids consultation area further raising doubt as to the validity of the schemes anticipated substation location. It stands to reason that the anticipated substation location is at the very best speculation and is misleading for the purpose of this consultation.	N	The Applicant notes this comment and confirms that it has continued work closely with NGET regarding the proposed Weston Marsh substations being developed as part of their Grimsby to Walpole project, which will be our point of connection to the National Electricity Transmission System (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 were updated, which required the inclusion of additional land within the Scheme boundary to facilitate our grid connection to the proposed Weston Marsh Substation B. An additional targeted consultation was undertaken on this additional land.

Respondent	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	Failure to Provide Undertakings for Professional Fees The scheme is an NSIP, consequently landowners affected by the scheme are entitled to experienced professional representation, the reasonable cost of which should be met by the scheme. To date the scheme has refused to pay surveyors' fees where landowners are affected by the cable route, placing parties at a disadvantage and contravening the Compensation Code.	N	The Applicant notes the concerns raised by Brown & Co. on behalf of its clients. The **Draft DCO** (Doc Ref. 3.1) makes provision for the compulsory acquisition of land and rights where required for the Scheme and applies the statutory compensation regime to the exercise of those powers. Any compensation payable as a result of the exercise of compulsory acquisition or temporary possession powers would be assessed in accordance with the Compensation Code. In addition, the draft Order includes provisions requiring appropriate security to be put in place in respect of the payment of compensation prior to the exercise of such powers. The Applicant is continuing to engage with landowners in respect of fees relating to the ongoing progression of property agreements with landowners. In respect of fees arising from the engagement with the application and the Examination process, the Applicant notes the MHCLG Guidance Planning Act 2008: awards of costs - examinations of applications for development consent orders confirms that all parties will normally be expected to meet their own costs in relation to the examination process.
	Summary Our client appreciates the opportunities to feedback on the project's proposals in the hope of providing constructive insight into the shortcomings and, potentially considerable, impact of the project. The importance of engaging is also understood as an attempt to resolve the highlighted issues. Notwithstanding the above, the validity of this targeted feedback is questionable when it is understood, following contact with National Grid's agents that they have had no input into Meridian Solar's refinement of the anticipated location of the Weston Marsh substation site. Consequently, with the lack of meaningful interaction between National Grid and the developer, additional feedback is rendered somewhat meaningless as details of the development of the Weston Marsh area and therefore connection points are equally vague as it was during the previous round of statutory consultation.	N	The Applicant notes the concerns raised by Brown & Co. on behalf of its clients and has responded to the matters raised above. The Applicant would welcome further engagement regarding these points, if required.

5. Response from L.A.N.D

Respondent	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
L.A.N.D	Lincolnshire Against Destruction (LAND) submits this objection with deep concern and disappointment at the fragmented and reactive nature of the proposed Meridian Solar Farm. The volume and scope of late-stage amendments—now totalling 38 distinct changes to the Order Limits—reveal a troubling lack of foresight, coordination, and planning discipline. Had the Stage Two consultation plans been properly assessed, many of these revisions could have been avoided. Instead, the developer has pursued a piecemeal approach that undermines public confidence and casts doubt on their capacity to deliver a nationally significant infrastructure project with the rigour and transparency it demands. The absence of a confirmed substation connection site location at this advanced stage is particularly alarming. It signals the rush to develop without the means to do so, but also a broader failure to present a coherent, deliverable proposal. This omission alone renders the application premature and procedurally unsound. LAND represents residents, landowners, and communities who have engaged in good faith throughout the consultation process. We now find ourselves responding to a scheme that has shifted substantially in scope and geography from its inception, without adequate re-consultation or justification. This is not how strategic energy planning should be conducted.	N	The Applicant has responded to the concerns raised by LAND below.
	Section 1: Relocation of BESS Infrastructure – Planning Risk & Safety Oversight Issue The developer proposes relocating all Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) infrastructure to the 400kV substation site, citing technical efficiency, reduced cabling, and improved emergency planning. However, this change raises significant planning and safety concerns, particularly: • Lack of site-specific fire risk assessment for the new BESS location	N	The **Environmental Statement** (Doc Ref 6.1) submitted with the application provides the relevant assessments for the Scheme, including the BESS infrastructure, and considers potential environmental effects and appropriate mitigation measures. The location of the BESS and the design evolution of the Scheme are explained in **ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The assessment of potential noise and vibration effects associated with the Scheme, including BESS infrastructure, is provided in **ES Chapter 13: Noise and Vibration** (Doc Ref. 6.1) which concludes no significant effects in relation to the BESS after the inclusion of mitigation such as the utilisation of 'low noise' BESS containers. These measures are secured within the OEMP, which will be prepared in accordance with the **OOEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.11) and secured by way of a Requirement in the **Draft DCO** (Doc Ref. 3.1). Flood risk and hydrological considerations

Respondent	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	• Absence of consultation with emergency services regarding access, containment, and evacuation protocols • No evidence of thermal runaway modelling, despite known risks associated with lithium-ion battery systems • Potential land use conflict with flood risk zones and proximity to critical infrastructure • The claim that this change "reduces noise effects" and "simplifies emergency planning" is not substantiated by technical data or third-party validation. The relocation may reduce residential proximity, but it concentrates risk in a single location without robust mitigation.		relating to the proposed infrastructure are assessed within **ES Chapter 11: Hydrology and Flood Risk** (Doc Ref. 6.1) which concludes no significant effects are expected. Details relating to battery safety, including emergency response procedures and access arrangements for the emergency services in the event of a fire, are set out within the **OBSMP** (Doc Ref. 7.18) which will be implemented in consultation with the Lincolnshire Fire & Rescue Service, in accordance with the requirements of the **Draft DCO** (Doc Ref. 3.1). The Applicant considers that the environmental and safety considerations associated with the proposed BESS location have been appropriately assessed and documented within the application. The Applicant also considers the consultation undertaken the be sufficient, noting that engagement with consultees has been undertaken in accordance with the PA 2008, as detailed in the **Consultation Report** (Doc Ref. 5.1.
	Impact • Fire & Explosion Risk: Centralising BESS increases the scale of potential incidents. Lithium-ion systems are vulnerable to thermal runaway, which can lead to uncontrollable fires. • Emergency Access Constraints: The new location may be harder to reach during flood events or grid failure, compromising emergency response. • Noise & Vibration: While distance to homes increases, the cumulative acoustic impact of multiple BESS units in one location may exceed thresholds without proper modelling. • Planning Transparency: This change was introduced post-PEIR and may not have been adequately consulted on with affected stakeholders.		
	References National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) – Paragraph 97 Requires planning decisions to consider the safety and resilience of energy infrastructure. Health & Safety Executive (HSE) – Battery Storage Fire Risk Guidance Highlights the need for thermal runaway modelling and emergency containment plans. Environment Agency – Flood Risk & Infrastructure Siting Advises against placing sensitive infrastructure in flood-prone zones without robust mitigation.	N	The Applicant notes these references.

Respondent	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	NFCC Position Statement – Lithium-ion Battery Storage Recommends consultation with fire services and site-specific emergency planning.		
	Action Requested We call on the Planning Authority to: • Reject the relocation of BESS infrastructure unless a full fire risk assessment and emergency access plan is submitted • Consult with Lincolnshire Fire & Rescue Service and the Environment Agency regarding site suitability and containment protocols • Require acoustic modelling for cumulative BESS noise impacts at the new location • Ensure transparent re-consultation with affected stakeholders, including residents and emergency planners	N	Potential environmental effects associated with the Scheme, including matters relating to flood risk and noise, have been assessed within the **Environmental Statement** (Doc Ref. 6.1), including **ES Chapter 11: Hydrology and Flood Risk** (Doc Ref. 6.1) which concludes no significant effects and **ES Chapter 13: Noise and Vibration** (Doc Ref. 6.1) which concludes no significant effects in relation to the BESS after the inclusion of mitigation such as the utilisation of 'low noise' BESS containers. These measures are secured within the OEMP, which will be prepared in accordance with the **OOEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.11) and secured by way of a Requirement in the **Draft DCO** (Doc Ref. 3.1). The potential for BESS fire risks is presented in **ES Chapter 16: Other Environmental Topics** (Doc Ref. 6.1). Battery safety and emergency response arrangements are addressed within the **OBSMP** (Doc Ref. 7.18), which includes measures relating to fire safety, emergency response procedures and access for emergency services. The final BSMP will be secured through the DCO and will be subject to approval in consultation with Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue Service. The Applicant has engaged with relevant stakeholders during the preparation of the application, including Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue Service, and considers that the approach to battery safety is in line with all relevant legislation and guidance.
	Section 2: Relocation of 132kV Substation – Flood Risk Avoidance, Visual Impact & Procedural Oversight Issue The developer proposes relocating the 132kV substation from Parcel B to Parcel C, citing flood risk avoidance in the event of a breach of the River Welland flood defences. While this change may reduce flood vulnerability, it introduces new planning concerns: • The new location is closer to the Scheme boundary and may extend the Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV), particularly affecting receptors at Martins Farm, approximately 375 metres away. The PEIR already identified potentially significant visual effects at this location. • The relocation was introduced post-PEIR and may not have been accompanied by updated visual receptor modelling, screened ZTV analysis, or seasonal viewpoint photography.	N	The Applicant is confident that the revised substation location has been appropriately assessed within the **Environmental Statement** (Doc Ref. 6.1). This includes consideration of potential visual effects and Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) in **ES Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual** (Doc Ref. 6.1), and flood risk matters in **ES Chapter 11: Hydrology and Flood Risk** (Doc Ref. 6.1). These assessments consider the potential impacts of the Scheme, including the siting of infrastructure and relevant mitigation measures. Application of the Sequential Test is set out in **ES Appendix 11-3: Flood Risk Assessment** and the **Site Selection Report** (Doc Ref. 7.1). The Applicant also notes that engagement with consultees has been undertaken in accordance with the PA 2008, as detailed in the **Consultation Report** (Doc Ref. 5.1).

Respondent	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	• There is no evidence of consultation with landscape officers, local residents, or heritage stakeholders regarding the revised siting and its implications for cumulative landscape character. • While flood risk reduction is a valid objective, the proposal lacks a Sequential Test justification comparing alternative low-risk sites within the Scheme boundary. • Flood risks were raised during initial consultations and should have been addressed sooner. • Concern that post construction the site will still require redesign and restructuring due to lack of due diligence where flooding is a heightened risk throughout the site.		
	Impact • Visual Intrusion: The substation is a large, industrial structure with fencing, lighting, and acoustic enclosures. Its relocation may increase visibility from sensitive receptors, especially in winter months. • Landscape Character Disruption: Parcel C is closer to open fen-edge landscapes and may lack the screening features present in Parcel B. • Planning Transparency: The change introduces new visual and spatial impacts without updated assessment or stakeholder engagement. • Flood Risk Trade-Off: While the relocation avoids one flood risk zone, it may introduce new risks if not supported by full Sequential and Exception Tests.		
	References National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) – Paragraphs 159–167 Requires application of the Sequential Test and Exception Test for flood-sensitive infrastructure, and mandates avoidance of flood zones where possible. Meridian Solar Farm PEIR Volume I – Chapter 8: Hydrology, Flood Risk and WFD Provides baseline flood risk mapping and identifies areas vulnerable to breach scenarios from the River Welland. PEIR Volume II Figure 10-7: Zone of Theoretical Visibility (Bare Earth) Should be updated to reflect the new substation location	N	The Applicant notes these references.

Respondent	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	and assess screened visibility from Martins Farm and other receptors. Solar Farm Flood Risk Assessment – Unda Consultants Advises that substations must be located outside flood extents and supported by robust drainage and access strategies.		
	Action Requested We call on the Planning Authority to: • Reject the substation relocation to Parcel C unless updated ZTV modelling and visual receptor assessments are submitted • Require a full Sequential and Exception Test, demonstrating that the new location is the most appropriate in terms of flood risk and landscape impact • Consult with landscape officers, heritage stakeholders, and affected residents, particularly those at Martins Farm • Ensure transparent re-consultation, with a clear explanation of visual, acoustic, and flood-related implications	N	Updated assessments of the Scheme are provided within the **Environmental Statement** (Doc Ref. 6.1). This includes consideration of landscape and visual effects, including ZTV modelling, within **ES Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual** (Doc Ref. 6.1), and flood risk matters within **ES Chapter 11: Hydrology and Flood Risk** (Doc Ref. 6.1). Application of the Sequential and Exception Tests is set out in **ES Appendix 11-3: Flood Risk Assessment** and the **Site Selection Report** (Doc Ref. 7.1). The Applicant further confirms that consultation has been undertaken in accordance with the PA 2008, as set out in the **Consultation Report** (Doc Ref. 5.1). On this basis, the Applicant considers that the assessments and consultation undertaken are proportionate and appropriate, and does not consider that further re-consultation is required.
	Section 3: Parcel B Reconfiguration – Flood Risk, Land Classification & Habitat Mitigation Concerns Issue The developer proposes an internal reconfiguration of the Scheme layout within Parcel B, relocating solar panels away from areas of higher flood risk and into the centre of the parcel. This change is justified by the Sequential Test, which requires infrastructure to be sited in areas of lowest flood risk. However, the proposal raises several concerns: • The updated Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) survey now identifies the central area as Grade 3a and Grade 2, contradicting earlier assumptions of Grade 1 land. This shift in classification is not independently verified and may reflect selective sampling. • The proposal to use Flood Zone 3b land for habitat mitigation is problematic. Flood Zone 3b is defined as the functional floodplain, where development is typically restricted due to high flood risk and ecological sensitivity.	N	The Applicant notes this comment but confirms that updated assessments relating to land classification, flood risk and ecological considerations are provided within the **Environmental Statement** (Doc Ref. 6.1). This includes the assessment of agricultural land classification and effects on BMV land within **ES Chapter 5: Agriculture and Soils** (Doc Ref. 6.1), and flood risk considerations within **ES Chapter 11: Hydrology and Flood Risk** (Doc Ref. 6.1). Application of the Sequential and Exception Tests is set out in **ES Appendix 11-3: Flood Risk Assessment** and the **Site Selection Report** (Doc Ref. 7.1). An assessment of likely significant effects of the Scheme on ecology are assessed within **ES Chapter 9: Ecology and Biodiversity** (Doc Ref. 6.1) which concludes no significant effects. 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.

Respondent	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	• There is no evidence of ecological suitability for habitat creation in Flood Zone 3b, nor any long-term management plan for maintaining biodiversity in flood-prone areas. • These issues have been raised during consultations, there is concern that the developer is only just taking action at this late stage. Impact • Loss of Agricultural Productivity: Grade 2 and 3a land is still considered Best and Most Versatile (BMV) and should be protected under planning policy. • Ecological Risk: Habitat mitigation in Flood Zone 3b may be unsustainable due to seasonal inundation, soil instability, and lack of species resilience. • Planning Integrity: The reclassification of land and repurposing of floodplain areas may be used to circumvent objections to development on BMV land. • Lack of Transparency: No detailed soil survey methodology or ecological feasibility study has been provided to support these claims.		The **OSMP** (Doc Ref. 7.14) includes measures to protect soil structure and function throughout construction and operation, including careful handling, storage, and reinstatement of soils. These measures are designed to ensure that the soil resource is safeguarded and that agricultural capability is not degraded over the lifetime of the Scheme. Following decommissioning, the land will be restored so far as reasonably practicable to its pre-construction condition, with the aim of returning it to its existing ALC grade. Post-restoration monitoring is secured within the **OSMP** (Doc Ref. 7.14), and any minor variability from baseline ALC grades identified at that stage would be investigated and addressed to ensure the land is capable of productive agricultural use once reinstated. On this basis, while a substantial proportion of the Site comprises BMV land, the majority of the effects from land-take are long-term but reversible, and do not constitute a permanent loss of agricultural land. However, there is some uncertainty around whether Grade 1 and 2 land which has been temporarily sealed under hard standing can be restored to the same ALC grade following decommissioning. As such for a worst-case assessment of impacts, the temporary use of any Grade 1 and 2 land for infrastructure which requires hard standing to be established has been considered to result in a permanent loss of these grades. In addition, the establishment of trees and shrubs along field boundaries has been assessed as permanent loss of agricultural land. The Applicant further notes that details of how feedback received during each round of consultation has been considered are presented within **Appendix H: Section 42 Applicant's Responses** (Doc Ref. 5.1), **Appendix I: Section 47 Applicant's Responses** (Doc Ref. 5.1), **Appendix K: Targeted Consultation Applicant's Responses** (Doc Ref. 5.1) and **Appendix L: Additional Targeted Consultation** (Doc Ref. 5.1), as well as within the relevant topic chapters of the **Environmental Statement** (Doc Ref. 6.1).
	References Flood Risk Assessment: Flood Zones 1, 2, 3 and 3b – GOV.UK Confirms that Flood Zone 3b is the functional floodplain and generally unsuitable for development or habitat mitigation without robust justification. NPPF Footnote 62 – Agricultural Land Protection Advises that BMV land (Grades 1–3a) should be avoided for development unless absolutely necessary. Environment Agency – Flood Zone Guidance Recommends caution when proposing ecological mitigation in flood-prone areas due to unpredictability and maintenance challenges. Solar Farm Development Flood Guidance – Central Bedfordshire Council Highlights the need for formalised	N	The Applicant notes this comment.

Respondent	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	drainage and ecological resilience in flood-sensitive solar farm sites.		
	Action Requested We call on the Planning Authority to: • Reject the reconfiguration of Parcel B unless independent verification of ALC data is provided • Refuse habitat mitigation proposals in Flood Zone 3b without a full ecological feasibility study and long-term management plan • Consult with Natural England and the Environment Agency regarding the suitability of floodplain land for biodiversity offsetting • Apply NPPF protections for BMV land, ensuring that Grade 2 and 3a land is not sacrificed without compelling justification	N	Agricultural Land Classification surveys were undertaken by appropriately qualified specialists, and the methodology and results are reported in **ES Chapter 5: Agriculture and Soils** (Doc Ref. 6.1) which concludes that from the commencement of construction, the long-term restriction to agricultural use of the ALC Grade 1 and 2 land within the Solar Development Area as a result of the construction of the solar panels and associated infrastructure is considered to represent a significant adverse effect. However, following decommissioning, the land would be returned to the landowner for agricultural use. Good practice environmental management measures have been set out within the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10), **OOEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.11) and **ODEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.12). These include measures to minimise the risk of contamination of soils as a result of the Scheme, and measures for the protection of existing land drainage. Furthermore, the **Outline Soil Management Plan** (Doc Ref. 7.14), submitted with the DCO Application, provides a comprehensive set of measures across the lifetime of the Scheme for the preservation of the soil resource within the Site. Ecological suitability and proposed habitat creation have also been assessed as part of the long-term management of habitats secured through the **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16). As set out within the **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16), the area referred to comprises Habitat Management Area 3. This area is proposed to remain in arable use with skylark plots introduced to provide improved nesting habitats for ground-nesting birds. No areas of woodland are proposed, which could permanently restrict the use of BMV land for agriculture, with shrub and tree planting specified on field boundaries. As such, there is considered to be no significant effect from flood risk perspective. Consultation with statutory authorities forms an established part of the pre-application process, and relevant bodies have been consulted at each stage of the Scheme's development. The **Planning Statement** (Doc Ref. 7.1) sets out compliance with relevant National Policy Statements and the NPPF. The Applicant further notes that details of how feedback received during each round of consultation has been considered are presented within **Appendix H: Section 42 Applicant's Responses** (Doc Ref. 5.1), **Appendix I: Section 47 Applicant's Responses** (Doc Ref. 5.1), **Appendix K: Targeted Consultation Applicant's Responses** (Doc Ref. 5.1) and **Appendix L: Additional Targeted Consultation** (Doc Ref. 5.1), as well as within the relevant topic chapters of the **Environmental Statement** (Doc Ref. 6.1).
	Section 4: Underground Grid Connection & CSECs – Landscape Permanence, Archaeological Risk & Planning Oversight Issue	N	The Applicant considers that the potential effects associated with the CSECs and the underground cable section have been appropriately considered within the **Environmental Statement** (Doc Ref. 6.1). This includes assessments relating to landscape and visual effects

Respondent	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	The developer proposes to underground a section of the grid connection where it crosses the existing 132kV line, with two Cable Sealing End Compounds (CSECs) installed to transition between overhead and underground infrastructure. While this change is framed as a technical necessity, it introduces new planning concerns: • Each CSEC is a permanent, fenced compound containing electrical equipment, remaining in place for the 40-year lifetime of the Scheme. These structures introduce new above-ground infrastructure in a rural landscape, yet no detailed visual receptor modelling, screened ZTV analysis, or seasonal viewpoint photography has been provided. • The underground cable will cross a drain, but no formal hydrological impact assessment, culvert design, or trenchless feasibility study is included. The Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (OCEMP) is referenced, but not publicly available for scrutiny. • The proposal acknowledges potential archaeological impacts, yet no site-specific geoarchaeological survey, LiDAR analysis, or Historic Environment Record (HER) consultation is cited. • Maintenance access from Delgate Bank may be infrequent, but the cumulative impact of multiple infrastructure access points across the Scheme has not been assessed.		within **ES Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual** (Doc Ref. 6.1), cultural heritage within **ES Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage** (Doc Ref. 6.1), access and transport considerations within **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref. 6.1) and flood risk matters within **ES Chapter 11: Hydrology and Flood Risk** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The Applicant further notes that the infrastructure forms part of a temporary Scheme that would operate for the consented lifetime of the development and would be decommissioned in accordance with the requirements of the DCO. Construction management measures are secured through the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10), which is submitted as part of the DCO and will be available on the project page of the Planning Inspectorate's website once the Application is accepted for examination. The Applicant also considers the consultation undertaken the be sufficient, noting that engagement with consultees has been undertaken in accordance with the PA 2008, as detailed in the **Consultation Report** (Doc Ref. 5.1).
	Impact • Landscape Permanence: CSECs are industrial compounds that introduce visual and spatial disruption, especially in open fen-edge landscapes. • Archaeological Risk: Cable trenching and compound installation may disturb buried heritage assets, especially near historic drainage networks and Roman-era routes. • Hydrological Sensitivity: Drain crossings without robust design may lead to erosion, sedimentation, or habitat degradation.		

Respondent	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	• Planning Transparency: The change introduces permanent infrastructure without updated environmental, visual, or archaeological assessment.		
	References National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) – Paragraphs 174–176 & 194–202 Requires developments to protect landscape character, ecological networks, and heritage assets. Cable Sealing End Compound Construction – National Grid UK Details the scale, fencing, and visual permanence of CSECs, including access requirements and maintenance protocols. Springwell Solar Farm Grid Connection Statement – Planning Inspectorate Demonstrates best practice in defining grid connection infrastructure, land acquisition, and archaeological mitigation. PEIR Volume I – Chapter 6: Cultural Heritage Should be updated to reflect the new CSEC locations and assess archaeological risk along the underground cable corridor.	N	The Applicant notes these references
	Action Requested We call on the Planning Authority to: • Reject the underground grid connection and CSEC installation unless updated visual, archaeological, and hydrological assessments are submitted • Require full design details, including trenching method, compound dimensions, and access protocols • Consult with Historic England, Internal Drainage Boards, and affected landowners regarding the proposed infrastructure • Ensure transparent re-consultation, with clear explanation of landscape, heritage, and ecological implications	N	The landscape and visual effects of the Cable Sealing End Compounds (CSECs) 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). As the detailed design of the CSECs will be determined at a later stage, the assessments reported within the **Environmental Statement** (Doc Ref. 6.1) have been undertaken using reasonable worst-case assumptions. The cultural heritage assessment of the proposed infrastructure, including the grid connection and CSECs, is presented in **ES Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage** (Doc Ref. 6.1). Hydrology and flood risk matters are assessed in **ES Chapter 11: Hydrology and Flood Risk** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The Applicant has undertaken consultation with relevant statutory consultees including Historic England and the Internal Drainage Boards and affected landowners as part of the pre-application process, as reported in the **Consultation Report** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The Applicant therefore considers that the matters raised have been appropriately assessed and consulted upon.
	Section 5: Parcel D Extension – Historic Sensitivity, Landscape Impact & Procedural Concerns Issue	N	As stated in **ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution** (Doc Ref. 6.1) four additional fields in Parcel D were brought forward for development with solar PV panels, following comments received from landowners during Statutory Consultation. This included the

Respondent	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	The developer proposes to extend the Order Limits in Parcel D, adding four new fields for solar PV panels (33.3 ha) and removing one field (18.4 ha) due to historic sensitivity. While the net increase is 14.9 ha, the proposal claims no change to the Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV). However, this change raises several concerns: • The historic sensitivity of the removed field is acknowledged, yet no detailed archaeological assessment or mitigation strategy is provided. The option to use this land for habitat enhancement may conflict with its heritage value. • The additional fields are located near properties along Langary Gate Road, and while panels are not proposed directly adjacent, the expansion increases proximity and potential cumulative visual impact. • The claim that ZTV remains unchanged is based on screened modelling, which may not reflect seasonal visibility, hedgerow loss, or receptor experience from public rights of way. • The change was introduced post-PEIR and may not have been adequately consulted on with affected residents or heritage stakeholders.		addition of 33.3 ha. Field D4 (18.4 ha) was however removed from consideration for solar PV, owing to its historic sensitivity, with the option to use this land for habitat enhancement retained instead. Overall, this resulted in a net increase of 14.9 ha of solar PV panels across Parcel D. Additional buffers were also included around properties along Langary Gate Road, where no solar PV panels would be located, in order to avoid impacting on the residential visual amenity of these properties and to avoid significant glint and glare effects. Crown Estate land previously indicated as inter-array within Parcel D has been removed from the Order Limits. Historical sensitivity is considered at Section 8.8. of **ES Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage** (Doc Ref. 6.1) which states that Parcel D4 is the site of a German Dornier 217 bomber aircraft that crashed during the Second World War. The assessment concludes no significant effects are expected. 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 was reduced between statutory consultation and targeted consultation. The Applicant further notes that a mailing zone around Langary Gate Road was devised, ensuring affected parties were informed. 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. In terms of using historically sensitive land as BNG offset this is considered to be acceptable.
	Impact • Heritage Risk: The removal of a historically sensitive field without full disclosure of its significance undermines transparency and heritage protection. • Landscape Intrusion: The expansion increases the footprint of industrial infrastructure in a rural setting, with potential cumulative effects not fully assessed. • Consultation Gaps: Residents near Langary Gate Road may not have been consulted on the revised layout, despite increased proximity and potential disruption. • Misuse of Habitat Mitigation: Repurposing historically sensitive land for biodiversity offsetting may conflict with its archaeological value and planning guidance.		
	References National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) – Paragraphs 194–202 Requires developments to assess and avoid harm to	N	The Applicant notes these references.

Respondent	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	heritage assets, including non-designated sites of archaeological interest. National Policy Statement EN-1 (2023) – Paragraph 5.9.10 Emphasizes the need to understand and mitigate impacts on the historic environment. Comparison of Archaeological Evaluation Investigations on Solar Schemes – Planning Inspectorate Highlights the lack of consistent archaeological evaluation across solar NSIPs and the need for proportionate fieldwork. Good Practice Guide – Archaeology and Solar Farms (2025 Consultation Draft) Recommends early-stage archaeological assessment and stakeholder engagement for solar developments.		
	Action Requested We call on the Planning Authority to: • Reject the Parcel D extension unless a full archaeological assessment is submitted for the historically sensitive field • Require updated ZTV modelling, including seasonal variation and receptor-based analysis • Consult with Historic England and local heritage groups regarding the suitability of habitat mitigation on sensitive land • Ensure re-consultation with affected residents, particularly those near Langary Gate Road	N	Updated environmental assessments, including those relating to landscape and visual effects, cultural heritage and hydrology, are provided within the **Environmental Statement** (Doc Ref. 6.1). This includes ES **Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual** (Doc Ref. 6.1), **ES Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage** (Doc Ref. 6.1) and **ES Chapter 11: Hydrology and Flood Risk** (Doc Ref. 6.1). As part of the EIA process, the potential effects of the Scheme on heritage assets and archaeological remains have been assessed and reported within the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.1). Relevant statutory consultees have been consulted throughout the pre-application process, as reported in the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 5.1) and within the relevant topic chapters of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.1). The Applicant therefore considers that the matters raised have been appropriately assessed and consulted upon through the application documentation.
	Section 6: Weston Marsh Substation Extension – Planning Uncertainty, Environmental Oversight & Procedural Fairness Issue The developer proposes an extension of the Order Limits to encompass the remainder of the field identified as the likely location for the Weston Marsh substation, which serves as the Scheme's point of connection to the National Grid. While the change is framed as providing "greater flexibility," it raises several planning concerns:	N	The Applicant notes that the Weston Marsh Substation will be consented and delivered separately to the Scheme by NGET. The **Design Parameters** (Doc Ref. 7.4) document provides the key maximum and minimum parameters which the detailed design of the Scheme must comply, as secured in Schedule 2, requirement 5 (detailed design approval) of the **Draft DCO** (Doc Ref. 3.1). Finalising the detailed design post-consent is necessary to achieve technological and design flexibility for the Scheme, particularly where technology is rapidly evolving, and where final minor changes may be necessary once matters of procurement and construction are confirmed. That necessary flexibility has been facilitated by the adoption of the 'Rochdale

Respondent	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	• The substation is a major infrastructure component, yet its final siting remains undefined. This undermines the principle of fixed design parameters required for Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA). • The extension introduces new land into the Scheme boundary post-PEIR, without updated assessments of landscape impact, ecological sensitivity, or cumulative effects. • The claim that "conditions are consistent with surrounding fields" is speculative and not supported by updated soil surveys, hydrological mapping, or ecological appraisals. • There is no evidence of consultation with landowners, local residents, or statutory consultees regarding the revised substation siting and its implications for access, noise, and visual impact. Impact • Planning Uncertainty: The lack of a defined substation location prevents meaningful public engagement and undermines the integrity of the EIA process. • Environmental Oversight: The new land may contain features not assessed in the PEIR, including drainage networks, field margins, or biodiversity corridors. • Consultation Gaps: Affected parties may not have been informed or consulted on the revised Order Limits and infrastructure siting. • Precedent Risk: Allowing post-consent flexibility for critical infrastructure sets a dangerous precedent for future NSIPs.		Envelope' approach in the **Environmental Statement** (Doc Ref. 6.1) which is explained in **ES Chapter 2: The Scheme** (Doc Ref. 6.1). Updated surveys and assessments, including those relating to landscape and visual effects, ecology and biodiversity, hydrology and flood risk, and cultural heritage, are provided within the **Environmental Statement** (Doc Ref 6.1), including: • **ES Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual** (Doc Ref 6.1) • **ES Chapter 9: Ecology and Biodiversity** (Doc Ref. 6.1) • **ES Chapter 11: Hydrology and Flood Risk** (Doc Ref. 6.1). • **ES Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage** (Doc Ref. 6.1). Each chapter also considers potential cumulative effects, with overall interactions addressed within **ES Chapter 17: Effect Interactions** (Doc Ref. 6.1). ALC surveys are presented within **ES Chapter 5: Agriculture and Soils** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The Applicant also considers the consultation undertaken the be sufficient, noting that engagement with consultees has been undertaken in accordance with the PA 2008, as detailed in the **Consultation Report** (Doc Ref. 5.1).
	References National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) – Paragraphs 16 & 174 Requires developments to be clearly defined and to protect environmental assets and landowner rights. Planning Act 2008 – Section 47 Mandates effective consultation with those affected by changes to land use or operational scope. Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009 – Regulation 5 Requires	N	The Applicant notes these references.

Respondent	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	applicants to define the scope and purpose of all land included within the Order Limits. PEIR Volume I – Chapter 2: The Scheme Describes the Weston Marsh substation as the point of connection but does not confirm its final location or assess the newly added land.		
	Action Requested We call on the Planning Authority to: • Reject the Weston Marsh substation extension unless the final siting is confirmed and supported by updated environmental, landscape, and access assessments • Require fixed design parameters prior to consent, in line with EIA regulations and NPS guidance • Consult with affected landowners, residents, and statutory consultees, ensuring procedural fairness and transparency • Apply the precautionary principle, refusing flexibility that undermines public engagement and environmental oversight	N	The Applicant notes that the Weston Marsh Substation will be consented and delivered separately to the Scheme by NGET. The **Design Parameters** (Doc Ref. 7.4) document provides the key maximum and minimum parameters which the detailed design of the Scheme must comply, as secured in Schedule 2, requirement 5 (detailed design approval) of the **Draft DCO** (Doc Ref. 3.1). The Applicant also considers the consultation undertaken the be sufficient, noting that engagement with consultees has been undertaken in accordance with the PA 2008, as detailed in the **Consultation Report** (Doc Ref. 5.1).
	Section 7: Extension of Order Limits – Planning Transparency & Post-Consent Flexibility Risks Issue The developer proposes to extend the Order Limits to include additional fields for overhead line construction and to allow greater flexibility during the detailed design stage, after the application has been submitted and determined. This change is presented as minor, with "no new or different significant effects" anticipated. However, this approach raises serious concerns: • The extension introduces post-consent uncertainty, allowing infrastructure siting decisions to be made without public scrutiny or environmental assessment. • The claim that conditions are "expected to be similar" is speculative and not supported by updated surveys or impact modelling. • The additional land may include undocumented ecological, archaeological, or hydrological sensitivities, which will not be assessed if flexibility is granted without constraint.	N	The **Design Parameters** (Doc Ref. 7.4) document provides the key maximum and minimum parameters which the detailed design of the Scheme must comply, as secured in Schedule 2, requirement 5 (detailed design approval) of the **Draft DCO** (Doc Ref. 3.1). Finalising the detailed design post-consent is necessary to achieve technological and design flexibility for the Scheme, particularly where technology is rapidly evolving, and where final minor changes may be necessary once matters of procurement and construction are confirmed. That necessary flexibility has been facilitated by the adoption of the 'Rochdale Envelope' approach in the **Environmental Statement** (Doc Ref. 6.1) which is explained in **ES Chapter 2: The Scheme** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The Applicant confirms that the inclusion of additional land does not give rise to new or materially different significant effects. The assessments are presented within the **Environmental Statement** (Doc Ref. 6.1): • **ES Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage** (Doc Ref. 6.1) • **ES Chapter 9: Ecology and Biodiversity** (Doc Ref. 6.1) • **ES Chapter 11: Hydrology and Flood Risk** (Doc Ref. 6.1) • **ES Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual** (Doc Ref. 6.1)

Respondent	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	• This undermines the principle of fixed design parameters required for Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and violates the spirit of procedural fairness under the Planning Act 2008.		The Applicant further notes that consultation with landowners, residents and statutory consultees has been undertaken in accordance with the PA2008, as set out in the **Consultation Report** (Doc Ref. 5.1). How feedback received during each round of consultation has been considered is presented within **Appendix H: Section 42 Applicant's Responses** (Doc Ref. 5.1), **Appendix I: Section 47 Applicant's Responses** (Doc Ref. 5.1), **Appendix K: Targeted Consultation Applicant's Responses** (Doc Ref. 5.1) and **Appendix L: Additional Targeted Consultation** (Doc Ref. 5.1), as well as within the relevant topic chapters of the **Environmental Statement** (Doc Ref. 6.1).The Applicant further notes that consultation with affected landowners, residents and statutory consultees has been undertaken in accordance with the PA2008, as detailed in the **Consultation Report** (Doc Ref. 5.1).
	Impact • Loss of Planning Certainty: Residents and stakeholders cannot meaningfully engage with a proposal that may change after consent is granted. • Environmental Oversight Gaps: Additional land may contain features not covered in the PEIR, leading to unassessed impacts. • Precedent Risk: Allowing post-consent flexibility sets a dangerous precedent for other NSIPs, weakening the integrity of the planning process. • Consultation Undermined: Affected landowners and communities may not have been consulted on the newly included areas.	N	
	References Planning Act 2008 – Section 47 Requires developers to consult effectively and transparently with affected parties. Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009 – Regulation 5 Mandates clear definition of Order Limits and project scope at the application stage. National Policy Statement EN-1 – Paragraph 4.2.6 Requires applicants to define the project with sufficient detail to enable robust environmental assessment. Mallard Pass Solar Farm – ES Chapter 3: Order Limits Demonstrates best practice in defining Order Limits and assessing landform, ecology, and heritage within those boundaries.	N	The Applicant notes theses references.
	Action Requested We call on the Planning Authority to: • Reject the extension of Order Limits unless full environmental, archaeological, and hydrological surveys are conducted for the newly included land	N	Relevant environmental matters, including archaeology, ecology and hydrology, are considered within the **Environmental Statement** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The **Design Parameters** (Doc Ref. 7.4) document provides the key maximum and minimum parameters which the detailed design of the Scheme must comply, as secured in Schedule 2, requirement 5 (detailed design approval) of the **Draft DCO** (Doc Ref. 3.1).

Respondent	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	• Require fixed design parameters prior to consent, in line with EIA regulations and NPS guidance • Consult with affected landowners and stakeholders, ensuring procedural fairness and transparency • Apply the precautionary principle, refusing flexibility that undermines public engagement and environmental oversight.		The Applicant further notes that consultation with affected landowners, residents and statutory consultees has been undertaken in accordance with the PA2008, as detailed in the **Consultation Report** (Doc Ref. 5.1). There is further opportunity to comment on the Scheme during the Examination process.
	Section 8: Overhead Line Extension – Planning Uncertainty, Environmental Oversight & Procedural Integrity Issue The developer proposes an extension of the Order Limits to include the remainder of the fields required for overhead line construction and to provide additional flexibility for infrastructure siting during the detailed design stage. This change is intended to support connection into the Weston Marsh substation, which is to be consented and delivered by National Grid Electricity Transmission (NGET). While the change is described as minor, it raises several planning concerns: • The proposal introduces post-consent uncertainty, allowing infrastructure siting decisions to be made without public scrutiny or updated environmental assessment. • The Weston Marsh substation is a critical grid connection point, yet its final location and design remain undefined, undermining the principle of fixed design parameters required under Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) regulations. • The newly added land may contain unassessed ecological, archaeological, or hydrological sensitivities, especially given its proximity to drainage networks and fen-edge habitats. • The change was introduced post-PEIR and may not have been adequately consulted on with affected landowners, residents, or statutory consultees.	N	The **Design Parameters** (Doc Ref. 7.4) document provides the key maximum and minimum parameters which the detailed design of the Scheme must comply, as secured in Schedule 2, requirement 5 (detailed design approval) of the **Draft DCO** (Doc Ref. 3.1). Finalising the detailed design post-consent is necessary to achieve technological and design flexibility for the Scheme, particularly where technology is rapidly evolving, and where final minor changes may be necessary once matters of procurement and construction are confirmed. That necessary flexibility has been facilitated by the adoption of the 'Rochdale Envelope' approach in the **Environmental Statement** (Doc Ref. 6.1) which is explained in **ES Chapter 2: The Scheme** (Doc Ref. 6.1). Consultation with affected landowners, residents and statutory consultees has been undertaken in accordance with the PA 2008, as detailed in the **Consultation Report** (Doc Ref. 5.1). Details of how feedback received during each round of consultation has been considered are presented within **Appendix H: Section 42 Applicant's Responses** (Doc Ref. 5.1), **Appendix I: Section 47 Applicant's Responses** (Doc Ref. 5.1), **Appendix K: Targeted Consultation Applicant's Responses** (Doc Ref. 5.1) and **Appendix L: Additional Targeted Consultation** (Doc Ref. 5.1), as well as within the relevant topic chapters of the **Environmental Statement** (Doc Ref. 6.1). Interested parties will also have a further opportunity to provide comments by submitting a Relevant Representation should the Application be accepted for examination.
	Impact • Planning Uncertainty: Without a confirmed infrastructure layout, stakeholders cannot meaningfully engage or assess impacts.	N	

Respondent	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	• Environmental Oversight: The PEIR does not account for the newly added land, which may contain features requiring mitigation. • Consultation Gaps: Affected parties may not have been informed or consulted on the revised Order Limits and infrastructure siting. • Precedent Risk: Allowing post-consent flexibility for critical infrastructure sets a dangerous precedent for future NSIPs.		
	References National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) – Paragraphs 16 & 174 Requires developments to be clearly defined and to protect environmental assets and landowner rights. Planning Act 2008 – Section 47 Mandates effective consultation with those affected by changes to land use or operational scope. Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009 – Regulation 5 Requires applicants to define the scope and purpose of all land included within the Order Limits. PEIR Volume I – Chapter 2: The Scheme Describes the grid connection corridor and Weston Marsh substation as key infrastructure components, but does not confirm final siting or assess newly added land.	N	The Applicant notes these references.
	Action Requested We call on the Planning Authority to: • Reject the Order Limits extension unless the final infrastructure layout is confirmed and supported by updated environmental, landscape, and access assessments • Require fixed design parameters prior to consent, in line with EIA regulations and NPS guidance • Consult with affected landowners, residents, and statutory consultees, ensuring procedural fairness and transparency • Apply the precautionary principle, refusing flexibility that undermines public engagement and environmental oversight.	N	Relevant environmental matters, including archaeology, ecology and hydrology, are considered within the **Environmental Statement** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The **Design Parameters** (Doc Ref. 7.4) document provides the key maximum and minimum parameters which the detailed design of the Scheme must comply, as secured in Schedule 2, requirement 5 (detailed design approval) of the **Draft DCO** (Doc Ref. 3.1). The Applicant further notes that consultation with affected landowners, residents and statutory consultees has been undertaken in accordance with the PA2008, as detailed in the **Consultation Report** (Doc Ref. 5.1). There is further opportunity to comment on the Scheme during the Examination process.

Respondent	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	Section 9: Swindler's Drove Extension – Landscape, Access & Procedural Oversight Issue The developer proposes an extension of the Order Limits toward Swindler's Drove to accommodate a relocated tower alignment and provide maintenance access for overhead line infrastructure. While the change is described as minor and "not anticipated to materially alter" landscape effects, this assertion is not supported by updated modelling or receptor-based analysis. The proposal raises several concerns: • Swindler's Drove is a rural lane with limited width and ecological sensitivity, often used by walkers, cyclists, and agricultural vehicles. Even infrequent maintenance access could disrupt local use and degrade surface conditions. • The relocated tower alignment may introduce new visual intrusion, especially from low-lying viewpoints and public rights of way not previously assessed in the PEIR. • The claim that the land is "similar in character" is vague and unsupported by updated landscape character assessments or ecological surveys. • The change was introduced post-PEIR and may not have been adequately consulted on with affected residents or landowners.	N	The landscape and visual effects of the Grid Connection Route and associated infrastructure within the existing context have been assessed in detail within **ES Appendix 12-4: Landscape Assessment** (Doc Ref. 6.3) and **ES Appendix 12-6: Visual Assessmen**t (Doc Ref. 6.3), with a summary provided within **ES Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual** (Doc Ref. 6.1). 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 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). **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref. 6.1), **ES Appendix 15-4: Transport Assessment Note** (Doc Ref. 6.3), and the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13) provide details of mitigation measures proposed to prevent or reduce potential adverse effects associated with construction traffic on local roads. The impact of the Scheme on road safety has been assessed in **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref. 6.1) which concludes no significant effects. Mitigation measures such as the use of traffic marshals at site accesses and crossing points during the construction phase, are detailed in the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13). As confirmed in Section 15.6 of **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref. 6.1) and presented in **ES Figure 15-2: Existing Walking and Cycling Network** (Doc Ref. 6.2), there is a range of existing walking, cycling and equestrian routes within and surrounding the Order Limits. Details relating to a proposed permissive path which is an additional enhancement (i.e. not mitigation) to be implemented within the Order Limits. The Applicant further notes that the targeted consultation was designed to ensure that those most likely to be affected by the proposed changes were appropriately informed, including in relation to Swindler's Drove, through the identification of consultation zones around each change. Further details of the consultation approach and how it was undertaken are set out in the **Consultation Report** (Doc Ref. 5.1).
	Impact • Visual Intrusion: Overhead line infrastructure is elevated and reflective, with potential cumulative impact not reassessed in light of the alignment change. • Access Disruption: Swindler's Drove may be subject to surface degradation, traffic conflict, and loss of amenity during maintenance periods. • Ecological Sensitivity: The area may host hedgerows, ditches, and field margins that support biodiversity and are vulnerable to construction disturbance. • Consultation Gaps: Residents and users of Swindler's Drove may not have been informed or consulted on the revised alignment and access plan.	N	

Respondent	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	References National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) – Paragraphs 174–176 Requires developments to protect and enhance valued landscapes and public access routes. National Policy Statement EN-1 – Paragraph 5.9.8 Advises that landscape and visual impacts should be assessed from representative viewpoints, including public rights of way. Planning Act 2008 – Section 47 Requires developers to consult effectively and transparently with affected parties, including those impacted by access changes. Meadow View Solar Farm – Overhead Line Screening Decision (2025) Highlights the need for specific environmental screening when overhead line alignments are altered post-consent.	N	The Applicant notes these references.
	Action Requested We call on the Planning Authority to: • Reject the Swindler's Drove extension unless updated landscape and visual impact assessments are submitted • Require access impact modelling, including surface condition, traffic conflict, and amenity loss • Consult with local residents, landowners, and rights of way officers regarding the proposed alignment and access plan • Apply the precautionary principle, refusing infrastructure changes that lack transparent assessment and stakeholder engagement	N	Landscape and visual effects associated with the Grid Connection Route and overhead line infrastructure have been assessed within the **Environmental Statement** (Doc Ref. 6.1), including **ES Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual** (Doc Ref. 6.1) and detailed assessments within **ES Appendix 12-4: Landscape Assessment** (Doc Ref. 6.3) and **ES Appendix 12-6: Visual Assessment** (Doc Ref. 6.3). Traffic and access matters, including potential effects associated with construction traffic and use of the local road network, have been assessed within **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref. 6.1) and **ES Appendix 15-4: Transport Assessment Note** (Doc Ref. 6.3). Relevant statutory consultees, landowners and stakeholders were consulted during the pre-application process, as reported in the **Consultation Report** (Doc Ref. 5.1).
	Section 10: A151 Extension – Highway Safety, Visibility Splays & Procedural Scrutiny Issue The developer proposes an extension of the Order Limits to include part of the A151 to facilitate construction and maintenance access to the overhead line, including visibility splays. While the change is described as minor and consistent with the PEIR, it raises several planning concerns: • The A151 is a classified road with fast-moving traffic and limited pedestrian infrastructure. Introducing visibility splays and access points without formal	N	Traffic and access matters, including potential effects associated with construction traffic and use of the local road network, have been assessed within **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref. 6.1) and **ES Appendix 15-4: Transport Assessment Note** (Doc Ref. 6.3). **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). Measures to manage construction traffic, including traffic management procedures and controls at site accesses, are set out in the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13).

Respondent	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	junction design, swept path analysis, or traffic safety audit may pose risks to road users. • The PEIR references the A151 as a construction route, but does not include updated modelling for visibility splay impacts, access geometry, or cumulative transport effects. • The claim that "no vegetation removal would be required" does not address potential verge disturbance, soil compaction, or drainage alteration during construction. • The extension was introduced post-PEIR and may not have been adequately consulted on with Lincolnshire Highways, local residents, or road safety stakeholders.		Potential environmental effects associated with construction activities, including noise, dust and disturbance, are assessed within the **Environmental Statement** (Doc Ref. 6.1) and managed through measures secured within the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10). Relevant statutory consultees the local highway authority and affected landowners have been consulted throughout the pre application process, as reported in the **Consultation Report** (Doc Ref. 5.1).
	Impact • Highway Safety Risk: Without formal design and traffic control measures, visibility splays may be insufficient for safe access, especially for HGVs and maintenance vehicles. • Amenity Disruption: Residents and agricultural users may experience noise, dust, and traffic conflict during construction and operation. • Planning Transparency: The lack of detailed access design undermines public scrutiny and procedural fairness. • Cumulative Oversight: The PEIR does not account for overlapping construction phases, seasonal traffic peaks, or emergency access needs.	N	
	References National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) – Paragraph 111 Requires developments to ensure safe and suitable access for all users and to avoid unacceptable impacts on highway safety. Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) – CD 123: Geometric Design of Junctions Sets out standards for visibility splays, junction geometry, and swept path analysis for construction and operational traffic. National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy Infrastructure (EN-3) Requires applicants to demonstrate safe and sustainable access arrangements for nationally significant infrastructure.	N	The Applicant notes these references.

Respondent	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	ES Chapter 13 – Transport & Access (NSIP) Highlights the importance of visibility splays and safe junction design in solar farm access planning.		
	Action Requested We call on the Planning Authority to: • Reject the A151 extension unless a full highway safety audit and visibility splay design are submitted • Require updated traffic modelling, including swept path analysis and cumulative impact assessment • Consult with Lincolnshire Highways and affected residents regarding the proposed access arrangements • Ensure transparent re-consultation, with clear explanation of traffic volumes, timings, and mitigation measures.	N	Traffic and access matters, including potential effects associated with construction traffic and use of the local road network, have been assessed within **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref. 6.1) and **ES Appendix 15-4: Transport Assessment Note** (Doc Ref. 6.3). The suitability of the roads proposed has been confirmed by swept path analysis required for the AILs transporting materials to the relevant access points of the Scheme, as set out in Annex A and Annex B of the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13). Measures to manage environmental effects associated with construction are set out in the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10). Measures to manage construction traffic and site access arrangements are set out in the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13). Relevant statutory consultees, including the local highway authority and affected landowners have been consulted throughout the pre application process, as reported in the **Consultation Report** (Doc Ref. 5.1). The Applicant does therefore not consider it necessary to re-consult on the inclusion of land.
	Section 11: Broad Gate Extension – Highway Safety, Access Transparency & Cumulative Impact Issue The developer proposes an extension of the Order Limits along Broad Gate to facilitate a visibility splay at the internal construction haul route crossing. While construction access is not proposed directly from Broad Gate, the change introduces new planning risks: • The visibility splay implies frequent construction traffic crossing a rural road, yet no detailed traffic modelling, safety audit, or junction design has been provided. • The PEIR (Chapter 13) does not assess the cumulative impact of haul route crossings, especially in combination with other NSIPs and local developments in the area. • The extension was introduced post-PEIR and may not have been adequately consulted on with affected residents, landowners, or highways officers. • The claim that "no new or different significant environmental effects" are anticipated is speculative	N	Traffic and access matters have been assessed in **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref. 6.1) and **ES Appendix 15-4: Transport Assessment Note** (Doc Ref. 6.3), including construction and operational traffic movements. During operation, traffic associated with the Scheme would be infrequent. The provision of visibility splays is to ensure safe access and does not imply additional traffic or an intensification of use. **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref. 6.1) also considers cumulative impacts in relation to other developments. **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access (**Doc Ref. 6.1) includes an assessment of the impact of the Scheme on road safety, which concludes that no significant effects are expected with the implementation of measures contained within the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13). Relevant statutory consultees, including the local highway authority and affected landowners, have been consulted throughout the pre-application process, as reported in the **Consultation Report** (Doc Ref. 5.1).

Respondent	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	without updated traffic flow diagrams or swept path analysis.		
	Impact • Highway Safety Risk: Broad Gate is a narrow rural lane with limited visibility and no formal pedestrian infrastructure. Construction traffic crossings may pose collision risks. • Amenity Loss: Residents and agricultural users may experience disruption, noise, and surface degradation during haul route operations. • Planning Transparency: The visibility splay implies intensification of use, yet no formal access application or junction design has been submitted. • Cumulative Oversight: The PEIR does not account for overlapping construction phases with other NSIPs, housing developments, or seasonal agricultural traffic.	N	
	References National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) – Paragraph 111 Requires developments to ensure safe and suitable access for all users and to avoid unacceptable impacts on highway safety. Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) – CD 123: Geometric Design of Junctions Sets out standards for visibility splays, junction geometry, and swept path analysis for construction traffic. PEIR Volume I – Chapter 13: Traffic and Access Contains baseline traffic data but lacks detailed modelling for haul route crossings and visibility splay impacts. Vehicular Access Standards – Development Control Advice Note 15 (UK) Advises that visibility splays must be assessed in context of road classification, traffic volume, and receptor sensitivity.	N	The Applicant notes these references.
	Action Requested We call on the Planning Authority to: • Reject the Broad Gate extension unless a full highway safety audit and visibility splay design are submitted • Require updated traffic modelling, including swept path analysis and cumulative impact assessment	N	Traffic and access matters have been assessed in **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref. 6.1) and **ES Appendix 15-4: Transport Assessment Note** (Doc Ref. 6.3), including construction and operational traffic movements. **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref. 6.1) also considers cumulative impacts in relation to other developments.

Respondent	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	• Consult with Lincolnshire Highways and affected residents regarding the proposed haul route crossing • Ensure transparent re-consultation, with clear explanation of construction traffic volumes, timings, and mitigation measures.		**ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access (**Doc Ref. 6.1) includes an assessment of the impact of the Scheme on road safety, which concludes that no significant effects are expected with the implementation of measures contained within the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13). Relevant statutory consultees, including the local highway authority and affected landowners, have been consulted throughout the pre-application process, as reported in the **Consultation Report** (Doc Ref. 5.1).
	Section 12: Broad Gate Extension – Third-Party Asset Ambiguity, Visibility Splays & Planning Oversight Issue The developer proposes an extension of the Order Limits towards Broad Gate to facilitate works to a third-party asset and to install a visibility splay where the internal haul route crosses the road. While the change is described as minor, with "no new or different significant effects" anticipated, it raises several planning concerns: • The nature of the third-party asset is undefined—whether it is grid infrastructure, drainage equipment, or highway apparatus—making it impossible to assess operational risk or land use conflict. • The visibility splay implies vehicle movement across Broad Gate, yet no junction design, swept path analysis, or traffic safety audit is provided. • The PEIR does not assess the cumulative impact of multiple haul route crossings, especially in combination with other NSIPs, seasonal agricultural traffic, and local development. • The extension was introduced post-PEIR and may not have been adequately consulted on with affected residents, landowners, or highways officers.	N	The third-party asset referred to is an existing National Grid Electricity Distribution (NGED) 11kV overhead line. The works relate to the interaction between the Scheme and this existing infrastructure. Traffic and access matters, including construction traffic movements and the use of the local highway network, have been assessed **in ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref. 6.1) and **ES Appendix 15-4: Transport Assessment Note** (Doc Ref. 6.3). The assessment includes consideration of cumulative effects and concludes that no significant effects are expected. Measures to manage construction traffic are set out in the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13). Affected residents and relevant statutory consultees, including the local highway authority and affected landowners, have been consulted throughout the pre-application process, as reported in the **Consultation Report** (Doc Ref. 5.1).
	Impact • Planning Uncertainty: Without clarity on the asset and scope of works, the Planning Authority cannot assess compliance with environmental or operational standards. • Highway Safety Risk: Broad Gate is a rural lane with limited visibility and no formal pedestrian infrastructure. Even infrequent maintenance traffic may pose collision risks.	N	

Respondent	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	• Landscape Fragmentation: Visibility splays and haul route crossings may require hedgerow removal or verge alteration, disrupting ecological corridors and rural character. • Consultation Gaps: Affected parties may not have been informed or consulted on the revised access arrangements.		
	References National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) – Paragraphs 111 & 174 Requires developments to ensure safe and suitable access for all users and to protect landscape character and ecological networks. Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) – CD 123: Geometric Design of Junctions Sets out standards for visibility splays, junction geometry, and swept path analysis for construction traffic. Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009 – Regulation 5 Requires applicants to define the scope and purpose of all land included within the Order Limits. Planning for Solar Farms – House of Commons Library Briefing Highlights the importance of clear infrastructure siting and stakeholder engagement in solar farm planning.	N	The Applicants notes these references.
	Action Requested We call on the Planning Authority to: • Reject the Broad Gate extension unless full clarification is provided on the third-party asset type, ownership, and scope of works • Require updated traffic modelling, including swept path analysis and cumulative impact assessment • Consult with Lincolnshire Highways and affected residents regarding the proposed haul route crossing and third-party access • Ensure transparent re-consultation, with clear explanation of infrastructure location, design, and long-term management.	N	The third-party asset referred to is an existing National Grid Electricity Distribution (NGED) 11kV overhead line. The works relate to the interaction between the Scheme and this existing infrastructure. Traffic and access matters, including construction traffic movements and the use of the local highway network, have been assessed in **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref. 6.1) and **ES Appendix 15-4: Transport Assessment Note** (Doc Ref. 6.3). Measures to manage construction traffic are set out in the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13). Affected residents and relevant statutory consultees, including the local highway authority and affected landowners, have been consulted throughout the pre-application process, as reported in the **Consultation Report** (Doc Ref. 5.1). The Applicant does therefore not consider it necessary to re-consult on the inclusion of land.

Respondent	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	Section 13: Austendike Road Extension – Access Ambiguity & Third-Party Asset Oversight Issue The developer proposes an extension of the Order Limits south of Austendike Road to facilitate maintenance and access to third-party assets. While the change is described as minor, with "no new or different significant effects" anticipated, this raises several planning concerns: • The nature of the third-party assets is not defined. It is unclear whether these are grid-related, drainage infrastructure, or private utilities—each of which carries different planning and safety implications. • The frequency and type of maintenance trips is not quantified, nor is there any swept path analysis, vehicle type specification, or surface condition assessment. • The area south of Austendike Road may include field margins, drainage ditches, or informal access routes that are ecologically sensitive or agriculturally active. • The extension was introduced post-PEIR and may not have been adequately consulted on with affected landowners or local access stakeholders.	N	The third-party asset referred to is an existing National Grid Electricity Distribution (NGED) 11kV overhead line. The works relate to the interaction between the Scheme and this existing infrastructure. Traffic and access matters have been assessed in **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref. 6.1). During general operation and maintenance, the Scheme is expected to generate a low level of vehicle trips. As a reasonable worst-case scenario, the Scheme would be serviced by up to 10 staff per day undertaking maintenance activities, together with approximately five visitors per week. This would equate to up to 11 vehicles (22 two-way movements) per day. Staff vehicles and those used for maintenance would primarily comprise four-wheel drive vehicles and vans, with HGVs rarely accessing the Site during the operational phase. The inclusion of this land and the associated infrastructure has been taken into account within the assessments reported in the **Environmental Statement** (Doc Ref. 6.1). Relevant consultees and affected landowners have been consulted throughout the pre-application process, as reported in the **Consultation Report** (Doc Ref. 5.1). The Applicant therefore considers the consultation undertaken to be sufficient and in line with relevant legislation and guidance, and does not consider it necessary to undertake further consultation in relation to the inclusion of this land.
	Impact • Access Ambiguity: Without clarity on asset type and access frequency, the planning authority cannot assess operational risk or land use conflict. • Ecological Sensitivity: Field margins and ditch networks may support biodiversity and be vulnerable to disturbance from maintenance traffic. • Landowner Rights: If third-party assets cross private land, access arrangements must be formalised and consulted on transparently. • Procedural Gaps: The extension introduces new operational zones without updated environmental or traffic assessment.	N	
	References National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) – Paragraphs 92 & 174 Requires developments to protect local access routes and	N	The Applicant notes these references.

Respondent	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	ecological networks, and to engage transparently with affected communities. Planning Act 2008 – Section 47 Mandates effective consultation with those affected by changes to access, land use, or operational zones. National Policy Statement EN-1 – Paragraph 4.2.6 Requires applicants to define project scope and operational zones with sufficient detail to enable robust environmental assessment. Internal Drainage Boards – Access & Maintenance Guidance Advises that access to drainage assets must be planned with ecological and landowner considerations in mind.		
	Action Requested We call on the Planning Authority to: • Reject the Austendike Road extension unless full clarification is provided on the nature of third-party assets and access requirements • Require updated operational access modelling, including vehicle types, frequency, and ecological impact • Consult with affected landowners and drainage authorities regarding access rights and maintenance protocols • Ensure transparent re-consultation, with clear explanation of operational zones and long-term land use implications	N	The third-party asset referred to is an existing National Grid Electricity Distribution (NGED) 11kV overhead line, and the works relate to the interaction between the Scheme and this existing infrastructure. Traffic and access matters, including operational vehicle movements, have been assessed in **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The inclusion of this land and associated infrastructure has been taken into account within the assessments reported in the **Environmental Statement** (Doc Ref. 6.1). Relevant statutory consultees and affected landowners have been consulted throughout the pre-application process, as reported in the **Consultation Report** (Doc Ref. 5.1). The Applicant considers the consultation undertaken to be sufficient and in line with relevant legislation and guidance and does not consider further consultation to be necessary in relation to the inclusion of this land.
	Section 14: Long Lane to Austendike Road Extension – Haul Route Construction, Stringing Zone Impacts & Planning Oversight Issue The developer proposes an extension of the Order Limits between Long Lane and Austendike Road to construct an internal haul route and provide space for the stringing position of the overhead line—the area required to set out and pull cables between pylons. While the change is described as minor, with "no new or different significant effects" anticipated, it raises several planning concerns:	N	Landscape mitigation measures for the Scheme are set out in the **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16). An outline landscape masterplan is also provided as Figure 1 of the **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16) to illustrate how the landscape strategy could be implemented. The impact of the Scheme on agricultural land is assessed in **ES Chapter 5: Agriculture and Soils** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The illustrative layout of the Scheme shown in **ES Figure 2-2 Indicative Solar Development Area and Inter-Array Layout Plans** (Doc Ref. 6.2) has been designed to minimise the loss of, and avoid significant impacts on, existing vegetation, including the incorporation of a minimum offset of 5–10m from existing vegetation boundaries. Tree constraints and arboricultural impacts associated with the Scheme, including mitigation measures, are described in **ES Appendix 12-8: Arboricultural Impact Assessment** (Doc Ref. 6.3).

Respondent	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	• The stringing zone involves temporary but intensive activity, including crane use, cable tensioning, and vehicle movement across open fields. These operations may cause soil compaction, habitat disruption, and visual intrusion, especially near public rights of way or sensitive receptors. • The internal haul route is not defined in terms of surface treatment, vehicle type, or drainage design, making it impossible to assess runoff risk, dust generation, or long-term landscape degradation. • The PEIR does not include updated construction compound layouts, stringing zone diagrams, or seasonal activity schedules for this corridor. • The extension was introduced post-PEIR and may not have been adequately consulted on with landowners, ecological stakeholders, or drainage authorities.		Hydrology and drainage matters are assessed in **ES Chapter 11: Hydrology and Flood Risk** (Doc Ref. 6.1). **ES Appendix 11-3: Flood Risk Assessment** (Doc Ref. 6.3) considers the effects on the surface water drainage strategy and sets out measures to ensure that impacts are appropriately mitigated. **ES Appendix 11-4: Outline Drainage Strategy** (Doc Ref. 6.3) incorporates sustainable drainage systems and pollution control measures to manage surface water. Traffic and access matters have been assessed in **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref. 6.1) which concludes no significant effects are expected. This includes consideration of vehicle type.
	Impact • Landscape & Visual Intrusion: Stringing operations may require temporary removal of hedgerows or fencing, altering the rural character and increasing visibility of construction activity. • Soil & Drainage Risk: Haul route construction may compact soil, alter runoff patterns, and disrupt field margins, especially near drainage ditches. • Ecological Sensitivity: The corridor may intersect hedgerows, ditches, or species-rich margins that require protection and mitigation. • Planning Transparency: The lack of detailed infrastructure layout undermines public scrutiny and procedural fairness.	N	
	References National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) – Paragraphs 174–176 Requires developments to protect landscape character, ecological networks, and water management systems. Outline Export Cable Route Construction Method Statement – One Earth Solar Farm Demonstrates best practice in defining trenching zones, stringing positions, and haul route construction impacts.	N	The Applicant notes these references.

Respondent	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	Solar Farm Development Planning Guidance – Rushcliffe Borough Council Highlights the importance of internal access design, landscape protection, and cumulative impact assessment. PEIR Volume II Figure 13-6 – Indicative Access Points Grid Connection Corridor Should be updated to reflect the new haul route and stringing zone between Long Lane and Austendike Road.		
	Action Requested We call on the Planning Authority to: • Reject the Long Lane to Austendike Road extension unless updated visual, ecological, and drainage assessments are submitted • Require detailed haul route and stringing zone layouts, including surface treatment, access protocols, and seasonal activity schedules • Consult with Internal Drainage Boards, affected landowners, and ecological stakeholders regarding the proposed infrastructure • Ensure transparent re-consultation, with clear explanation of construction impacts and long-term management commitments.	N	Landscape, ecological and drainage matters associated with the Scheme have been assessed within the **Environmental Statement** (Doc Ref. 6.1), including **ES Chapter 5: Agriculture and Soils** (Doc Ref. 6.1) and **ES Chapter 11: Hydrology and Flood Risk** (Doc Ref. 6.1). Further details of the drainage strategy are provided in **ES Appendix 11-3: Flood Risk Assessment** (Doc Ref. 6.3) and **ES Appendix 11-4: Outline Drainage Strategy** (Doc Ref. 6.3). Landscape mitigation measures are set out in the **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16), and the Scheme layout has been designed to minimise impacts on existing vegetation. Relevant statutory consultees and affected landowners have been consulted throughout the pre-application process, as reported in the **Consultation Report** (Doc Ref. 5.1). The Applicant considers the consultation undertaken to be sufficient and in line with relevant legislation and guidance.
	Section 16: Third-Party Asset Works – Planning Ambiguity & Environmental Oversight Issue • The developer proposes an extension of the Order Limits to accommodate potential works to a third-party asset, without specifying the nature, ownership, or operational requirements of the asset. This vague justification raises serious planning concerns: • The type of asset is not defined—whether it is grid infrastructure, drainage equipment, or private utility—which prevents meaningful assessment of environmental or operational impact. • The phrase "potential works" introduces speculative development, which is contrary to the principles of fixed design required under Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) regulations.	N	The third-party asset referred to is an existing National Grid Electricity Distribution (NGED) 11kV overhead line, and the works relate to the interaction between the Scheme and this existing infrastructure. The inclusion of this land has been taken into account within the assessments reported in the **Environmental Statement** (Doc Ref. 6.1). Relevant statutory consultees and affected landowners have been consulted throughout the pre-application process, as reported in the Consultation **Report** (Doc Ref. 5.1). The Applicant considers the consultation undertaken to be sufficient and in line with relevant legislation and guidance. In terms of managing construction traffic, the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13) considers road user safety and how to reduce traffic impacts from the Scheme.

Respondent	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	• The extent of land added may be small, but its purpose is undefined, and no mitigation strategy or operational plan is provided. • The change was introduced post-PEIR and may not have been adequately consulted on with affected landowners, asset owners, or statutory consultees.		
	Impact • Planning Uncertainty: Without clarity on the asset and scope of works, the Planning Authority cannot assess compliance with environmental or operational standards. • Environmental Risk: Even minor works may involve excavation, vehicle access, or vegetation clearance, with unassessed ecological consequences. • Landowner Rights: If the asset crosses private land, access and works must be formalised through transparent consultation and legal agreement. • Precedent Risk: Allowing speculative infrastructure works sets a precedent for post-consent expansion without scrutiny.	N	
	References National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) – Paragraphs 16 & 174 Requires developments to be clearly defined and to protect environmental assets and landowner rights. Planning Act 2008 – Section 47 Mandates effective consultation with those affected by changes to land use or operational scope. Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009 – Regulation 5 Requires applicants to define the scope and purpose of all land included within the Order Limits. Mallard Pass Solar Farm – ES Chapter 3: Order Limits Demonstrates best practice in defining land use, asset interaction, and environmental assessment within Order Limits.	N	The Applicant notes these references.
	Action Requested We call on the Planning Authority to:	N	The third-party asset referred to is an existing National Grid Electricity Distribution (NGED) 11kV overhead line, and the works relate to the interaction between the Scheme and this existing infrastructure. The inclusion of this land has been taken into account within the assessments reported in the **Environmental Statement** (Doc Ref. 6.1).

Respondent	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	• Reject the extension for third-party asset works unless full clarification is provided on the asset type, ownership, and scope of works • Require updated environmental and operational assessments, including access, excavation, and mitigation plans • Consult with affected landowners and statutory consultees, including drainage boards and utility providers • Ensure transparent re-consultation, with clear explanation of the purpose and long-term implications of the added land		Relevant statutory consultees and affected landowners have been consulted throughout the pre-application process, as reported in the **Consultation Report** (Doc Ref. 5.1). The Applicant considers the consultation undertaken to be sufficient and in line with relevant legislation and guidance.
	Section 17: Austendike Road Extension – Visibility Splays, Highway Safety & Procedural Transparency Issue The developer proposes an extension of the Order Limits along Austendike Road (B1165) to accommodate visibility splays at two construction access points, serving the northern and southern sections of the Scheme. While the change is described as minor and consistent with the PEIR, it raises several planning concerns: • Visibility splays imply intensified vehicle movement across a classified rural road, yet no formal junction design, swept path analysis, or traffic safety audit is provided. • The PEIR identifies these access points but does not include updated modelling for visibility splay impacts, access geometry, or cumulative transport effects following the Order Limits extension. • The claim that "no new or different significant environmental effects" are anticipated does not address potential verge disturbance, soil compaction, or drainage alteration during construction. • The extension was introduced post-PEIR and may not have been adequately consulted on with Lincolnshire Highways, local residents, or road safety stakeholders.	N	Traffic and access matters have been assessed in **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The provision of visibility splays is to ensure safe access and does not imply an increase or intensification of traffic movements. During general operation and maintenance, the Scheme is expected to generate a low level of vehicle trips. As a reasonable worst-case scenario, the Scheme would be serviced by up to 10 staff per day undertaking maintenance activities, together with approximately five visitors per week. This would equate to up to 11 vehicles (22 two-way movements) per day. Staff vehicles and those used for maintenance would primarily comprise four-wheel drive vehicles and vans, with HGVs rarely accessing the Site during the operational phase. The suitability of the roads proposed has been confirmed by swept path analysis required for the AILs transporting materials to the relevant access points of the Scheme, as set out in Annex A and Annex B of the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13). Measures to manage environmental effects associated with construction are set out in the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10). The Applicant also confirms additional land does not give rise to new or materially different significant effects. The assessments are presented within the **Environmental Statement** (Doc Ref. 6.1): • **ES Chapter 9: Ecology and Biodiversity** (Doc Ref. 6.1) • **ES Chapter 11: Hydrology and Flood Risk** (Doc Ref. 6.1) 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
	Impact • Highway Safety Risk: Without formal design and traffic control measures, visibility splays may be insufficient	N	

Respondent	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	for safe access, especially for HGVs and maintenance vehicles. • Amenity Disruption: Residents and agricultural users may experience noise, dust, and traffic conflict during construction and operation. • Planning Transparency: The lack of detailed access design undermines public scrutiny and procedural fairness. • Cumulative Oversight: The PEIR does not account for overlapping construction phases, seasonal traffic peaks, or emergency access needs.		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. The **OSMP** (Doc Ref. 7.14) includes measures to protect soil structure and function throughout construction and operation, including careful handling, storage, and reinstatement of soils. These measures are designed to ensure that the soil resource is safeguarded and that agricultural capability is not degraded over the lifetime of the Scheme. Relevant statutory consultees including the local highways authority and residents have been consulted throughout the pre-application process, as reported in the **Consultation Report** (Doc Ref. 5.1). The Applicant considers the consultation undertaken to be sufficient and in line with relevant legislation and guidance. In terms of the impact of the Scheme on noise this has been assessed in **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. The impact of construction on air quality has been assessed within **ES Chapter 6: Air Quality** (Doc Ref. 6.1) which concludes no significant effects are expected. Best practice measures to reduce air quality impacts including dust are included within the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10). In terms of detailed access design for the Scheme, refer to **Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans (Doc Ref. 2.6)** which shows where accesses are proposed. Cumulative effects associated with traffic have also been assessed within **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref. 6.1).
	References National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) – Paragraph 111 Requires developments to ensure safe and suitable access for all users and to avoid unacceptable impacts on highway safety. Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) – CD 123: Geometric Design of Junctions Sets out standards for visibility splays, junction geometry, and swept path analysis for construction and operational traffic. PEIR Volume I – Chapter 13: Traffic and Access Identifies Austendike Road as part of the construction route but does not assess the extended Order Limits or visibility splay impacts. Planning for Solar Farms – House of Commons Library Briefing Highlights the importance of clear infrastructure siting and stakeholder engagement in solar farm planning.	N	The Applicant notes these refences.
	Action Requested	N	Traffic and access matters have been assessed in **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The provision of visibility splays is to ensure safe access and does not imply an

Respondent	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	We call on the Planning Authority to: • Reject the Austendike Road extension unless a full highway safety audit and visibility splay design are submitted • Require updated traffic modelling, including swept path analysis and cumulative impact assessment • Consult with Lincolnshire Highways and affected residents regarding the proposed access arrangements • Ensure transparent re-consultation, with clear explanation of traffic volumes, timings, and mitigation measures		increase or intensification of traffic movements. During operation, the Scheme is expected to generate a low level of vehicle trips. Refer to the **Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans (Doc Ref. 2.6)** which shows where accesses and visibility splays are proposed**.** The suitability of the proposed access routes has been confirmed through swept path analysis for AILs transporting materials to the relevant access points, as set out in Annex A and Annex B of the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13). Measures to manage construction traffic are also set out in the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13). Relevant statutory consultees, including the relevant highways authority, residents and affected landowners, have been consulted throughout the pre-application process, as evidenced in the **Consultation Report** (Doc Ref. 5.1) and its appendices. The Applicant does not consider it necessary to undertake further consultation in relation to the inclusion of this land.
	Section 18: West Gate Extension – Visibility Splays, Third-Party Access & Cumulative Transport Risk Issue The developer proposes an extension of the Order Limits along West Gate to facilitate maintenance and third-party access, and to allow for visibility splays where the internal haul route crosses the road. While construction access is not proposed directly from West Gate, this change introduces several planning risks: • The visibility splay implies regular vehicle movement across West Gate, yet no junction design, swept path analysis, or traffic safety audit is provided. • The nature of third-party access remains undefined—whether for grid infrastructure, drainage, or private utilities—making it impossible to assess operational risk or land use conflict. • The PEIR does not assess the cumulative impact of multiple haul route crossings, especially in combination with other NSIPs and seasonal agricultural traffic. • The extension was introduced post-PEIR and may not have been adequately consulted on with affected residents, landowners, or highways officers.	N	The suitability of the roads proposed has been confirmed by swept path analysis required for the AILs transporting materials to the relevant access points of the Scheme, as set out in Annex A and Annex B of the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13). The provision of visibility splays is to ensure safe access and does not imply an increase or intensification of traffic movements. During general operation and maintenance, the Scheme is expected to generate a low level of vehicle trips. As a reasonable worst-case scenario, the Scheme would be serviced by up to 10 staff per day undertaking maintenance activities, together with approximately five visitors per week, equating to up to 11 vehicles (22 two-way movements) per day. Staff vehicles and those used for maintenance would primarily comprise four-wheel drive vehicles and vans, with HGVs rarely accessing the Site during the operational phase. **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref. 6.1) includes an assessment of the impact of the Scheme on road safety, which concludes that no significant effects are expected with the implementation of measures contained within the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13). The third-party asset referred to is an existing National Grid Electricity Distribution (NGED) 11kV overhead line, and the works relate to the interaction between the Scheme and this existing infrastructure. The **Environmental Statement** (Doc Ref. 6.1) includes a cumulative assessment of other proposed developments within the study area. The list of cumulative developments considered has been agreed with the local highway authorities.
	Impact	N	

Respondent	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	• Highway Safety Risk: West Gate is a rural lane with limited visibility and no formal pedestrian infrastructure. Even infrequent maintenance traffic may pose collision risks. • Amenity Loss: Residents and agricultural users may experience disruption, noise, and surface degradation during haul route operations. • Planning Transparency: The visibility splay and third-party access imply intensification of use, yet no formal access application or operational plan has been submitted. • Consultation Gaps: Affected parties may not have been informed or consulted on the revised access arrangements.		
	References National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) – Paragraph 111 Requires developments to ensure safe and suitable access for all users and to avoid unacceptable impacts on highway safety. Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) – CD 123: Geometric Design of Junctions Sets out standards for visibility splays, junction geometry, and swept path analysis for construction traffic. Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009 – Regulation 5 Requires applicants to define the scope and purpose of all land included within the Order Limits. One Earth Solar Farm – Public Right of Way Management Plan Demonstrates best practice in managing rural access routes and visibility splays during solar farm construction.	N	The Applicant notes these references.
	Action Requested We call on the Planning Authority to: • Reject the West Gate extension unless a full highway safety audit and visibility splay design are submitted • Require updated traffic modelling, including swept path analysis and cumulative impact assessment • Consult with Lincolnshire Highways and affected residents regarding the proposed haul route crossing and third-party access	N	The suitability of the roads proposed has been confirmed by swept path analysis required for the AILs transporting materials to the relevant access points of the Scheme, as set out in Annex A and Annex B of the **Outline CTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13). The provision of visibility splays is to ensure safe access and does not imply an increase or intensification of traffic movements. **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref. 6.1) includes an assessment of the impact of the Scheme on road safety, which concludes that no significant effects are expected with the implementation of measures contained within the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13). The

Respondent	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	• Ensure transparent re-consultation, with clear explanation of construction traffic volumes, timings, and mitigation measures		Environmental Statement also includes a cumulative assessment of other proposed developments within the study area. Relevant statutory consultees, including the relevant highways authority, have been consulted throughout the pre-application process, as evidenced in the **Consultation Report** (Doc Ref. 5.1) and its appendices.
	Section 19: Delgate Bank Extension – Drainage Oversight, Infrastructure Permanence & Planning Transparency Issue The developer proposes an extension of the Order Limits at Delgate Bank to facilitate maintenance access and drainage requirements associated with the Cable Sealing End Compounds (CSECs). While the change is described as minor, with "no significant effects anticipated," it raises several planning concerns: • The CSECs are permanent electrical compounds, and access infrastructure—however infrequent—requires drainage design, surface treatment, and runoff management, especially in fen-edge terrain. • The proposal lacks a site-specific drainage strategy, including culvert design, infiltration capacity, and runoff containment measures. This is critical given the proximity to Internal Drainage Board (IDB) assets and known surface water sensitivities. • The PEIR does not include updated hydrological modelling, soil permeability mapping, or SuDS integration for the newly added land. • The extension was introduced post-PEIR and may not have been adequately consulted on with IDBs, ecological stakeholders, or landowners.	N	The impact of the Scheme on drainage and flood risk has been assessed within **ES Chapter 11: Hydrology and Flood Risk** (Doc Ref. 6.1), which concludes that no significant effects are expected with the implementation of measures included within **ES Appendix 11-4: Outline Drainage Strategy** (Doc Ref. 6.3). The impact of the Scheme on soils is assessed within **ES Chapter 5: Agriculture and Soils** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The likely significant effects of the Scheme on landscape character are assessed within **ES Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual** (Doc Ref 6.1). The assessment considers the nature, timing, and anticipated success of mitigation measures, including the establishment and growth of planting, and how these influence the degree of change and residual effects over the operational period. Commentary is provided on the extent to which mitigation reduces effects and the limitations on reversibility, ensuring that the assessment does not overstate the potential for full restoration. In terms of ecological function, this has been assessed within **ES Chapter 9: Ecology and Biodiversity** (Doc Ref 6.1) which concludes no significant effects.
	Impact • Hydrological Risk: Poorly designed access and drainage infrastructure may lead to erosion, sedimentation, or waterlogging, especially during peak rainfall. • Infrastructure Permanence: Even infrequent access requires durable surfacing and drainage, which may alter landscape character and ecological function.	N	

Respondent	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	• Planning Transparency: The lack of detailed drainage and access design undermines public scrutiny and procedural fairness. • Ecological Sensitivity: Verge and ditch alteration may disrupt habitat continuity and water vole corridors.		
	References National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) – Paragraphs 174 & 167 Requires developments to protect water environments and ensure sustainable drainage systems. Essex Design Guide – Solar Array Development Advises that solar farms must include drainage strategies and land management plans to mitigate surface water runoff and erosion. Central Bedfordshire Council – Solar Farm Flood Guidance Recommends formalised perimeter drainage, vegetative cover, and infiltration features for solar farm infrastructure. PEIR Volume II Figure 8-3 – Internal Drainage Boards Identifies drainage assets near Delgate Bank that may be affected by access and infrastructure works.	N	The Applicant notes these references.
	Action Requested We call on the Planning Authority to: • Reject the Delgate Bank extension unless a full drainage strategy and access design are submitted, including SuDS integration and runoff modelling • Require consultation with Internal Drainage Boards, ecological stakeholders, and affected landowners • Ensure transparent re-consultation, with clear explanation of infrastructure permanence, hydrological impacts, and long-term management.	N	The impact of the Scheme on drainage and flood risk has been assessed within **ES Chapter 11: Hydrology and Flood Risk** (Doc Ref. 6.1), which concludes that no significant effects are expected with the implementation of measures included within **ES Appendix 11-4: Outline Drainage Strategy** (Doc Ref. 6.3). The impact of the Scheme on soils is assessed **within ES Chapter 5: Agriculture and Soils** (Doc Ref. 6.1). Relevant statutory consultees, including the Internal Drainage Board, Natural England and the Environment Agency, have been consulted, as reported in the **Consultation Report** (Doc Ref. 5.1). The Applicant does therefore not consider it necessary to undertake further consultation.
	Section 20: Delgate Bank to Roman Road Extension – Limits of Deviation, Haul Route & Drainage Oversight Issue The developer proposes an extension of the Order Limits between Delgate Bank and Roman Road to accommodate the limits of deviation for the overhead line and to facilitate an internal construction haul route and associated drainage. While the change is described as minor, with "no new or different	N	**ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution** (Doc Ref. 6.1) and the **Design Approach Document** (Doc Ref. 7.3) describe the alternatives and design evolution considered for the Grid Connection Route, including the reasons for the proposed alignment and tower design. The **Design Parameters** (Doc Ref. 7.4) document provides the key maximum and minimum parameters which the detailed design of the Scheme must comply, as secured in Schedule 2, requirement 5 (detailed design approval) of the **Draft DCO** (Doc Ref. 3.1). The assessments within the **Environmental Statement** (Doc Ref. 6.1) are based on worst-case parameters.

Respondent	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	significant environmental effects" anticipated, this raises several planning concerns: • The limits of deviation introduce uncertainty about the final alignment of pylons and cables, which may affect visual receptors, ecological corridors, and landowner boundaries not previously assessed. • The internal haul route and drainage infrastructure are not defined in terms of surface treatment, vehicle type, or long-term maintenance, making it impossible to assess soil compaction, runoff, or biodiversity disruption. • The PEIR does not include updated modelling for drainage impacts, especially in areas with known surface water vulnerability or proximity to Internal Drainage Board assets. • The extension was introduced post-PEIR and may not have been adequately consulted on with affected landowners, ecological stakeholders, or drainage authorities.		The impact of the Scheme on drainage and flood risk has been assessed within **ES Chapter 11: Hydrology and Flood Risk** (Doc Ref. 6.1), which concludes that no significant effects are expected with the implementation of measures included within **ES Appendix 11-4: Outline Drainage Strategy** (Doc Ref. 6.3). The impact of the Scheme on soils is assessed **within ES Chapter 5: Agriculture and Soils (**Doc Ref. 6.1). The impact of the Scheme on landscape and visual receptors is assessed within **ES Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual (**Doc Ref. 6.1). The **Outline LEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16) describes the landscape and ecological strategy for planting and mitigation across the Scheme. In terms of the impact of the Scheme on hedgerows, ditches and species-rich margins, this has been assessed within **ES Chapter 9: Ecology and Biodiversity** (Doc Ref 6.1) which concludes no significant effects.
	Impact • Visual & Landscape Intrusion: Overhead line deviation may introduce new visual impacts not captured in the original ZTV modelling. • Soil & Drainage Risk: Haul route construction and drainage works may compact soil, alter runoff patterns, and disrupt field margins. • Ecological Sensitivity: The corridor may intersect hedgerows, ditches, or species-rich margins that require protection and mitigation. • Planning Uncertainty: Limits of deviation and undefined infrastructure weaken the integrity of the EIA process and public consultation.	N	
	References National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) – Paragraphs 174–176 Requires developments to protect landscape character, ecological networks, and water management systems. Electricity Act 1989 – Section 37 Guidance Advises that overhead line deviations must be assessed for environmental	N	The Applicant notes these references.

Respondent	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	and community impact, with consultation from statutory bodies. Meadow View Solar Farm – Overhead Line Screening Decision Demonstrates best practice in assessing visual, ecological, and drainage impacts of overhead line deviation. Internal Drainage Boards – Access & Infrastructure Guidance Advises that haul routes and drainage infrastructure must be planned with ecological and hydrological sensitivity.		
	Action Requested We call on the Planning Authority to: • Reject the Delgate Bank to Roman Road extension unless updated visual, ecological, and drainage assessments are submitted • Require fixed alignment parameters for overhead lines, with justification for any deviation • Consult with Internal Drainage Boards and affected landowners regarding haul route and drainage infrastructure • Ensure transparent re-consultation, with clear explanation of infrastructure location, design, and long-term management.	N	In terms of the updated visual, ecological and drainage assessments these have been submitted and are contained within **ES Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual** (Doc Ref. 6.1), **ES Chapter 9: Ecology and Biodiversity** (Doc Ref 6.1) and **ES Appendix 11-4: Outline Drainage Strategy** (Doc Ref. 6.3). **ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution** (Doc Ref. 6.1) and the **Design Approach Document** (Doc Ref. 7.3) describe the alternatives and design evolution considered for the Grid Connection Route, including the reasons for the proposed alignment and tower design. The **Design Parameters** (Doc Ref. 7.4) set out the maximum and minimum parameters which the detailed design of the Scheme must comply with, as secured in Schedule 2, Requirement 5 (detailed design approval) of the **Draft DCO** (Doc Ref. 3.1). Relevant statutory consultees, including the Internal Drainage Board and affected landowners, have been consulted throughout the pre-application process as evidenced in the **Consultation Report** (Doc Ref. 5.1) and its appendices. The Applicant therefore does not consider it necessary to undertake further consultation.
	Section 21: Watercourse Crossing Extension – Ecological Integrity, Hydrological Sensitivity & Planning Transparency Issue The developer proposes an extension of the Order Limits near a temporary watercourse crossing to facilitate habitat reinstatement and enhancement, extending 15 metres upstream and downstream. While this is framed as a mitigation measure, it raises several concerns: • The proposal lacks detail on habitat type, target species, and long-term management, making it impossible to assess ecological viability or biodiversity net gain. • Watercourses are dynamic systems, and temporary crossings can cause bank erosion, sedimentation, and disruption to aquatic and riparian habitats. Reinstatement must be based on site-specific	N	Measures to limit impacts on watercourses during construction set out within the **Outline CEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10), including stand-offs (typically 10m where practicable), fenced buffers, bank protection, sediment and pollution control measures, the use of trenchless techniques at sensitive locations, and pre-works ecological checks. The creation and subsequent management of habitats is detailed within the **Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan** (Doc Ref. 7.16), included as part of the DCO Application. A Water Framework Directive Screening Assessment has been submitted as part of the DCO Application and is contained within **ES Appendix 11-2: Water Framework Directive Assessment** (Doc Ref 6.3). Biodiversity net gain for the Scheme is set out in the **Biodiversity Net Gain Report** (Doc Ref. 7.9). Seasonal habitat surveys have been carried out. Refer to **ES Chapter 9: Ecology and Biodiversity** (Doc Ref. 6.1) for further details.

Respondent	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	ecological and hydrological data—not generic buffer zones. • The PEIR does not include updated Water Framework Directive (WFD) screening, biodiversity net gain calculations, or seasonal habitat surveys for these extended areas. • There is no evidence of consultation with Internal Drainage Boards, Natural England, or local ecological stakeholders regarding the suitability and sustainability of proposed enhancements.		Relevant statutory consultees, including the Internal Drainage Boards and Natural England, have been consulted during the pre-application process, as evidenced in the **Consultation Report** (Doc Ref. 5.1) and its appendices, as well as the relevant topic chapters of the **Environmental Statement** (Doc Ref. 6.1).
	Impact • Ecological Risk: Poorly designed reinstatement may fail to restore habitat function or may introduce invasive species. • Hydrological Disruption: Temporary crossings can alter flow regimes, increase runoff, and degrade water quality—especially if reinstatement is superficial. • Planning Transparency: The extension introduces new ecological zones without updated assessment or stakeholder engagement. • Net Gain Uncertainty: Without clear metrics, the habitat enhancement cannot be counted toward biodiversity net gain obligations.	N	
	References National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) – Paragraphs 174 & 180 Requires developments to protect and enhance ecological networks and watercourses, and to deliver measurable biodiversity net gain. Environment Act 2021 – Biodiversity Net Gain Provisions Mandates measurable biodiversity net gain for all new developments, including restoration and enhancement works. Biodiversity and Solar Farms – Planning Inspectorate Guidance Emphasizes the need for coherent ecological networks and robust habitat management plans in solar farm developments. Water Framework Directive Screening Assessment – PEIR Appendix 8-1 Should be updated to reflect the extended Order Limits and assess cumulative hydrological impacts.	N	The Applicant notes these references.

Respondent	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	Action Requested We call on the Planning Authority to: • Reject the watercourse crossing extension unless a full ecological and hydrological assessment is submitted • Require updated WFD screening and biodiversity net gain calculations, including habitat type, species targets, and management protocols • Consult with Internal Drainage Boards, Natural England, and local ecological stakeholders regarding the suitability of proposed enhancements • Ensure transparent re-consultation, with clear explanation of habitat reinstatement strategy and long-term monitoring commitments.	N	Measures to limit impacts on watercourses during construction are set out within the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10), including stand-offs (typically 10m where practicable), fenced buffers, bank protection, sediment and pollution control measures, the use of trenchless techniques at sensitive locations, and pre-works ecological checks. The creation and subsequent management of habitats is detailed within the **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16), included as part of the DCO Application. Biodiversity net gain for the Scheme is set out in the **Biodiversity Net Gain Report** (Doc Ref. 7.9). Relevant statutory consultees, including the Internal Drainage Boards and Natural England, have been consulted during the pre-application process, as evidenced in the **Consultation Report** (Doc Ref. 5.1) and its appendices, as well as the relevant topic chapters of the **Environmental Statement** (Doc Ref. 6.1).
	Section 22: Delgate Bank to Moulton Chapel Road Extension – Visibility Splays, Third-Party Access & Landscape Oversight Issue The developer proposes an extension of the Order Limits along Delgate Bank to Moulton Chapel Road / Roman Road to facilitate maintenance and third-party access, and to allow for visibility splays where the internal haul route crosses the road. While construction access is not proposed directly from Delgate Bank, this change introduces several planning risks: • The visibility splay implies regular vehicle movement across rural roads, yet no junction design, swept path analysis, or traffic safety audit is provided. • The nature of third-party access remains undefined—whether for grid infrastructure, drainage, or private utilities—making it impossible to assess operational risk or land use conflict. • The PEIR does not assess the cumulative impact of multiple haul route crossings, especially in combination with other NSIPs, seasonal agricultural traffic, and local development. • The extension adds land along a longer stretch of Delgate Bank, which may affect landscape character, hedgerow continuity, and public amenity, yet no updated visual or ecological assessment is provided.	N	The suitability of the roads proposed has been confirmed by swept path analysis required for the AILs transporting materials to the relevant access points of the Scheme, as set out in Annex A and Annex B of the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13). The provision of visibility splays is to ensure safe access and does not imply an increase or intensification of traffic movements. During general operation and maintenance, the Scheme is expected to generate a low level of vehicle trips. As a reasonable worst-case scenario, the Scheme would be serviced by up to 10 staff per day undertaking maintenance activities, together with approximately five visitors per week, equating to up to 11 vehicles (22 two-way movements) per day. Staff vehicles and those used for maintenance would primarily comprise four-wheel drive vehicles and vans, with HGVs rarely accessing the Site during the operational phase. The third-party asset referred to is an existing National Grid Electricity Distribution (NGED) 11kV overhead line, and the works relate to the interaction between the Scheme and this existing infrastructure. **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref. 6.1) also considers cumulative impacts, including in relation to other developments. The landscape and visual impact of the Scheme has been assessed within **ES Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual** (Doc Ref. 6.1). **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref. 6.1) includes an assessment of the impact of the Scheme on road safety, which concludes that no significant effects are expected with the implementation of measures contained within the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13). Local residents, landowners and statutory consultees have been consulted throughout the pre-application process, as evidenced in the **Consultation Report** (Doc Ref. 5.1).
	Impact	N	

Respondent	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	• Highway Safety Risk: Rural lanes like Delgate Bank and Roman Road have limited visibility and no pedestrian infrastructure. Even infrequent maintenance traffic may pose collision risks. • Landscape Fragmentation: Visibility splays and haul route crossings may require hedgerow removal or verge alteration, disrupting ecological corridors and rural character. • Planning Transparency: The visibility splay and third-party access imply intensification of use, yet no formal access application or operational plan has been submitted. • Consultation Gaps: Affected residents, landowners, and highways officers may not have been informed or consulted on the revised access arrangements.		
	References National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) – Paragraphs 111 & 174 Requires developments to ensure safe and suitable access for all users and to protect landscape character and ecological networks. Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) – CD 123: Geometric Design of Junctions Sets out standards for visibility splays, junction geometry, and swept path analysis for construction traffic. Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009 – Regulation 5 Requires applicants to define the scope and purpose of all land included within the Order Limits. South Holland Strategic Landscape Capacity Study (2003) Identifies landscape sensitivity and capacity constraints in the Moulton Chapel area, including rural lanes and fen-edge habitats.	N	The Applicant notes these references.
	Action Requested We call on the Planning Authority to: • Reject the Delgate Bank to Moulton Chapel Road extension unless a full highway safety audit and visibility splay design are submitted	N	The suitability of the roads proposed has been confirmed by swept path analysis required for the AILs transporting materials to the relevant access points of the Scheme, as set out in Annex A and Annex B of the **Outline CTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13). The provision of visibility splays is to ensure safe access and does not imply an increase or intensification of traffic movements. During operation, the Scheme is expected to generate a low level of vehicle trips, primarily associated with maintenance staff and visitors.

Respondent	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	• Require updated landscape and ecological assessments, including hedgerow continuity and receptor-based visual impact • Consult with Lincolnshire Highways, local residents, and ecological stakeholders regarding the proposed haul route crossing and third-party access • Ensure transparent re-consultation, with clear explanation of construction traffic volumes, timings, and mitigation measures.		The third-party asset referred to is an existing National Grid Electricity Distribution (NGED) 11kV overhead line, and the works relate to the interaction between the Scheme and this existing infrastructure. Traffic and access matters, including cumulative effects and road safety, are assessed in **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref. 6.1), which concludes that no significant effects are expected with the implementation of measures set out in the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13). Landscape and visual effects are assessed within **ES Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual** (Doc Ref. 6.1). Relevant consultees including statutory consultees, the local highways authority and residents have been consulted throughout the pre-application process, as reported in the **Consultation Report** (Doc Ref. 5.1). The Applicant considers the consultation undertaken to be sufficient and in line with relevant legislation and guidance.
	Section 23: Temporary Construction Compound Extension – Drainage Oversight, Soil Integrity & Planning Transparency Issue The developer proposes an extension of the Order Limits within the field to accommodate a temporary construction compound and associated drainage infrastructure. While the change is described as minor, with "no new or different significant environmental effects" anticipated, it raises several planning concerns: • Construction compounds typically involve heavy machinery, storage of materials, and frequent vehicle movement, which can lead to soil compaction, surface water runoff, and erosion. • The proposal lacks a site-specific drainage strategy, including infiltration design, runoff containment, and SuDS (Sustainable Drainage Systems) integration. This is especially critical in fen-edge terrain with known hydrological sensitivities. • The PEIR does not include updated surface water modelling, soil permeability mapping, or vegetation reinstatement plans for the newly added land. • The extension was introduced post-PEIR and may not have been adequately consulted on with Internal Drainage Boards, landowners, or ecological stakeholders.	N	The creation and subsequent management of habitats is detailed within the **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16), included as part of the DCO Application. The illustrative layout of the Scheme shown in **ES Figure 2-2 Indicative Solar Development Area and Inter-Array Layout Plans** (Doc Ref. 6.2) has been designed to minimise the loss of, and avoid significant impacts on, existing vegetation. The impact of the Scheme on drainage and flood risk has been assessed within **ES Chapter 11: Hydrology and Flood Risk** (Doc Ref. 6.1), which concludes that no significant effects are expected with the implementation of measures included within **ES Appendix 11-4: Outline Drainage Strategy** (Doc Ref. 6.3). The impact of construction on soil has been assessed within **ES Chapter 5: Agriculture and Soils** (Doc Ref. 6.1). Measures are included within the **Outline Soil Management Plan** (Doc Ref. 7.14) to avoid soil compaction during the construction phase. Relevant statutory consultees, including the Internal Drainage Boards and Natural England, have been consulted during the pre-application process, as evidenced in the **Consultation Report** (Doc Ref. 5.1) and its appendices, as well as the relevant topic chapters of the **Environmental Statement** (Doc Ref. 6.1).
	Impact	N	

Respondent	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	• Hydrological Risk: Poorly managed compounds may increase peak runoff rates and degrade downstream water quality. • Soil & Landscape Degradation: Heavy equipment and temporary surfacing may compact soil and disrupt field drainage patterns. • Ecological Oversight: Verge and field margin disturbance may affect habitat connectivity and biodiversity. • Planning Transparency: The lack of detailed compound layout and drainage design undermines public scrutiny and procedural fairness.		
	References National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) – Paragraphs 167 & 174 Requires developments to manage surface water sustainably and protect landscape character and ecological networks. Doncaster Council – Solar Farm Drainage Strategy Advice Advises that solar farms must include drainage and land management strategies to mitigate erosion and runoff from construction compounds. Glyntaff Solar Farm – Flood Consequence Assessment & Drainage Strategy Demonstrates best practice in integrating drainage measures for temporary compounds to attenuate surface water flows. PEIR Volume I – Chapter 8: Hydrology, Flood Risk and WFD Should be updated to reflect the extended Order Limits and assess drainage impacts of the temporary compound.	N	The Applicant notes these references.
	Action Requested We call on the Planning Authority to: • Reject the construction compound extension unless a full drainage strategy and compound layout are submitted, including SuDS integration and runoff modelling • Require consultation with Internal Drainage Boards, ecological stakeholders, and affected landowners	N	The impact of the Scheme on drainage and flood risk has been assessed within **ES Chapter 11: Hydrology and Flood Risk** (Doc Ref. 6.1), which concludes that no significant effects are expected with the implementation of measures included **within ES Appendix 11-4: Outline Drainage Strategy** (Doc Ref. 6.3). Relevant statutory consultees, including the Internal Drainage Boards and Natural England and landowners have been consulted during the pre-application process, as evidenced in the **Consultation Report** (Doc Ref. 5.1) and its appendices, as well as the relevant topic chapters of the **Environmental Statement** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The Applicant does therefore not consider it necessary to undertake further consultation.

Respondent	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	• Ensure transparent re-consultation, with clear explanation of infrastructure permanence, hydrological impacts, and long-term management.		
	Section 24: A16 Crowland Bypass Extension – Highway Safety, Visibility Splays & Planning Oversight Issue The developer proposes an extension of the Order Limits along the A16 Crowland Bypass to facilitate maintenance access and visibility splays for overhead line inspections. While the change is described as minor, with "no significant environmental effects" anticipated, this raises several planning concerns: • The A16 Crowland Bypass is a high-speed trunk road, with limited pedestrian infrastructure and fast-moving traffic. Even infrequent maintenance access introduces safety risks without formal junction design or traffic control measures. • The proposal lacks a swept path analysis, vehicle type specification, or visibility splay design, making it impossible to assess compliance with highway safety standards. • The PEIR does not include updated traffic modelling or cumulative impact assessment for multiple access points along the A16, especially in combination with other NSIPs and seasonal agricultural traffic. • The extension was introduced post-PEIR and may not have been adequately consulted on with Lincolnshire Highways, local residents, or emergency services.	N	Traffic and access matters, including cumulative effects and road safety, are assessed in **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref. 6.1), which concludes that no significant effects are expected with the implementation of measures set out in the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13). The suitability of the roads proposed has been confirmed by swept path analysis required for the AILs transporting materials to the relevant access points of the Scheme, as set out in Annex A and Annex B of the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13). Relevant statutory consultees, including the relevant highway authority has consulted during the pre-application process, as evidenced in the **Consultation Report** (Doc Ref. 5.1) and its appendices, as well as the relevant topic chapters of the **Environmental Statement** (Doc Ref. 6.1).
	Impact • Collision Risk: Maintenance vehicles accessing or crossing the A16 may pose a hazard to fast-moving traffic without proper visibility and signage. • Amenity Disruption: Even infrequent access may degrade verges, disrupt traffic flow, and reduce road safety for other users. • Planning Transparency: The lack of detailed access design undermines public scrutiny and procedural fairness.	N	

Respondent	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	• Precedent Risk: Allowing infrastructure access on high-speed roads without formal design sets a dangerous precedent for future NSIPs.		
	References National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) – Paragraph 111 Requires developments to ensure safe and suitable access for all users and to avoid unacceptable impacts on highway safety. Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) – CD 123: Geometric Design of Junctions Sets out standards for visibility splays, junction geometry, and swept path analysis for construction and maintenance traffic. Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009 – Regulation 5 Requires applicants to define the scope and purpose of all land included within the Order Limits. Meridian Solar Farm Project Information – Planning Inspectorate Confirms the scale and infrastructure complexity of the proposal, including grid connection and overhead line works.	N	The Applicant notes these references.
	Action Requested We call on the Planning Authority to: • Reject the A16 Crowland Bypass extension unless a full highway safety audit and visibility splay design are submitted • Require updated traffic modelling, including swept path analysis and cumulative impact assessment • Consult with Lincolnshire Highways and emergency services regarding the proposed maintenance access • Ensure transparent re-consultation, with clear explanation of traffic volumes, timings, and mitigation measures.	N	Traffic and access matters, including cumulative effects and road safety, are assessed in **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref. 6.1), which concludes that no significant effects are expected with the implementation of measures set out in the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13). The suitability of the roads proposed has been confirmed by swept path analysis required for the AILs transporting materials to the relevant access points of the Scheme, as set out in Annex A and Annex B of the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13). Relevant statutory consultees, including the relevant highway authority, have been consulted during the pre-application process, as evidenced in the **Consultation Report** (Doc Ref. 5.1) and its appendices, as well as the relevant topic chapters of the **Environmental Statement** (Doc Ref. 6.1).
	Section 25: Delgate Bank to Roman Road Extension – Limits of Deviation, Haul Route Construction & Drainage Oversight Issue • The developer proposes an extension of the between Delgate Bank and Roman Road to accommodate the limits eviation for the overheadlhile the change is	N	The inclusion of land has been appropriately assessed within the **Environmental Statement** (Doc Ref. 6.1). It is correct that limits of deviation have been set for the Scheme enabling flexibility in final routing, but the environmental assessment has taken this into account and the flexibility of alignment within Order limits have been communicated to stakeholders throughout the consultation process. This flexibility is controlled by the **Design Parameters** (Doc Ref. 7.4) document provides the key maximum and minimum parameters which the

Respondent	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	described as minor`arameters required under Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) regulations. • The haul route corridor is not defined in tles for this corridor. • The extension was introduced post-PEIR and may not have been adequately consulted on with Internal Drainage Boards, landowners, or ecological stakeholders.		detailed design of the Scheme must comply, as secured in Schedule 2, requirement 5 (detailed design approval) of the **Draft DCO** (Doc Ref. 3.1). This approach is standard for DCO schemes, including other overhead line DCOs brought forward by National Grid. Potential impacts on soils, including compaction, are assessed within **ES Chapter 5: Agriculture and Soils** (Doc Ref. 6.1), with measures to manage soils set out in the **OSMP** (Doc Ref. 7.14). Potential impacts on drainage and flood risk are assessed within **ES Chapter 11: Hydrology and Flood Risk** (Doc Ref. 6.1). Proposed mitigation measures are included within the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10) and **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13). The Applicant has engaged with relevant statutory consultees, including Internal Drainage Boards and affected landowners, as detailed within the **Consultation Report** (Doc Ref. 5.1)
	Impact • Planning Uncertainty: Limits of deviation allow infrastructure to shift within a defined corridor, preventing meaningful public engagement and undermining environmental scrutiny. l Risk: Haul route construction may compact soil, alter runoff patterns, and disrupt field drainage, especially near ditches and IDB assets. • Ecological Sensitivity: The corridor may intersect hedgerows, ditches, or species-rich margins that require protection and mitigation. • Procedural Fairness: Stakeholders may not have been consulted on the full extent of infrastructure flexibility or drainage implications.	N	
	References National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) – Paragraphs 167 & 174 Requires developments to manage surface water sustainably and protect landscape character and ecological networks. Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009 – Regulation 5 Requires applicants to define the scope and purpose of all land included within the Order Limits. Solar Farm Drainage Strategy Advice – Doncaster Council Advises that solar farms must include drainage and land management strategies to mitigate erosion and runoff from construction compounds and haul routes. Outline Export Cable Route Construction Method Statement – One Earth Solar Farm Demonstrates best practice in defining	N	The Applicant notes these references.

Respondent	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	trenching zones, haul route construction, and drainage mitigation.		
	Action Requested We call on the Planning Authority to: • Reject the Delgate Bank to Roman Road extension unless updated haul route and drainage designs are submitted, including SuDS integration and runoff modelling • Require fixed design parameters for the overhead line corridor, limiting deviation to areas with confirmed environmental clearance • Consult with Internal Drainage Boards, affected landowners, and ecological stakeholders regarding the proposed infrastructure • Ensure transparent re-consultation, with clear explanation of construction impacts, infrastructure flexibility, and long-term management commitments.	N	The **Design Parameter**s (Doc Ref. 7.4) set out the maximum and minimum parameters which the detailed design of the Scheme must comply with, as secured in Schedule 2, Requirement 5 (detailed design approval) of the **Draft DCO** (Doc Ref. 3.1). The impact of the Scheme on drainage and flood risk has been assessed within **ES Chapter 11: Hydrology and Flood Risk** (Doc Ref. 6.1), with mitigation measures set out in **ES Appendix 11-4: Outline Drainage Strategy** (Doc Ref. 6.3). Relevant statutory consultees, including the Internal Drainage Board, the EA and Natural Engalnd and affected landowners, have been consulted throughout the pre-application process, as evidenced in the **Consultation Report** (Doc Ref. 5.1) and its appendices. The Applicant therefore does not consider it necessary to undertake further consultation.
	Section 26: A16 Crowland Bypass Extension – Emergency Access to BESS & Highway Safety Oversight Issue The developer proposes an extension of the Order Limits toward the A16 Crowland Bypass to facilitate a maintenance access track to the overhead line and provide alternative operation and emergency access to the Battery Energy Storage System (BESS). While the change is described as minor, with "no materially different significant environmental effects" anticipated, this raises serious planning and safety concerns: • The A16 Crowland Bypass is a high-speed trunk road, and emergency access from this location introduces collision risk, especially during fire or system failure events. • The proposal lacks a dedicated emergency access plan, including vehicle staging, traffic control, and coordination with Lincolnshire Fire & Rescue Service. • The BESS is a high-risk infrastructure with known vulnerabilities to thermal runaway, requiring robust containment and rapid response protocols.	N	**ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref. 6.1) includes an assessment of the impact of the Scheme on road safety, which concludes that no significant effects are expected with the implementation of measures contained within the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13). Details relating to emergency planning in the event of a fire (including how the Fire Service will access the BESS area) are contained within the **OBSMP** (Doc Ref. 7.18). The **Outline BSMP** will be secured by way of a Requirement in the DCO, with the final BSMP to be approved by the relevant planning authority in consultation with the relevant emergency services.

Respondent	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	• The PEIR does not include updated modelling for emergency access scenarios, nor does it assess the impact of emergency vehicle movement on traffic flow or verge stability.		
	Impact • Public Safety Risk: Emergency access from a high-speed road without formal junction design or traffic control measures may endanger responders and road users. • Operational Uncertainty: Without a defined emergency access strategy, the site may be unprepared for fire, explosion, or system failure events. • Planning Transparency: The change introduces critical infrastructure access without updated safety modelling or stakeholder consultation. • Precedent Risk: Allowing emergency access on trunk roads without formal design sets a dangerous precedent for future NSIPs.	N	
	References National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) – Paragraph 97 & 111 Requires developments to ensure safe and resilient infrastructure access, including emergency response routes. Health & Safety Executive (HSE) – Battery Storage Fire Risk Guidance Highlights the need for thermal runaway modelling and emergency containment plans for lithium-ion BESS installations. National Fire Chiefs Council (NFCC) – Lithium-ion Battery Storage Position Statement Recommends consultation with fire services and site-specific emergency planning for BESS infrastructure. Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) – CD 123: Geometric Design of Junctions Sets out standards for visibility splays, junction geometry, and swept path analysis for emergency and maintenance traffic.	N	The Applicant notes these references.
	Action Requested We call on the Planning Authority to:	N	**ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref. 6.1) includes an assessment of the impact of the Scheme on road safety, which concludes that no significant effects are expected with the implementation of measures contained within the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13).

Respondent	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	• Reject the A16 Crowland Bypass extension unless a full emergency access plan and highway safety audit are submitted • Require consultation with Lincolnshire Fire & Rescue Service, including thermal runaway response protocols and vehicle staging plans • Demand updated traffic modelling, including swept path analysis and cumulative impact assessment for emergency scenarios • Ensure transparent re-consultation, with clear explanation of emergency access routes, infrastructure risks, and mitigation measures.		Details relating to emergency planning in the event of a fire (including how the Fire Service will access the BESS area) are contained within the **OBSMP** (Doc Ref. 7.18). The **OBSMP** will be secured by way of a Requirement in the DCO, with the final BSMP to be approved by the relevant planning authority in consultation with the relevant emergency services. The Applicant therefore does not consider it necessary to undertake further consultation.
	Section 27: Broadgate Drove Extension – Maintenance Access, Infrastructure Permanence & Drainage Oversight Issue The developer proposes an extension of the Order Limits along Broadgate Drove to facilitate maintenance access, including annual inspections and occasional servicing. While the change is described as minor, with "no significant environmental effects anticipated," it raises several planning concerns: • Even low-frequency access requires durable surfacing, drainage infrastructure, and vehicular turning areas, which may introduce permanent or semi-permanent infrastructure into a sensitive rural lane. • The proposal lacks a site-specific access design, including visibility splays, swept path analysis, and surface treatment details. There is no indication of how access will be managed during wet seasons or in proximity to drainage ditches. • The PEIR does not assess the cumulative impact of multiple maintenance access points across the Scheme, nor does it evaluate seasonal access constraints or ecological corridor disruption. • There is no evidence of consultation with Internal Drainage Boards, Lincolnshire Highways, or local residents regarding the proposed access arrangements.	N	During general operation and maintenance, the Scheme is expected to generate a low level of vehicle trips. As a reasonable worst-case scenario, the Scheme would be serviced by up to 10 staff per day undertaking maintenance activities, together with approximately five visitors per week, equating to up to 11 vehicles (22 two-way movements) per day. Staff vehicles and those used for maintenance would primarily comprise four-wheel drive vehicles and vans, with HGVs rarely accessing the Site during the operational phase. The suitability of the roads proposed has been confirmed by swept path analysis required for the AILs transporting materials to the relevant access points of the Scheme, as set out in Annex A and Annex B of the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13). Relevant statutory consultees, including the Internal Drainage Board and affected landowners, have been consulted throughout the pre-application process, as evidenced in the **Consultation Report** (Doc Ref. 5.1) and its appendices. The impact of the Scheme on drainage and flood risk has been assessed within **ES Chapter 11: Hydrology and Flood Risk** (Doc Ref. 6.1), which concludes that no significant effects are expected with the implementation of measures included within **ES Appendix 11-4: Outline Drainage Strategy** (Doc Ref. 6.3). The impact of the Scheme on soils is assessed within ES **Chapter 5: Agriculture and Soils** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The impact of multiple access points across the Scheme has been assessed within the technical chapters of the ES (Doc Ref. 6.1). In terms of the impact on ecology, this has been assessed within **ES Chapter 9: Ecology and Biodiversity** (Doc Ref. 6.1) which concludes no significant effects. The **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16) sets out the measures for the protection and management of existing and proposed landscape planting.
	Impact	N	

Respondent	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	• Infrastructure Permanence: Even infrequent access may require hardstanding, gates, or culverts, altering the rural character and ecological function of Broadgate Drove. • Hydrological Risk: Verge disturbance and informal access creation may disrupt drainage patterns and increase runoff or erosion. • Ecological Sensitivity: The area may contain hedgerows, ditches, or species-rich margins that require protection and mitigation. • Planning Transparency: The lack of detailed access design undermines public scrutiny and procedural fairness.		
	References National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) – Paragraphs 111 & 174 Requires developments to ensure safe access and protect landscape character and ecological networks. Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) – CD 123: Geometric Design of Junctions Sets out standards for visibility splays, junction geometry, and swept path analysis for construction and maintenance traffic. Planning for Solar Farms – House of Commons Library Briefing Highlights the importance of clear infrastructure siting and stakeholder engagement in solar farm planning. The Droves Solar Farm Programme Document – September 2025 Emphasizes the need for robust pre-application engagement and infrastructure clarity for NSIPs.	N	The Applicant notes these references.
	Action Requested We call on the Planning Authority to: • Reject the Broadgate Drove extension unless a full access design and drainage strategy are submitted, including SuDS integration and seasonal access protocols • Require consultation with Internal Drainage Boards, Lincolnshire Highways, and affected landowners • Ensure transparent re-consultation, with clear explanation of infrastructure permanence, hydrological impacts, and long-term management.	N	The impact of the Scheme on drainage and flood risk has been assessed within **ES Chapter 11: Hydrology and Flood Risk** (Doc Ref. 6.1), which concludes that no significant effects are expected with the implementation of measures included within **ES Appendix 11-4: Outline Drainage Strategy** (Doc Ref. 6.3). The impact of the Scheme on soils is assessed within ES **Chapter 5: Agriculture and Soils** (Doc Ref. 6.1). Relevant statutory consultees, including the Internal Drainage Board and affected landowners, have been consulted throughout the pre-application process, as evidenced in the **Consultation Report** (Doc Ref. 5.1) and its appendices. The Applicant therefore does not consider it necessary to undertake further consultation.

Respondent	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	Section 28: Watercourse Crossing Extension – Habitat Reinstatement, Hydrological Sensitivity & Ecological Oversight Issue The developer proposes an extension of the Order Limits near temporary watercourse crossings to facilitate habitat reinstatement and enhancement 15 metres upstream and downstream of each crossing. While this is framed as a mitigation measure, it raises several concerns: • The proposal lacks detail on habitat type, species targets, and long-term management, making it impossible to assess ecological viability. • Watercourses are dynamic systems, and temporary crossings can cause bank erosion, sedimentation, and disruption to aquatic and riparian habitats. Reinstatement must be based on site-specific ecological and hydrological data—not generic buffer zones. • The PEIR does not include updated Water Framework Directive (WFD) screening or biodiversity net gain calculations for these extended areas. • There is no evidence of consultation with Internal Drainage Boards, Natural England, or local ecological stakeholders regarding the suitability and sustainability of proposed enhancements.	N	The creation and subsequent management of proposed habitats is detailed within the **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16), included as part of the DCO Application. Biodiversity net gain for the Scheme is set out in the **Biodiversity Net Gain Report** (Doc Ref. 7.9). The impact of the Scheme on drainage and flood risk has been assessed within **ES Chapter 11: Hydrology and Flood Risk** (Doc Ref. 6.1), which concludes that no significant effects are expected with the implementation of measures included within **ES Appendix 11-4: Outline Drainage Strategy** (Doc Ref. 6.3). The Applicant notes that WFD screening is provided at **ES Appendix 11-2: Water Framework Directive Report** (Doc Ref. 6.3). Relevant statutory consultees, including the Internal Drainage Board and affected landowners, have been consulted throughout the pre-application process, as evidenced in the **Consultation Report** (Doc Ref. 5.1) and its appendices.
	Impact • Ecological Risk: Poorly designed reinstatement may fail to restore habitat function or may introduce invasive species. • Hydrological Disruption: Temporary crossings can alter flow regimes, increase runoff, and degrade water quality—especially if reinstatement is superficial. • Planning Transparency: The extension introduces new ecological zones without updated assessment or stakeholder engagement. • Net Gain Uncertainty: Without clear metrics, the habitat enhancement cannot be counted toward biodiversity net gain obligations.	N	

Respondent	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	References National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) – Paragraphs 174 & 180 Requires developments to protect and enhance ecological networks and watercourses, and to deliver measurable biodiversity net gain. Environment Act 2021 – Biodiversity Net Gain Provisions Mandates measurable biodiversity net gain for all new developments, including restoration and enhancement works. Water Framework Directive Screening Assessment – Meridian Solar Farm PEIR Appendix 8-1 Should be updated to reflect the extended Order Limits and assess cumulative hydrological impacts. Biodiversity and Solar Farms – Planning Inspectorate Guidance Emphasizes the need for coherent ecological networks and robust habitat management plans in solar farm developments.	N	The Applicant notes these references.
	Action Requested We call on the Planning Authority to: • Reject the watercourse crossing extension unless a full ecological and hydrological assessment is submitted • Require updated WFD screening and biodiversity net gain calculations, including habitat type, species targets, and management protocols • Consult with Internal Drainage Boards, Natural England, and local ecological stakeholders regarding the suitability of proposed enhancements • Ensure transparent re-consultation, with clear explanation of habitat reinstatement strategy and long-term monitoring commitments.	N	The impact of the Scheme on drainage and flood risk has been assessed within **ES Chapter 11: Hydrology and Flood Risk** (Doc Ref. 6.1), which concludes that no significant effects are expected with the implementation of measures included within **ES Appendix 11-4: Outline Drainage Strategy** (Doc Ref. 6.3). The Applicant notes that WFD screening is provided at **ES Appendix 11-2: Water Framework Directive Report** (Doc Ref. 6.3). Ecological effects associated with the Scheme are assessed within **ES Chapter 9: Ecology and Biodiversity** (Doc Ref. 6.1). Biodiversity net gain for the Scheme is set out in the **Biodiversity Net Gain Report** (Doc Ref. 7.9). Relevant statutory consultees, including the Internal Drainage Board and affected landowners, have been consulted throughout the pre-application process, as evidenced in the **Consultation Report** (Doc Ref. 5.1) and its appendices. The Applicant therefore does not consider further consultation to be necessary.
	Section 29: Western Extension – Construction Compound Flexibility, Drainage Oversight & Environmental Accountability Issue The developer proposes an extension of the Order Limits to the west to allow for flexibility in siting a construction compound and associated drainage infrastructure during the detailed design stage. While the change is described as minor, with "no new or different significant environmental effects anticipated," it raises several planning concerns:	N	The impact of construction on soil has been assessed within **ES Chapter 5: Agriculture and Soils** (Doc Ref. 6.1). Measures are included within the **OSMP** (Doc Ref. 7.14) to avoid soil compaction during the construction phase. The impact of the Scheme on drainage and flood risk has been assessed within **ES Chapter 11: Hydrology and Flood Risk** (Doc Ref. 6.1), which concludes that no significant effects are expected with the implementation of measures included within **ES Appendix 11-4: Outline Drainage Strategy** (Doc Ref. 6.3). c

Respondent	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	• Construction compounds typically involve heavy machinery, material storage, and frequent vehicle movement, which can lead to soil compaction, surface water runoff, and erosion. • The proposal lacks a defined compound layout, surface treatment, or drainage strategy, making it impossible to assess runoff risk, SuDS integration, or vegetation reinstatement. • The PEIR does not include updated surface water modelling, soil permeability mapping, or seasonal activity schedules for the newly added land. • The extension was introduced post-PEIR and may not have been adequately consulted on with Internal Drainage Boards, landowners, or ecological stakeholders.		Ecological effects associated with the Scheme are assessed within **ES Chapter 9: Ecology and Biodiversity** (Doc Ref. 6.1). Biodiversity net gain for the Scheme is set out in the **Biodiversity Net Gain Report** (Doc Ref. 7.9). Relevant statutory consultees, including the Internal Drainage Board, affected landowners, and ecological stakeholders have been consulted throughout the pre-application process, as evidenced in the **Consultation Report** (Doc Ref. 5.1) and its appendices.
	Impact • Hydrological Risk: Compounds without robust drainage design may increase peak runoff, degrade water quality, and impact adjacent land. • Soil & Landscape Degradation: Heavy equipment and temporary surfacing may compact soil and disrupt field drainage patterns. • Ecological Oversight: Verge and field margin disturbance may affect habitat connectivity and biodiversity. • Planning Transparency: The lack of detailed compound design undermines public scrutiny and procedural fairness.	N	
	References Solar Farm Drainage Strategy Advice – Doncaster Council Advises that solar farms must include drainage and land management strategies to mitigate erosion and runoff from construction compounds. Whitestone Solar Farm – Outline Surface Water Drainage Strategy Demonstrates best practice in integrating drainage measures for temporary compounds to attenuate surface water flows. Solar Farm Development Flood Guidance – Central Bedfordshire Council Recommends formalised perimeter	N	The Applicant notes these references.

Respondent	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	drainage, vegetation cover, and infiltration features for solar farm infrastructure. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) – Paragraphs 167 & 174 Requires developments to manage surface water sustainably and protect landscape character and ecological networks.		
	Action Requested We call on the Planning Authority to: • Reject the western extension unless a full drainage strategy and compound layout are submitted, including SuDS integration and runoff modelling • Require consultation with Internal Drainage Boards, ecological stakeholders, and affected landowners • Ensure transparent re-consultation, with clear explanation of infrastructure permanence, hydrological impacts, and long-term management.	N	The impact of the Scheme on drainage and flood risk has been assessed within **ES Chapter 11: Hydrology and Flood Risk** (Doc Ref. 6.1), which concludes that no significant effects are expected with the implementation of measures included within **ES Appendix 11-4: Outline Drainage Strategy** (Doc Ref. 6.3). Relevant statutory consultees, including the Internal Drainage Board, affected landowners, and ecological stakeholders have been consulted throughout the pre-application process, as evidenced in the **Consultation Report** (Doc Ref. 5.1) and its appendices.
	Section 30: Spalding Road Extension – Visibility Splays, Traffic Management & Planning Oversight Issue The developer proposes an extension of the Order Limits to include Spalding Road to facilitate visibility splays and traffic management measures for construction and operational access to the inter-array area and Parcel A. While the change is described as minor, with "no new or different significant effects" anticipated, this raises several planning concerns: • Spalding Road is a key local route, used by agricultural vehicles, residents, and commuters. Introducing visibility splays and traffic management measures implies intensification of use, yet no detailed junction design, swept path analysis, or traffic safety audit is provided. • The PEIR does not include updated modelling for construction and operational traffic volumes, nor does it assess the cumulative impact of multiple access points across the scheme. • The claim that "no vegetation clearance is required" does not address potential verge disturbance,	N	**ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref. 6.1) includes an assessment of the impact of the Scheme on road safety and the effects of increased traffic levels during construction. The assessment concludes that no significant effects are expected with the implementation of measures contained within the **OuCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13). The suitability of the roads proposed has been confirmed by swept path analysis required for the AILs transporting materials to the relevant access points of the Scheme, as set out in Annex A and Annex B of the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13). **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref. 6.1) also considers cumulative impacts, including in relation to other developments. Measures to manage construction traffic are set out in the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13). Relevant statutory consultees, including the relevant highways authority, residents and affected landowners, have been consulted throughout the pre-application process, as evidenced in the **Consultation Report** (Doc Ref. 5.1) and its appendices.

Respondent	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	hedgerow trimming, or surface degradation during construction. • The extension was introduced post-PEIR and may not have been adequately consulted on with Lincolnshire Highways, local residents, or road safety stakeholders.		
	Impact • Highway Safety Risk: Without formal design and traffic control measures, visibility splays may be insufficient for safe access, especially for HGVs and maintenance vehicles. • Amenity Disruption: Residents and agricultural users may experience noise, dust, and traffic conflict during construction and operation. • Planning Transparency: The lack of detailed access design undermines public scrutiny and procedural fairness. • Cumulative Oversight: The PEIR does not account for overlapping construction phases, seasonal traffic peaks, or emergency access needs.	N	
	References • National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) – Paragraph 111 Requires developments to ensure safe and suitable access for all users and to avoid unacceptable impacts on highway safety. • Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) – CD 123: Geometric Design of Junctions Sets out standards for visibility splays, junction geometry, and swept path analysis for construction and operational traffic. • South Holland District Council – Planning Supporting Statement for Solar Farm Access Design Demonstrates best practice in defining access points, visibility splays, and traffic management for solar farm developments in the Spalding area. • Meridian Solar Farm PEIR Volume I – Chapter 13: Traffic and Access Contains baseline traffic data but lacks detailed modelling for new access points and visibility splay impacts.	N	The Applicant notes these references.
	Action Requested We call on the Planning Authority to:	N	Traffic and access matters, including construction traffic levels, cumulative impacts and road safety, are assessed in **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The assessment

Respondent	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	• Reject the Spalding Road extension unless a full highway safety audit and visibility splay design are submitted • Require updated traffic modelling, including swept path analysis and cumulative impact assessment • Consult with Lincolnshire Highways and affected residents regarding the proposed access arrangements • Ensure transparent re-consultation, with clear explanation of traffic volumes, timings, and mitigation measures.		concludes that no significant effects are expected with the implementation of measures contained within the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13). The suitability of the roads proposed has been confirmed by swept path analysis required for the AILs transporting materials to the relevant access points of the Scheme, as set out in Annex A and Annex B of the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13). Relevant statutory consultees, including the relevant highways authority, residents and affected landowners, have been consulted throughout the pre-application process, as evidenced in the **Consultation Report** (Doc Ref. 5.1) and its appendices. The Applicant therefore does not consider further consultation to be necessary.
	Section 31: Queen's Bank Extension – Operational Access, Infrastructure Permanence & Planning Transparency Issue The developer proposes an extension of the Order Limits to Queen's Bank, following an existing vehicle access route, to facilitate operational access to Parcel B. While the change is described as minor, with "no new or different significant effects anticipated," it raises several planning concerns: • Even infrequent operational access for vegetation management, inspections, and maintenance requires durable surfacing, drainage infrastructure, and visibility splays, especially in fen-edge terrain with known hydrological sensitivities. • The proposal lacks a site-specific access design, including swept path analysis, surface treatment, and seasonal access protocols. There is no indication of how access will be managed during wet conditions or in proximity to drainage ditches. • The PEIR does not assess the cumulative impact of multiple operational access points across the Scheme, nor does it evaluate long-term landscape degradation or ecological corridor disruption. • The extension was introduced post-PEIR and may not have been adequately consulted on with Internal Drainage Boards, Lincolnshire Highways, or local residents.	N	Traffic and access matters, including operational access and road safety, are assessed in **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref. 6.1), which concludes that no significant effects are expected with the implementation of measures contained within the **Outline CTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13). **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref. 6.1) also considers cumulative impacts, including in relation to other developments. The impact of the Scheme on drainage and flood risk has been assessed within **ES Chapter 11: Hydrology and Flood Risk** (Doc Ref. 6.1), which concludes that no significant effects are expected with the implementation of measures included within **ES Appendix 11-4: Outline Drainage Strategy** (Doc Ref. 6.3). The suitability of the roads proposed has been confirmed by swept path analysis required for the AILs transporting materials to the relevant access points of the Scheme, as set out in Annex A and Annex B of the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13). Relevant statutory consultees, including the relevant highways authority, residents and affected landowners, have been consulted throughout the pre-application process, as evidenced in the **Consultation Report** (Doc Ref. 5.1) and its appendices.
	Impact • Infrastructure Permanence: Even low-frequency access may require hardstanding, gates, or culverts,	N	

Respondent	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	altering the rural character and ecological function of Queen's Bank. • Hydrological Risk: Verge disturbance and informal access creation may disrupt drainage patterns and increase runoff or erosion. • Ecological Sensitivity: The area may contain hedgerows, ditches, or species-rich margins that require protection and mitigation. • Planning Transparency: The lack of detailed access design undermines public scrutiny and procedural fairness.		
	References National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) – Paragraphs 111 & 174 Requires developments to ensure safe access and protect landscape character and ecological networks. Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) – CD 123: Geometric Design of Junctions Sets out standards for visibility splays, junction geometry, and swept path analysis for operational traffic. Planning for Solar Farms – House of Commons Library Briefing Highlights the importance of clear infrastructure siting and stakeholder engagement in solar farm planning. PEIR Volume I – Chapter 13: Traffic and Access Identifies operational traffic assumptions but does not assess the extended Order Limits or access design at Queen's Bank.	N	The Applicant notes these references.
	Action Requested We call on the Planning Authority to: • Reject the Queen's Bank extension unless a full access design and drainage strategy are submitted, including SuDS integration and seasonal access protocols • Require consultation with Internal Drainage Boards, Lincolnshire Highways, and affected landowners • Ensure transparent re-consultation, with clear explanation of infrastructure permanence, hydrological impacts, and long-term management.	N	The impact of the Scheme on drainage and flood risk has been assessed within **ES Chapter 11: Hydrology and Flood Risk** (Doc Ref. 6.1), which concludes that no significant effects are expected with the implementation of measures included within **ES Appendix 11-4: Outline Drainage Strategy** (Doc Ref. 6.3). Relevant statutory consultees, including the Internal Drainage Board, affected landowners, and ecological stakeholders have been consulted throughout the pre-application process, as evidenced in the **Consultation Report** (Doc Ref. 5.1) and its appendices. The Applicant does therefore no consider re-consultation necessary.
	Section 32: Martins Road & Hull's Drove Extension – Traffic Management, Drainage Crossings & Cumulative Impact	N	Traffic and access matters, including operational access and road safety, are assessed in **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref. 6.1), which concludes that no significant effects are

Respondent	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	Issue The developer proposes an extension of the Order Limits along Martins Road and Hull's Drove to facilitate visibility splays, passing bays, and traffic management measures for construction access to Parcels B and C. While the change is framed as beneficial—relocating access south of Martins Farm to reduce noise impacts—it raises several planning concerns: • The proposal introduces new access track crossings over existing drains, yet no detailed hydrological modelling, culvert design, or ecological impact assessment is provided. • The PEIR does not include updated traffic flow diagrams, swept path analysis, or cumulative transport modelling for construction access via rural lanes. • Visibility splays and passing bays may require hedgerow removal, verge widening, or surface alteration, which could fragment ecological corridors and alter landscape character. • The secondary operational access east of Martins Farm is described as minimal, but no long-term maintenance traffic schedule or surface condition monitoring plan is provided.		expected with the implementation of measures contained within the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13). **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref. 6.1) also considers cumulative impacts, including in relation to other developments. The impact of the Scheme on drainage and flood risk has been assessed within **ES Chapter 11: Hydrology and Flood Risk** (Doc Ref. 6.1), which concludes that no significant effects are expected with the implementation of measures included within **ES Appendix 11-4: Outline Drainage Strategy** (Doc Ref. 6.3). The suitability of the roads proposed has been confirmed by swept path analysis required for the AILs transporting materials to the relevant access points of the Scheme, as set out in Annex A and Annex B of the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13). **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref. 6.1) includes an assessment of the impact of the Scheme on road safety, which concludes that no significant effects are expected with the implementation of measures contained within the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13). Relevant statutory consultees, including the relevant highways authority, residents and affected landowners, have been consulted throughout the pre-application process, as evidenced in the **Consultation Report** (Doc Ref. 5.1) and its appendices.
	Impact • Drainage Risk: Crossing existing drains without robust design may lead to blockage, erosion, or waterlogging, especially during peak rainfall. • Ecological Disruption: Verge and hedgerow alteration for visibility splays and passing bays may degrade habitat connectivity and biodiversity. • Traffic Conflict: Martins Road and Hull's Drove are narrow rural lanes with limited visibility and mixed-use traffic. Construction access may pose safety risks without formal traffic management. • Planning Transparency: The change introduces new infrastructure elements without updated environmental or operational assessment.	N	
	References	N	The Applicant notes these references.

Respondent	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) – Paragraphs 111 & 174 Requires developments to ensure safe access and protect ecological networks and water environments. Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) – CD 123: Geometric Design of Junctions Sets out standards for visibility splays, junction geometry, and swept path analysis for construction traffic. Highways Development Design Guide – Visibility & Sightlines Advises that visibility splays must be designed to prevent conflict between motorists and vulnerable road users. Internal Drainage Boards – Access & Infrastructure Guidance Recommends consultation and design standards for infrastructure crossing drainage assets.		
	Action Requested We call on the Planning Authority to: • Reject the Martins Road and Hull's Drove extension unless full hydrological and ecological assessments are submitted for drain crossings and verge alterations • Require updated traffic modelling, including swept path analysis and cumulative construction impact • Consult with Lincolnshire Highways, Internal Drainage Boards, and ecological stakeholders regarding the proposed infrastructure changes • Ensure transparent re-consultation, with clear explanation of traffic volumes, mitigation measures, and long-term access protocols.	N	The impact of the Scheme on drainage and flood risk has been assessed within **ES Chapter 11: Hydrology and Flood Risk** (Doc Ref. 6.1), which concludes that no significant effects are expected with the implementation of measures included **within ES Appendix 11-4: Outline Drainage Strategy** (Doc Ref. 6.3). The impact of the Scheme on ecology has been assessed within **ES Chapter 9: Ecology and Biodiversity** (Doc Ref. 6.1) which concludes no significant effects are likely. The suitability of the roads proposed has been confirmed by swept path analysis required for the AILs transporting materials to the relevant access points of the Scheme, as set out in Annex A and Annex B of the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13). Relevant statutory consultees, including the relevant highways authority, residents and affected landowners, have been consulted throughout the pre-application process, as evidenced in the **Consultation Report** (Doc Ref. 5.1) and its appendices. The Applicant does therefore not consider re-consultation necessary.
	Section 33: Queen's Bank Extension – 400kV Substation Access, BESS Infrastructure & Highway Safety Oversight Issue The developer proposes an extension of the Order Limits along Queen's Bank to facilitate construction and operational access to the 400kV substation and Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) compound in Parcel B, and to provide an alternative construction access to the proposed overhead line. The change also includes visibility splays. While the works are described as consistent with the PEIR, this raises several planning concerns:	N	The suitability of the roads proposed has been confirmed by swept path analysis which is required for the AILs transporting materials to the relevant access points of the Scheme as set out in Annex A and B of the **Outline CTMP** (Doc. Ref. 7.13). Relevant statutory consultees, including the relevant highways authority, the Internal Drainage Board, residents and affected landowners, have been consulted throughout the pre-application process, as evidenced in the **Consultation Report** (Doc Ref. 5.1) and its appendices.

Respondent	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	• The 400kV substation and BESS are major infrastructure components with long-term operational requirements, including maintenance access, emergency response, and vegetation management. The proposal lacks a site-specific access design, including swept path analysis, surface treatment, and drainage strategy. • Visibility splays imply intensified vehicle movement across Queen's Bank, yet no formal junction geometry, traffic safety audit, or seasonal access protocol is provided. • The PEIR does not assess the cumulative impact of multiple access points, haul routes, and visibility splay interventions across the Scheme, nor does it evaluate landscape character disruption or ecological corridor fragmentation. • The extension was introduced post-PEIR and may not have been adequately consulted on with Lincolnshire Highways, Internal Drainage Boards, or local residents.		
	Impact • Infrastructure Permanence: Even low-frequency access may require hardstanding, gates, or culverts, altering the rural character and ecological function of Queen's Bank. • Highway Safety Risk: Without formal design and traffic control measures, visibility splays may be insufficient for safe access, especially for HGVs and emergency vehicles. • Hydrological Sensitivity: Verge disturbance and informal access creation may disrupt drainage patterns and increase runoff or erosion. • Planning Transparency: The lack of detailed access and infrastructure design undermines public scrutiny and procedural fairness.	N	
	References National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) – Paragraphs 111 & 174 Requires developments to ensure safe access and protect landscape character and ecological networks. Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) – CD 123: Geometric Design of Junctions Sets out standards for visibility	N	The Applicant notes these references.

Respondent	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	splays, junction geometry, and swept path analysis for construction and operational traffic. Great North Road Solar and Biodiversity Park – Viewpoint 14 Analysis Demonstrates how substations and BESS compounds can be visible from rural roads, requiring robust screening and access design. Kingsway Solar Farm – PEIR Chapter 3: The Scheme Highlights the importance of defining operational access routes and visibility splays for substations and BESS compounds.		
	Action Requested We call on the Planning Authority to: • Reject the Queen's Bank extension unless a full access design and drainage strategy are submitted, including SuDS integration and seasonal access protocols • Require updated traffic modelling, including swept path analysis and cumulative impact assessment • Consult with Lincolnshire Highways, Internal Drainage Boards, and affected residents regarding the proposed access arrangements • Ensure transparent re-consultation, with clear explanation of infrastructure permanence, hydrological impacts, and long-term management.	N	The suitability of the roads proposed has been confirmed by swept path analysis which is required for the AILs transporting materials to the relevant access points of the Scheme as set out in Annex A and B of the **OCTMP** (Doc. Ref. 7.13). Traffic and access matters, including construction traffic levels, cumulative impacts and road safety, are assessed in **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The assessment concludes that no significant effects are expected with the implementation of measures contained within the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13). The impact of the Scheme on drainage and flood risk has been assessed within **ES Chapter 11: Hydrology and Flood Risk** (Doc Ref. 6.1), which concludes that no significant effects are expected with the implementation of measures included within **ES Appendix 11-4: Outline Drainage Strategy** (Doc Ref. 6.3). Relevant statutory consultees, including the relevant highways authority, the Internal Drainage Board, residents and affected landowners, have been consulted throughout the pre-application process, as evidenced in the **Consultation Report** (Doc Ref. 5.1) and its appendices. The Applicant does therefore not consider re-consultation necessary.
	Section 34: Back Bank Extension – Traffic Management, Visibility Splays & Landscape Oversight Issue The developer proposes an extension of the Order Limits along Back Bank to facilitate traffic management measures, passing bays, and visibility splays for construction and maintenance access to the 132kV connection between Parcels C and D. While the change is described as minor, with "no new or different significant environmental effects" anticipated, this raises several planning concerns: • Back Bank is a narrow rural lane, often used by agricultural vehicles and local residents. Introducing passing bays and visibility splays implies intensification	N	The suitability of the roads proposed has been confirmed by swept path analysis which is required for the AILs transporting materials to the relevant access points of the Scheme as set out in Annex A and B of the **OCTMP** (Doc. Ref. 7.13). **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref 6.1) details the Applicant's consideration of the effects of increased traffic levels during construction. The assessment concludes no significant effects are expected. The cumulative impact of multiple access points, haul routes and visibility splays, as well as seasonal traffic peaks and emergency access needs has been assessed within the **Environmental Statement (**Doc Ref. 6.1) as the ES is based on a worst case scenario. In terms of managing construction traffic, measures are included in the **Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan** (Doc Ref. 7.13).The impact of the Scheme on drainage and flood risk has been assessed within **ES Chapter 11: Hydrology and Flood Risk** (Doc Ref. 6.1), which

Respondent	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	of use, yet no detailed traffic modelling, swept path analysis, or safety audit is provided. • The PEIR does not assess the cumulative impact of multiple access points, haul routes, and visibility splay interventions across the scheme, nor does it account for seasonal traffic peaks or emergency access needs. • Visibility splays and passing bays may require hedgerow removal, verge widening, or surface alteration, which could fragment ecological corridors and alter landscape character. • The change was introduced post-PEIR and may not have been adequately consulted on with Lincolnshire Highways, local residents, or ecological stakeholders.		concludes that no significant effects are expected with the implementation of measures included **within ES Appendix 11-4: Outline Drainage Strategy** (Doc Ref. 6.3). In terms of hedgerow removal this has been assessed within **ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Biodiversity** (Doc Ref. 6.1), as well as within **ES Appendix 12-8: Arboricultural Impact Assessment Report** (Doc Ref. 6.3).
	Impact • Highway Safety Risk: Without formal design and traffic control measures, visibility splays may be insufficient for safe access, especially for HGVs and maintenance vehicles. • Landscape Fragmentation: Verge and hedgerow alteration for visibility splays and passing bays may degrade habitat connectivity and rural character. • Planning Transparency: The lack of detailed access design undermines public scrutiny and procedural fairness. • Cumulative Oversight: The PEIR does not account for overlapping construction phases, seasonal traffic peaks, or emergency access needs.	N	
	References National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) – Paragraphs 111 & 174 Requires developments to ensure safe access and protect ecological networks and landscape character. Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) – CD 123: Geometric Design of Junctions Sets out standards for visibility splays, junction geometry, and swept path analysis for construction traffic. Fenwick Solar Farm – Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan Demonstrates best practice in defining	N	The Applicant notes these references.

Respondent	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	access points, visibility splays, and traffic management for solar farm developments. Meridian Solar Farm PEIR Volume I – Chapter 13: Traffic and Access Contains baseline traffic data but lacks detailed modelling for new access points and visibility splay impacts.		
	Action Requested We call on the Planning Authority to: • Reject the Back Bank extension unless a full highway safety audit and visibility splay design are submitted • Require updated traffic modelling, including swept path analysis and cumulative impact assessment • Consult with Lincolnshire Highways and affected residents regarding the proposed access arrangements • Ensure transparent re-consultation, with clear explanation of traffic volumes, timings, and mitigation measures.	N	The suitability of the roads proposed has been confirmed by swept path analysis which is required for the AILs transporting materials to the relevant access points of the Scheme as set out in Annex A and B of the **OCTMP** (Doc. Ref. 7.13). **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref 6.1) details the Applicant's consideration of the effects of increased traffic levels during construction. The assessment concludes no significant effects are expected. Cumulative effects are included in **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref. 6.1) Section 15.11. In terms of managing construction traffic, measures are included in the **Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan** (Doc Ref. 7.13).The impact of the Scheme on drainage and flood risk has been assessed within **ES Chapter 11: Hydrology and Flood Risk** (Doc Ref. 6.1), which concludes that no significant effects are expected with the implementation of measures included **within ES Appendix 11-4: Outline Drainage Strategy** (Doc Ref. 6.3). Relevant statutory consultees, including the relevant highways authority, residents and affected landowners, have been consulted throughout the pre-application process, as evidenced in the **Consultation Report** (Doc Ref. 5.1) and its appendices. The Applicant does therefore not consider re-consultation necessary.
	Section 35: Parcel A Northwest Extension – Planning Discipline, Procedural Integrity & Landscape Oversight Issue The developer proposes an extension of the Order Limits to align with the field parcel boundary at the northwestern corner of Parcel A, despite no physical works being proposed in this area. While the change is described as minor and environmentally neutral, it raises serious concerns about planning discipline and procedural transparency: • The adjustment appears to be a cartographic correction, suggesting that the original Order Limits were misaligned with land ownership or field geometry. This undermines confidence in the accuracy of the original site boundary, which is foundational to	N	The Applicant notes that this change relates to an extension of the Order Limits to align with the field parcel boundary at the northwestern corner of Parcel A. No physical works are proposed within this area and existing vegetation will be retained to provide landscape screening. The **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16) describes the landscape and ecological strategy for planting across the Site. The illustrative layout of the Scheme shown in **ES Figure 2-2 Indicative Solar Development Area and Inter-Array Layout Plans** (Doc Ref. 6.2) has been designed to minimise the loss of, and avoid significant impacts on, existing vegetation. A minimum offset of 5-10m from existing vegetation boundaries (trees and shrubs) has been incorporated. Tree constraints and arboricultural impacts associated with the Scheme (including mitigation measures) are described in **ES Appendix 12-8: Arboricultural Impact Assessment** (Doc Ref. 6.3). Consultation with relevant stakeholders, including landowners, officers and relevant ecological stakeholders, has been undertaken as detailed within the **Consultation Report**

Respondent	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and stakeholder consultation. • The inclusion of land with no proposed works and no clear operational purpose introduces scope creep, allowing future flexibility without scrutiny. • The claim that "existing vegetation will be retained" is unverified—no landscape management plan, tree protection strategy, or screening maintenance schedule is provided. • The change was introduced post-PEIR, and may not have been adequately consulted on with landowners, landscape officers, or ecological stakeholders.		(Doc Ref. 5.1), and the Applicant considers the consultation undertaken to be adequate and proportionate. The Applicant therefore considers that further consultation is therefore not considered necessary.
	Impact • Procedural Integrity: Retroactive boundary alignment suggests poor foresight and undermines the credibility of the original design and consultation process. • Landscape Protection Risk: Without formal commitments, retained vegetation may be degraded or removed during construction or maintenance. • Planning Transparency: The lack of defined purpose for the added land invites future use without environmental scrutiny or public engagement. • Precedent Risk: Allowing non-functional land to be added post-consultation sets a dangerous precedent for Order Limit manipulation.	N	
	References Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009 – Regulation 5 Requires applicants to define the scope and purpose of all land included within the Order Limits. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) – Paragraphs 16 & 174 Requires developments to be clearly defined and to protect landscape character and ecological networks. Planning for Solar Farms – House of Commons Library Briefing Highlights the importance of clear infrastructure siting and stakeholder engagement in solar farm planning.	N	The Applicant notes these references.

Respondent	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	Mallard Pass Solar Farm – ES Chapter 3: Order Limits Demonstrates best practice in defining Order Limits by function, not by convenience or cartographic tidiness.		
	Action Requested We call on the Planning Authority to: • Reject the Parcel A northwest extension unless a clear operational purpose and landscape management plan are submitted • Require justification for boundary misalignment, including mapping errors and consultation gaps • Consult with landscape officers, ecological stakeholders, and affected landowners regarding the proposed extension • Ensure transparent re-consultation, with clear explanation of land use intentions and vegetation protection commitments.	N	The **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16) describes the landscape and ecological strategy for planting across the Site. The illustrative layout of the Scheme shown in **ES Figure 2-2 Indicative Solar Development Area and Inter-Array Layout Plans** (Doc Ref. 6.2) has been designed to minimise the loss of, and avoid significant impacts on, existing vegetation. A minimum offset of 5-10m from existing vegetation boundaries (trees and shrubs) has been incorporated. Tree constraints and arboricultural impacts associated with the Scheme (including mitigation measures) are described in **ES Appendix 12-8: Arboricultural Impact Assessment** (Doc Ref. 6.3). Consultation with relevant stakeholders, including landowners and relevant ecological stakeholders, has been undertaken as detailed within the **Consultation Report** (Doc Ref. 5.1), and the Applicant considers the consultation undertaken to be adequate and proportionate. The Applicant therefore considers that further consultation is therefore not considered necessary.
	Section 36: Langary Gate Road Extension – Traffic Management, Watercourse Crossings & Planning Oversight Issue The developer proposes an extension of the Order Limits along Langary Gate Road and its junction to facilitate traffic management measures, passing bays, visibility splays, and overhead service diversions for construction access to Parcel D. While the change is described as minor, with "no new or different significant environmental effects" anticipated, this raises several planning concerns: • The proposal involves upgrading 13 existing field accesses to reduce new watercourse crossings, yet no detailed hydrological modelling, culvert design, or ecological impact assessment is provided. • The PEIR does not include updated traffic flow diagrams, swept path analysis, or cumulative transport modelling for construction access via Langary Gate Road. • Visibility splays and passing bays may require hedgerow removal, verge widening, or surface alteration, which could fragment ecological corridors and alter landscape character.	N	The suitability of the roads proposed has been confirmed by swept path analysis which is required for the AILs transporting materials to the relevant access points of the Scheme as set out in Annex A and B of the **OCTMP** (Doc. Ref. 7.13). **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref 6.1) details the Applicant's consideration of the effects of increased traffic levels during construction. The assessment concludes no significant effects are expected. In terms of the impacts associated with upgrading field accesses these have been assessed within the ES (Doc Ref. 6.1) as appropriate, including within **ES Chapter 9: Ecology and Biodiversity** (Doc Ref. 6.1). In terms of managing construction traffic, measures are included in the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13). This includes a road condition survey of Langary Gate Road which will be carried out pre-construction, during construction and post-construction, to identify any defects that arise to highways assets/verges during the construction phase of the Scheme for reinstatement. Relevant statutory consultees, including the relevant highways authority, residents and affected landowners, have been consulted throughout the pre-application process, as evidenced in the **Consultation Report** (Doc Ref. 5.1) and its appendices.

Respondent	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	• The extension was introduced post-PEIR and may not have been adequately consulted on with Lincolnshire Highways, Internal Drainage Boards, local residents, or ecological stakeholders.		
	Impact • Drainage Risk: Upgrading field accesses near watercourses without robust design may lead to blockage, erosion, or waterlogging, especially during peak rainfall. • Ecological Disruption: Verge and hedgerow alteration for visibility splays and passing bays may degrade habitat connectivity and biodiversity. • Traffic Conflict: Langary Gate Road is a narrow rural lane with limited visibility and mixed-use traffic. Construction access may pose safety risks without formal traffic management. • Planning Transparency: The change introduces new infrastructure elements without updated environmental or operational assessment.	N	
	References National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) – Paragraphs 111 & 174 Requires developments to ensure safe access and protect ecological networks and water environments. Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) – CD 123: Geometric Design of Junctions Sets out standards for visibility splays, junction geometry, and swept path analysis for construction traffic. Construction Traffic Management Plan – Hilfield Solar Farm Demonstrates best practice in defining access points, visibility splays, and traffic management for solar farm developments. Internal Drainage Boards – Access & Infrastructure Guidance Recommends consultation and design standards for infrastructure crossing drainage assets.	N	The Applicant notes these references.
	Action Requested We call on the Planning Authority to:	N	The suitability of the roads proposed has been confirmed by swept path analysis which is required for the AILs transporting materials to the relevant access points of the Scheme as set out in Annex A and B of the **Outline CTMP** (Doc. Ref. 7.13).

Respondent	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	• Reject the Langary Gate Road extension unless full hydrological and ecological assessments are submitted for upgraded field accesses and verge alterations • Require updated traffic modelling, including swept path analysis and cumulative construction impact • Consult with Lincolnshire Highways, Internal Drainage Boards, and ecological stakeholders regarding the proposed infrastructure changes • Ensure transparent re-consultation, with clear explanation of traffic volumes, mitigation measures, and long-term access protocols.		**ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref 6.1) details the Applicant's consideration of the effects of increased traffic levels during construction. The assessment concludes no significant effects are expected. In terms of managing construction traffic, measures are included in the **Outline CTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13). Relevant statutory consultees, including the relevant highways authority, the Internal Drainage Board and ecological stakeholders, have been consulted throughout the pre-application process, as evidenced in the **Consultation Report** (Doc Ref. 5.1) and its appendices. The Applicant does therefore not consider re-consultation necessary.
	Section 37: Chapel Gate Extension – Visibility Splays, Highway Safety & Planning Oversight Issue The developer proposes an extension of the Order Limits along Chapel Gate to accommodate visibility splays at a haul route crossing during construction of the 132kV connection between Parcels C and D. While the road itself will not be used for construction access, this change raises several planning concerns: • Visibility splays imply vehicle movement across a public highway, yet no formal junction design, swept path analysis, or traffic safety audit is provided. • The PEIR does not assess the cumulative impact of multiple haul route crossings, especially in combination with seasonal agricultural traffic, local development, and other NSIPs. • The claim that "no vegetation clearance is expected" does not address potential verge disturbance, soil compaction, or drainage alteration during construction. • The extension was introduced post-PEIR and may not have been adequately consulted on with Lincolnshire Highways, local residents, or road safety stakeholders.	N	The suitability of the roads proposed has been confirmed by swept path analysis which is required for the AILs transporting materials to the relevant access points of the Scheme as set out in Annex A and B of the O**CTMP** (Doc. Ref. 7.13). **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref 6.1) details the Applicant's consideration of the effects of increased traffic levels during construction. The assessment concludes no significant effects are expected. In terms of managing construction traffic, measures are included in the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13). Relevant statutory consultees, including the relevant highways authority and local residents, have been consulted throughout the pre-application process, as evidenced in the **Consultation Report** (Doc Ref. 5.1) and its appendices. The potential impacts associated with verge disturbance, soil compaction, or drainage alteration during construction have been assessed within the Environmental Statement as appropriate including within **ES Chapter 5: Agriculture and Soils** (Doc Ref. 6.1) and **ES Chapter 11: Hydrology and Flood Risk** (Doc Ref. 6.1).
	Impact • Highway Safety Risk: Without formal design and traffic control measures, visibility splays may be insufficient	N	

Respondent	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	for safe crossing, especially for HGVs and cable stringing equipment. • Amenity Disruption: Residents and agricultural users may experience noise, dust, and traffic conflict during construction. • Planning Transparency: The lack of detailed crossing design undermines public scrutiny and procedural fairness. • Cumulative Oversight: The PEIR does not account for overlapping construction phases, seasonal traffic peaks, or emergency access needs.		
	References National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) – Paragraph 111 Requires developments to ensure safe and suitable access for all users and to avoid unacceptable impacts on highway safety. Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) – CD 123: Geometric Design of Junctions Sets out standards for visibility splays, junction geometry, and swept path analysis for construction and operational traffic. Longhedge Solar Farm – Construction Traffic Management Plan Demonstrates best practice in managing haul route crossings, visibility splays, and traffic mitigation during solar farm construction. Hilfield Solar Farm – Construction Traffic Management Plan Provides detailed access arrangements and mitigation strategies for haul route crossings over public highways.	N	The Applicant notes these references.
	Action Requested We call on the Planning Authority to: • Reject the Chapel Gate extension unless a full highway safety audit and visibility splay design are submitted • Require updated traffic modelling, including swept path analysis and cumulative impact assessment • Consult with Lincolnshire Highways and affected residents regarding the proposed haul route crossing • Ensure transparent re-consultation, with clear explanation of traffic volumes, timings, and mitigation measures.	N	The suitability of the roads proposed has been confirmed by swept path analysis which is required for the AILs transporting materials to the relevant access points of the Scheme as set out in Annex A and B of the **Outline CTMP** (Doc. Ref. 7.13). **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref 6.1) details the Applicant's consideration of the effects of increased traffic levels during construction. The assessment concludes no significant effects are expected. In terms of managing construction traffic, measures are included in the **Outline CTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13). Relevant statutory consultees, including the relevant highways authority and local residents, have been consulted throughout the pre-application process, as evidenced in the

Respondent	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
			Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 5.1) and its appendices. The Applicant therefore does not consider re-consultation necessary.
	Section 38: Dog Drove Extension – Visibility Splays, Highway Safety & Planning Oversight Issue The developer proposes an extension of the Order Limits along Dog Drove to accommodate visibility splays at a haul route crossing during construction of the 132kV connection between Parcels C and D. While the road itself will not be used for construction access, this change raises several planning concerns: • Visibility splays imply vehicle movement across a public highway, yet no formal junction design, swept path analysis, or traffic safety audit is provided. • The PEIR does not assess the cumulative impact of multiple haul route crossings, especially in combination with seasonal agricultural traffic, local development, and other NSIPs. • The claim that "no vegetation clearance is expected" does not address potential verge disturbance, soil compaction, or drainage alteration during construction. • The extension was introduced post-PEIR and may not have been adequately consulted on with Lincolnshire Highways, local residents, or road safety stakeholders.	N	The suitability of the roads proposed has been confirmed by swept path analysis which is required for the AILs transporting materials to the relevant access points of the Scheme as set out in Annex A and B of the **Outline CTMP** (Doc. Ref. 7.13). **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref 6.1) details the Applicant's consideration of the effects of increased traffic levels during construction. The assessment concludes no significant effects are expected. In terms of managing construction traffic, measures are included in the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13). Relevant statutory consultees, including the relevant highways authority and local residents, have been consulted throughout the pre-application process, as evidenced in the **Consultation Report** (Doc Ref. 5.1) and its appendices. 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. This takes into account seasonal traffic, local development other NSIPs. The potential impact of the Scheme in relation to noise and vibration and air quality are reported in **ES Chapter 13: Noise and Vibration** (Doc Ref. 6.1) and **ES Chapter 6: Air Quality** (Doc Ref. 6.1), respectively.
	Impact • Highway Safety Risk: Without formal design and traffic control measures, visibility splays may be insufficient for safe crossing, especially for HGVs and cable stringing equipment. • Amenity Disruption: Residents and agricultural users may experience noise, dust, and traffic conflict during construction. • Planning Transparency: The lack of detailed crossing design undermines public scrutiny and procedural fairness.	N	

Respondent	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	• Cumulative Oversight: The PEIR does not account for overlapping construction phases, seasonal traffic peaks, or emergency access needs.		
	References • National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) – Paragraph 111 Requires developments to ensure safe and suitable access for all users and to avoid unacceptable impacts on highway safety. • Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) – CD 123: Geometric Design of Junctions Sets out standards for visibility splays, junction geometry, and swept path analysis for construction and operational traffic. • Longhedge Solar Farm – Construction Traffic Management Plan Demonstrates best practice in managing haul route crossings, visibility splays, and traffic mitigation during solar farm construction. • Hilfield Solar Farm – Construction Traffic Management Plan Provides detailed access arrangements and mitigation strategies for haul route crossings over public highways.	N	The Applicant notes these references.
	Action Requested We call on the Planning Authority to: • Reject the Dog Drove extension unless a full highway safety audit and visibility splay design are submitted • Require updated traffic modelling, including swept path analysis and cumulative impact assessment • Consult with Lincolnshire Highways and affected residents regarding the proposed haul route crossing • Ensure transparent re-consultation, with clear explanation of traffic volumes, timings, and mitigation measures.	N	The suitability of the roads proposed has been confirmed by swept path analysis which is required for the AILs transporting materials to the relevant access points of the Scheme as set out in Annex A and B of the **OCTMP** (Doc. Ref. 7.13). **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref 6.1) details the Applicant's consideration of the effects of increased traffic levels during construction. The assessment concludes no significant effects are expected. In terms of managing construction traffic, measures are included in the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13). Relevant statutory consultees, including the relevant highways authority and local residents, have been consulted throughout the pre-application process, as evidenced in the **Consultation Report** (Doc Ref. 5.1) and its appendices.
	Section 39: Holbeach Drove Gate Extension – Visibility Splays, Traffic Management & Planning Integrity Issue The developer proposes an extension of the Order Limits along Holbeach Drove Gate to facilitate visibility splays, passing bays, and traffic management measures for construction access to the 132kV connection between Parcels C and D. While the	N	The suitability of the roads proposed has been confirmed by swept path analysis which is required for the AILs transporting materials to the relevant access points of the Scheme as set out in Annex A and B of the **OCTMP** (Doc. Ref. 7.13). **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref 6.1) details the Applicant's consideration of the effects of increased traffic levels during construction. The assessment concludes no significant effects are expected.

Respondent	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	change is described as minor and consistent with the PEIR, it raises several planning concerns: • The introduction of passing bays and visibility splays implies intensified vehicle movement and physical alteration of a rural lane, yet no formal junction design, swept path analysis, or road safety audit is provided. • The PEIR does not assess the cumulative impact of multiple access upgrades, haul route crossings, and visibility interventions across the Scheme, nor does it evaluate landscape character disruption or ecological corridor fragmentation. • The proposal lacks a site-specific traffic management plan, including signage, speed control, and construction phasing, which are critical for protecting vulnerable road users and maintaining rural amenity. • The extension was introduced post-PEIR and may not have been adequately consulted on with Lincolnshire Highways, local residents, or road safety stakeholders.		In terms of managing construction traffic, measures are included in the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13). Relevant statutory consultees, including the relevant highways authority and local residents, have been consulted throughout the pre-application process, as evidenced in the **Consultation Report** (Doc Ref. 5.1) and its appendices. 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.
	Impact • Highway Safety Risk: Without formal design and traffic control measures, visibility splays and passing bays may be insufficient for safe access, especially for HGVs and cable stringing equipment. • Amenity Disruption: Residents and agricultural users may experience noise, dust, and traffic conflict during construction and maintenance. • Infrastructure Permanence: Passing bays and verge widening may result in permanent landscape alteration and ecological degradation. • Planning Transparency: The lack of detailed access and traffic management design undermines public scrutiny and procedural fairness.	N	
	References National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) – Paragraph 111 Requires developments to ensure safe and suitable access for all users and to avoid unacceptable impacts on highway safety. Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) – CD 123: Geometric Design of Junctions Sets out standards for visibility	N	The Applicant notes these references.

Respondent	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	splays, junction geometry, and swept path analysis for construction and operational traffic. Caudwell Farm Solar EIA – Chapter 4: Traffic & Transport Demonstrates best practice in assessing traffic impacts, access arrangements, and construction management for solar farm development in Holbeach. Red House Farm Solar Planning Statement – Holbeach Bank Highlights the importance of traffic management and visibility design in rural solar farm planning.		
	Action Requested We call on the Planning Authority to: • Reject the Holbeach Drove Gate extension unless a full traffic management plan and visibility splay design are submitted • Require updated traffic modelling, including swept path analysis and cumulative impact assessment • Consult with Lincolnshire Highways and affected residents regarding the proposed access arrangements • Ensure transparent re-consultation, with clear explanation of traffic volumes, timings, and mitigation measures.	N	The suitability of the roads proposed has been confirmed by swept path analysis which is required for the AILs transporting materials to the relevant access points of the Scheme as set out in Annex A and B of the **OCTMP** (Doc. Ref. 7.13). **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref 6.1) details the Applicant's consideration of the effects of increased traffic levels during construction. The assessment concludes no significant effects are expected. In terms of managing construction traffic, measures are included in the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13). Relevant statutory consultees, including the relevant highways authority and local residents, have been consulted throughout the pre-application process, as evidenced in the **Consultation Report** (Doc Ref. 5.1) and its appendices. The Applicant therefore does not consider re-consultation to be necessary.
	Conclusion The developer's reliance on post-PEIR amendments to correct fundamental oversights—ranging from haul route design and drainage strategy to visibility splays and access points—exposes a proposal that is not ready for examination. The cumulative effect of these changes is not minor; it is systemic. This application lacks the refinement, clarity, and strategic coherence required for submission to the Planning Inspectorate. It fails to demonstrate joined-up thinking, environmental accountability, or respect for the communities it affects. The absence of a confirmed substation connection site is emblematic of a wider failure to plan infrastructure holistically. LAND urges the Planning Inspectorate to reject this application in its current form. We call for a full redesign and re-consultation process that reflects the scale of the impacts, the	N	Updated environmental assessments relating to the matters raised have been provided within the **Environmental Statement** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The PEIR formed a key stage of consultation within the EIA process, the purpose of which was to gather feedback from statutory consultees, stakeholders and the local community. The Applicant remains confident that the Scheme has been appropriately designed, assessed and consulted upon, and that the application provides sufficient information to support its consideration through the examination process.

Respondent	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	complexity of the land use, and the rights of those whose lives and landscapes stand to be altered. We trust that Meridian solar Farm will do the right thing and pause developments until a thorough proposal can be assured which includes a final location of the substation to which the development will connect at Weston Marsh. Submitted on behalf of Lincolnshire against Needless Destruction		

6. General Feedback

Topic	Issue Summary	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
Consultation	Respondents felt further direct engagement was required to address the changes proposed. Respondents requested ongoing 'dialogue' with the Applicant to address concerns, through liaison meetings during the construction phase and formal agreements. Respondents requested any reasonable costs accrued as a result of consultation and development i.e. (legal matters) are borne in full by or on behalf of the Applicant. Respondent provided information on Outer DOWSING Offshore Wind. The respondents expressed their interest in collaboration and further engagement with regard to simultaneous operations throughout the construction period. Respondents felt they were presented with conflicting information at public consultation events at stage 1 and stage 2. There were also comments claiming the maps that were presented during the consultation were of poor quality.	N	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. 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. 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. The likely significant effects of the Scheme have been assessed within the **Environmental Statement** (Doc Ref. 6.1) which includes the following chapters: 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
Community Benefits	Respondents suggested public benefits that can come forward as part of the Scheme, such as a social, employment and education fund for meaningful engagement with Local planning authorities and parish councils.	N	
Climate Change	Respondents claim that solar energy is not the best form of energy regeneration to counter climate change, claiming the Earth has sustained itself through natural cycles and resilience. Another respondent claimed there are "far superior" alternatives such as Small modular reactors (SMRs), Thorium or closed-circuit nuclear that offers more reliable baseload power. Respondents felt a negative impact of the Scheme is on the climate change as the manufacturing of the materials will be outsourced. The amount of fossil fuel that will need to be expended in the manufacturing and shipping across the world outweighs the benefits the Scheme would bring.	N	
Conservation & Heritage	Respondents felt the Scheme would desecrate the ancient landscape, referring to the area of land southwest of Moulton	N	

Topic	Issue Summary	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	Chapel, which was once a battleground during the English Civil War. Respondents requested a balanced outcome that protects the community's rural heritage, while advancing food and energy security.		Chapter 15: Traffic and Access Chapter 16: Other Environmental Topics: • 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. Proposed mitigation measures are set out in the **OCEMP Plan** (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. 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. 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.
Scheme Design	Respondents requested the Applicant put the cable route underground and not overhead. Respondents raised safety concerns regarding the cable route's proximity to the existing gas pipelines and requested this is addressed according to Health and Safety Executive (HSE) guidance, Institution of Gas Engineers and Managers (GEM) standards, Gas Safety Regulations 1996 and the Pipeline Safety Regulations 1996. Respondents requested detailed cable route plans showing precise proximity to the gas pipeline and plans for protective measures safeguarding the pipeline operations are included in the DCO. Respondents raised safety concerns regarding construction traffic movements over buried pipeline and associated infrastructure.	N	
	Respondents requested detailed siting plans for the new substation and battery energy storage system (BESS) and inter-array connections.	N	
	Respondents felt the placement of the Solar PV panels should be on alternative sites such as rooftops of warehouses, hospitals, on moors and other desolate areas. The placement of panels on the ground would harm essential farmland.	N	
Environmental Impacts	Respondents raised concerns regarding the noise from the substation, claiming it will impact on the lives of local residents. One respondent made a specific reference to noise from the A16 and stated that it was not sufficient to mitigate the impact of the noise from the substation, as noise from the road is intermittent and significantly reduced at night. The noise from the substation would be constant. Another respondent claimed the vegetation proposed is insufficient to mitigate noise and suggested relocating the substation to another location where noise mitigation can be appropriately implemented. Respondents claimed the construction of the proposed infrastructure would negatively impact access and existing rights of way.	N	

Topic	Issue Summary	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	Respondents requested that a full traffic management, landscape and environmental impact statement be prepared for the DCO, including a construction plan, such as a methodology for BESS and cable installations.		
	Respondents requested enhanced mitigation measures, including taller and wider trees, to adequately screen the Scheme. Respondents requested the plans include public amenities such as pathways for walking, cycling, horse-riding, and dog walking to offset the loss of amenity to locals. Respondents felt the benefits of the Scheme are outweighed and are disproportionate to the negative effects that are likely to be caused to the surrounding landscape. Respondents requested geo-technical surveys data are provided at any proposed crossing point.	N	
Ecological Impact	Respondents raised concerns regarding the impact of the large-scale development on local birds and wildlife, making specific reference to skylarks and the birds of prey including honey buzzards, kestrels, and marsh harriers. Respondents claimed the placement of solar panels in green fields is taking away the natural habitats of local wildlife.	N	
Economical Impact	Respondents raised concerns regarding the impact on the local economy and jobs, claiming it would lead to a loss of agricultural jobs and local business would lose trade.	N	
General Opposition	Respondents expressed their general objection to the Scheme, claiming it will not bring any discernible benefit to the area and the lives of the local residents. Respondents also objected to the Scheme on the basis it was not good use of agricultural land. Respondents objected to the Scheme claiming their views and views of the local planning authorities submitted during Stage 2 consultation were not considered. One respondent did not object to the Scheme provided their requests for additional engagement and information were adhered.	N	

Topic	Issue Summary	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
Human Health	Respondents were concerned regarding the impact on human health, residing close to a solar farm, in some cases further exacerbate existing conditions. Respondents raised concern about the impact of mental health and wellbeing, from the loss of open rural land.	N	
Hydrology & Major Accidents	Respondents raised concerns regarding the risk of flood in the local area, as a result of the Scheme. Respondents raised concerns regarding drainage of water in the fields.	N	
	Respondents raised concern of fire risk at BESS site. Respondents raised concerns regarding the cable route's proximity to the gas pipeline. Respondents question the emergency response procedures during construction and operation	N	
Land & Property	Respondents complained the site proposed for the Scheme should not be taken from agricultural use, claiming it is arable farm land and should be retained for food security. Respondents expressed concern regarding the uptake of land, claiming the use of 1,100 hectares of arable farmland for the Scheme was not justified. Respondents requested a reconsideration of the sites, prioritising non-agricultural land.	N	
	Respondents were concerned that the Scheme would have a detrimental impact on local property values.	N	
Meridian Action Group	Respondents expressed their support for comments made by the Meridian Action group (MAG) on 18 October 2025.	N	

7. Responses from Consultees Engaged under Section 42(a) and Section 42(b)

7.1. North East Lincolnshire Council

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
North East Lincolnshire Council	Good afternoon, I hope this email finds you well. Following receipt of a letter regarding the targeted consultation, I can confirm it is a nil response from North East Lincolnshire Council. Kind regards,	N	The Applicant notes this acknowledgement and thanks North East Lincolnshire Council for its consultation response.

7.2. Environment Agency

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
Environment Agency	Dear Sir/Madam MERIDIAN SOLAR FARM LTD TARGETED CONSULTATION LAND EAST OF A16 CENTRED AROUND WHAPLODE DROVE, LINCOLNSHIRE Thank you for consulting us on the above. We have reviewed the changes as set out in the Targeted Consultation Information Booklet. We have no concerns to raise in relation to the changes described. 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. Yours faithfully	N	The Applicant notes this comment and thanks the Environment Agency for its consultation response. The changes are included within the Flood Risk Assessment submitted as part of the DCO submission. Refer to **ES Appendix 11-3 Flood Risk Assessment** (Doc Ref 6.3).

7.3. Health and Safety Executive

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
Health and Safety Executive	HSE's land use planning advice Will the proposed development fall within any of HSE's consultation distances? According to HSE's records, the proposed DCO application boundary for this Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project is within the consultation zones of no major accident hazard site ['MAHS'] and One major accident hazard pipeline ['MAHP']. This is based on the 'land added to order limits' drawings shown in Targeted Consulted 24 September – 22 October 2025 Information Booklet [Meridian-Solar_Targeted-Consultation_Information-Booklet.pdf] in conjunction with Figure 1-2 Version 1.0 10/04/2025 of the Preliminary Environmental Information Report April 2025 (hereafter referred to as 'PEIR') [downloaded from: https://meridiansolarfarm.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2025/stage-two-consultation/peir-volume-ii/0102%20-%20PEIR%20Volume%20II%20Figure%201-2%20The%20Site.pdf] and the GIS files provided GIS files of the Draft Order Limits provided on 09/05/2025 via WeTransfer. HSE's records indicate that the major accident hazard pipeline operated by InterGen (UK) Limited, is: • NTS to Spalding Energy PS Pipeline; HSE ref. number 11622.	N	The Applicant notes this comment and thanks the Health and Safety Executive for its response to the targeted consultation. InterGen major accident hazard pipeline has been included in the baseline and has been subject to an assessment within **ES Chapter 16: Other Environmental Topics** (Doc Ref. 6.1). It crosses the Order Limits at the northern end of the Grid Connection Route, where the indicative location of Weston Marsh Substation and an area of flexibility within the Scheme design have been identified. Subject to the final design and the location of infrastructure, the Applicant will contact the operator of the major accident hazard pipeline to review any proposed arrangements for the protection of the pipeline and required working arrangements. The Applicant is seeking to agree bespoke protective provisions with Spalding Energy Company Limited and Spalding Energy Expansion Limited (subsidiaries of InterGen) to secure appropriate protection of the pipeline and to regulate the exercise of DCO powers in the vicinity of the pipeline. These provisions will ensure that the pipeline operator's interests are safeguarded and that construction and operation of the Scheme do not compromise pipeline integrity or safety. Further information can be found in Section 16.5: Major Accidents and Disasters of **ES Chapter 16 Other Environmental Topics** (Doc Ref 6.1) and **ES Appendix 16-4: Long list of Major Accidents and Disasters** (Doc Ref 6.3).
	As described within the PEIR Table 14-6-2, the Applicant should contact the above operator to verify the above and to inform an assessment of whether or not the proposed development is vulnerable to a possible major accident. There are three particular reasons for this: i The pipeline operator may have a legal interest in developments in the vicinity of the pipeline. This may restrict developments within a certain proximity of the pipeline. ii The standards to which the pipeline is designed and operated may restrict major traffic routes within a certain proximity of the pipeline. Consequently, there may be a need for the	N	The InterGen major accident hazard pipeline has been included in the baseline and has been subject to an assessment within **ES Chapter 16: Other Environmental Topics** (Doc Ref. 6.1). It crosses the Order Limits at the northern end of the Grid Connection Route, where the indicative location of Weston Marsh Substation and an area of flexibility within the Scheme design have been identified. Subject to the final design and the location of infrastructure, the Applicant will contact the operator of the major accident hazard pipeline to review any proposed arrangements for the protection of the pipeline and required working arrangements. The Applicant is seeking to agree bespoke protective provisions with Spalding Energy Company Limited and Spalding Energy Expansion Limited (subsidiaries of InterGen) to secure appropriate protection of the pipeline and to regulate the exercise of DCO powers in the vicinity of the pipeline. These provisions will ensure that the pipeline operator's interests are safeguarded and that construction and operation of the Scheme do not compromise pipeline

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	operator to modify the pipeline or its operation, if the development proceeds. iii To establish the necessary measures required to alter/upgrade the pipeline to appropriate standards.		integrity or safety.Further information can be found in Section 16.5: Major Accidents and Disasters of **ES Chapter 16 Other Environmental Topics** (Doc Ref 6.1) and **ES Appendix 16-4: Long list of Major Accidents and Disasters** (Doc Ref 6.3).
	HSE's Land Use Planning advice is dependent on the location of areas where people may be present [HSE: Land use planning - HSE's land use planning methodology]. Based on the information in the PEIR it is unlikely that HSE would advise against the development. Please note that the advice is based on HSE's existing policy for providing land-use planning advice and the information which has been provided. HSE's advice in response to a subsequent planning application may differ should HSE's policy or the scope of the development change by the time the Development Consent Order application is submitted.	N	The Applicant notes this comment.
	Would Hazardous Substance Consent be needed? Hazard classification is relevant to the potential for accidents. Hazardous substances planning consent is required to store or use any of the Categories of Substances or Named Hazardous Substances set out in Schedule 1 of The Planning (Hazardous Substances) Regulations 2015 as amended, if those hazardous substances will be present on, over or under the land at or above the controlled quantities. There is an "addition rule" in Part 4 of Schedule 1 for below-threshold substances. Based on the PEIR it is not clear whether the applicant has considered the hazard classification of any chemicals that are proposed to be present at the development. This may be because there are no in-scope hazardous substances. If hazardous substances planning consent is required, please consult the relevant Hazardous Substance Authority (usually the Local Planning Authority) on the application.	N	The Scheme does not require the use and storage of chemical or hazardous substances therefore a Hazardous Substances Consent would not be required.

7.4. Anglian Water Services Ltd.

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
Anglian Water Services Ltd.	Thank you for your recent correspondence to our client, Anglian Water Services Ltd. We have examined the attached changes from an above ground assets and formal easement perspective only. Please note we have not checked for below ground apparatus not laid under formal easement. I have detailed my findings in the attached word document, for your ease of reference. Meridian Solar – Schedule of Affected Assets: Interest Part of Freehold Part of Freeheld Nearby Easement Ref LL255158 LL252420 & LL181906 ETO 11446	N	The Applicant notes this acknowledgement and thanks Anglian Water Services Ltd. for its consultation response.

7.5. Moulton Parish Council

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
Moulton Parish Council	The Moulton's Parish Councillors have discussed your project in depth yet again and would like to reiterate their concerns in regards to the impact it will have on many. The huge loss of valuable farmland along with the environmental impact and the effect it shall have on wildlife	N	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. 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.

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	The extra traffic while work takes place on roads that are clearly cannot cope as it is, without adding more.	N	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. 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.
	We have been made aware of the potential for the pylons to go via Gedney Hill instead and then into the Walpole station. The councillors think this would be a much better route if possible and would like to know why that route had not been chosen originally.	Y/ N	The Scheme has never involved proposals to connect directly to Walpole Substation. The Meridian Solar Farm and Grimsby to Walpole are two separate projects. The Applicant has worked with NGET to develop a design which allows both projects to be delivered within a shared corridor. The two project teams worked collaboratively to find solutions in order to ensure that two overhead lines could be delivered at the points of interaction. This meant that both NSIPs could progress without one posing a delivery risk to the other The Applicant and NGET also discussed the potential for a tee connection to the Grimsby to Walpole overhead line. This would represent the most economic and efficient solution for the Scheme as the Grimsby to Walpole line runs adjacent to the Scheme at Land Parcel D. A tee-in would avoid the requirement for a connection directly into the planned Weston Marsh substation, thus substantially reducing the length of the overhead line required. NGET advised that it would not provide for a tee-in connection and on this basis, only a connection into the future Weston Marsh Substation was considered deliverable for the grid connection
	We have a constant flow of residents worried about this project and another huge concern is the potential drop in their property value.	N	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. 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.

7.6. Deeping St Nicholas Parish Council

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
Deeping St Nicholas Parish Council	We believe that the consultation material is poor, both in content and format. One major concern is the proposed increase in land-take for the scheme, without adequate explanation. For example, by placing all BESS on one site, land will be released in the originally planned location, elsewhere in the scheme, but without explanation of what use that land will be put to.	N	Justification for the relocation of all the BESS to the On-Site 400kV Substation Compound is outlined within **ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The land released through relocating the BESS would not be used for solar infrastructure i.e. 132kV substation or PV solar panels. Please refer to **ES Figure 2-2: Indicative Solar Development and Inter-Array Layout Plan** (Doc Ref. 6.2) for further details. 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. The Applicant further notes that it remains confident that information made available during the targeted consultation was adequate and appropriate for that stage in the process.
	There are similar concerns about the proposed reconfiguration of Parcel B; what evidence is there for the changed lane use classification leading to the reconfiguration?	N	The changed land use classification is based on the results of an Agricultural Land Classification Survey. The survey report is included within **ES Appendix 5-3: ALC Survey for Parcels B & C** (Doc Ref. 6.3).
	Our greatest concerns is about the proposed reconfiguration of Parcel D, removing one area from solar panel use but adding four additional areas of land for solar panels. This means that there is a net gain of 14.9 hectares for solar panels. Little explanation is given for this increase.	N	As stated in **ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution** (Doc Ref. 6.1) four additional fields in Parcel D were brought forward for development with solar PV panels, following comments received from landowners during Statutory Consultation. This included the addition of 33.3 ha. Field D4 (18.4 ha) was however removed from consideration for solar PV, owing to its historic sensitivity, with the option to use this land for habitat enhancement retained instead. This resulted in a net increase of 14.9 ha of solar PV panels across Parcel D. However, overall, 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. Additional buffers were also included around properties along Langary Gate Road, where no solar PV panels would be located, in order to avoid impacting on the residential visual amenity of these properties and to avoid significant glint and glare effects. Crown Estate land previously indicated as inter-array within Parcel D has been removed from the Order Limits.
	The increase in the land-take across all the proposed changes, might be viewed as 'amendment of the scheme by stealth.' Plans for the Order Limits changes are inadequate to readily identify the location and scale of the proposed changes, and no indication s given of the area of additional land which will be taken. These changes will cause major disruption to many people, both local residents and road users and no explanation or	N	As stated in **ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution** (Doc Ref. 6.1) four additional fields in Parcel D were brought forward for development with solar PV panels, following comments received from landowners during the stage two consultation. This included the addition of 33.3 ha. Field D4 (18.4 ha) was however removed from consideration for solar PV, owing to its historic sensitivity , with the option to use this land for habitat enhancement retained instead. Overall, this resulted in a net increase of 14.9 ha of solar PV panels across Parcel D. Additional buffers were also included around properties along Langary Gate Road, where no solar PV panels would be located, in order to avoid impacting on the residential visual amenity of these properties and to avoid significant glint and glare effects. Crown

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	reason is offered as to why land within the Stage 2 Order Limits cannot be used, instead of additional land.		Estate land previously indicated as inter-array within Parcel D has been removed from the Order Limits. In terms of the comment that the changes will cause major disruption to many people, this has been assessed in **ES Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual** and **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref. 6.1). Measures are included within the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10) and **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13) to limit the disruption to local communities where practicable. The Applicant remains confident that the information issued for the consultation provided adequate time for community involvement and invited participation.
	Basically; No indication of the total additional land to be taken is given;	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 been reduced between statutory consultation and DCO submission.
	The colouring of the legend is unclear;	N	The Applicant acknowledges these comments but remains confident that information made available during the targeted consultation was adequate and appropriate for that stage in the process. The Applicant also notes that interested parties were able to contact the Community Relations Team by phone or email throughout the targeted consultation period to discuss the Scheme in more detail or ask questions.
	An explanation of the technical feasibility of constructing passing bays on silt land is needed. This also needs to accommodate HGVs, agricultural machinery as well as light vans and cars.	N	The requirement for road enhancements (including passing bays) would be subject to detail design and ground investigations. Any works to the highway would need to be approved by the local highway authority.
	In summary, as a consultation document, we believe that the Information Booklet is not fit for purpose.	N	The Applicant acknowledges these comments but remains confident that information made available during the targeted consultation was adequate and appropriate for that stage in the process. The Applicant thanks Deeping St James Parish Council for its consultation.

7.7. Cowbit Parish Council

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
Cowbit Parish Council	We believe that the consultation material is poor, both in content and format. One major concern is the proposed increase in land-take for the scheme, without adequate explanation. For example, by placing all BESS on one site, land will be released in the originally planned location, elsewhere in the	N	Justification for the relocation of all the BESS to the On-Site 400kV Substation Compound is outlined within **ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The land released through relocating the BESS would not be used for solar infrastructure i.e. 132kV substation or PV solar panels. Please refer to **ES Figure 2-2: Indicative Solar Development and Inter-Array Layout Plan** (Doc Ref. 6.2) for further details.

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	scheme, but without explanation of what use that land will be put to.		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. The Applicant further notes that it remains confident that information made available during the targeted consultation was adequate and appropriate for that stage in the process.
	There are similar concerns about the proposed reconfiguration of Parcel B; what evidence is there for the changed lane use classification leading to the reconfiguration?	N	The changed land use classification is based on the results of an Agricultural Land Classification Survey. The survey report is included within **ES Appendix 5-3: ALC Survey for Parcels B & C** (Doc Ref. 6.3).
	Our greatest concerns is about the proposed reconfiguration of Parcel D, removing one area from solar panel use but adding four additional areas of land for solar panels. This means that there is a net gain of 14.9 hectares for solar panels. Little explanation is given for this increase.	N	As stated in **ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution** (Doc Ref. 6.1) four additional fields in Parcel D were brought forward for development with solar PV panels, following comments received from landowners during Statutory Consultation. This included the addition of 33.3 ha. Field D4 (18.4 ha) was however removed from consideration for solar PV, owing to its historic sensitivity, with the option to use this land for habitat enhancement retained instead. Overall, this resulted in a net increase of 14.9 ha of solar PV panels across Parcel D. Additional buffers were also included around properties along Langary Gate Road, where no solar PV panels would be located, in order to avoid impacting on the residential visual amenity of these properties and to avoid significant glint and glare effects. Crown Estate land previously indicated as inter-array within Parcel D has been removed from the Order Limits.
	The increase in the land-take across all the proposed changes, might be viewed as 'amendment of the scheme by stealth.' Plans for the Order Limits changes are inadequate to readily identify the location and scale of the proposed changes, and no indication s given of the area of additional land which will be taken. These changes will cause major disruption to many people, both local residents and road users and no explanation or reason is offered as to why land within the Stage 2 Order Limits cannot be used, instead of additional land.	N	As stated in **ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution** (Doc Ref. 6.1) four additional fields in Parcel D were brought forward for development with solar PV panels, following comments received from landowners during Statutory Consultation. This included the addition of 33.3 ha. Field D4 (18.4 ha) was however removed from consideration for solar PV, owing to its historic sensitivity, with the option to use this land for habitat enhancement retained instead. Overall, this resulted in a net increase of 14.9 ha of solar PV panels across Parcel D. Additional buffers were also included around properties along Langary Gate Road, where no solar PV panels would be located, in order to avoid impacting on the residential visual amenity of these properties and to avoid significant glint and glare effects. Crown Estate land previously indicated as inter-array within Parcel D has been removed from the Order Limits. In terms of the comment that the changes will cause major disruption to many people, this has been assessed in **ES Chapter 12: Landscape** and Visual and **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref. 6.1). proposed measures are included within the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10) and **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13) to limit the disruption to local communities where practicable.
	Basically; No indication of the total additional land to be taken is given;	N	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 since the PEIR and targeted consultation. For comparison, the total area of the Site within the Order limits for the DCO

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
			submission is 1,616ha, whereas the total area of the Site within the draft Order limits in the PEIR was 2,121ha. This represents a significant reduction in the development footprint. The refinements introduced during targeted consultation were localised adjustments within the reduced Order limits to optimise layout and respond to consultation feedback. These changes do not constitute a substantial expansion of the overall development area. While they involve repositioning and refinement of infrastructure, they remain within the parameters assessed and do not materially increase the Scheme's scale or character beyond what was previously consulted upon. As such the changes introduced during targeted consultation are not considered to represent a substantial expansion of the overall development.
	The colouring of the legend is unclear;	N	The Applicant acknowledges these comments but remains confident that information made available during the targeted consultation was adequate and appropriate for that stage in the process. The Applicant also notes that interested parties were able to contact the Community Relations Team by phone or email throughout the targeted consultation period to discuss the Scheme in more detail or ask questions.
	An explanation of the technical feasibility of constructing passing bays on silt land is needed. This also needs to accommodate HGVs, agricultural machinery as well as light vans and cars	N	The requirement for road enhancements (including passing bays) would be subject to detail design and ground investigations. Any works to the highway would need to be approved by the local highway authority.
	In summary, as a consultation document, we believe that the Information Booklet is not fit for purpose.	N	The Applicant acknowledges these comments but remains confident that the information made available during the targeted consultation was adequate and appropriate for that stage in the process. The Applicant thanks Cowbit Parish Council for its consultation.

7.8. National Highways

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
National Highways	Proposal: Meridian solar farm, a solar farm with capacity of approximately 750 MW situated near Moulton Chapel in Lincolnshire Thank you for providing National Highways the opportunity to comment on the above-mentioned pre-planning application for a solar farm with capacity of approximately 750 MW situated near Moulton Chapel in Lincolnshire	N	The Applicant notes this and thanks National Highways for its response to the targeted consultation.

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	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 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. The SRN in the vicinity of the proposed development is the A47. Based on the information available to us, National Highways makes the following comments:		
	Access Access to the development is proposed to be taken from local roads. As these roads are part of the local road network managed and operated by Lincolnshire County Council, National Highways has no comments to make about the proposed access.	N	The Applicant notes this comment.
	Boundary Matters The nearest point of impact on the Strategic Road Network (SRN) will be the A47/A16 junction and the A1/A6121 junction approximately 12km south and 26km west, respectively of the Solar PV Area Boundary. The site does not share a common boundary with the SRN therefore we have no boundary related comments.	N	The Applicant notes this comment
	Traffic and Transport We have reviewed the Preliminary Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) and set out our specific and general comments below for your consideration.	N	The Applicant notes this comment

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	Future Baseline (Section 13.8) TEMPro has been used to derive traffic growth factors. Based on our independent review, the growth factors presented in Table 13-17 do not match the TEMPro outputs for the five locations in Paragraph 13.8.38. Please could you provide the methodology used to extract the growth factors in Table 13-17.	N	Whilst the comment falls outside of the scope of targeted consultation, in response to the comment made, Section 15.6 of **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref. 6.1) outlines the TemPRO growth rates which have been updated since the PEIR to provide robust rates for the peak construction year of 2031. These factors were agreed with LHAs and NH during the meeting in September 2025.
	Construction Trip Generation (Section 13.10) We acknowledge that the construction trip generation is estimated based on proxy sites and expected requirements for the scheme. During construction, a daily 400 HGV movements and 570 construction workers have been identified. National Highways welcomes the commitment by the applicant to ensure deliveries to the site are managed outside of peak network hours, thus minimising the impact on the A1 and the A47 as stated in Paragraph 13.9.4. However, we note that HGV deliveries will be restricted to 08.00-16.00 with some HGV deliveries taking place during the network AM peak hour of 08.00-09.00 which will have an impact on the SRN. We understand that a Delivery Management System will be implemented to regulate HGV deliveries and compliance of HGV routing as stated in Paragraph 13.9.4. However, to understand the proposed impact to the SRN, we welcome further information on the likely number of vehicles arriving/departing the site between 08:00-09:00 during the peak of the construction period as a worse-case scenario. We recognise that construction staff will work 12-hour shifts (Monday to Friday from 07:00-19:00). We acknowledge Paragraph 13.10.7 stating that 95% of workers would travel by private vehicle. National Highways welcomes initiatives such as shuttle services provision to encourage the use of sustainable transport modes to minimise the impacts of travel.	N	The **OCTMP** (Doc. Ref. 7.13) sets out the construction trips generation associated with the whole extent of the Scheme. HGV movements associated with the construction phase are expected to be managed across an 8-hour window outside of the SRN network peaks (08:00 – 09:00 and 17:00 – 18:00), however it is expected some HGV trips will be required in the local network peak of 16:00 – 17:00. Peak daily traffic numbers for the Scheme are outlined in section 15.8 of **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref. 6.1). Details on construction staff working hours are provided in section 15.5 of **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The **OCTMP** (Doc. Ref. 7.13) sets out updated assumptions associated with construction staff, 45% of staff are expected to travel by private vehicle, whilst 55% of staff are expected to travel in via Shuttle service provision – updated assumptions had been discussed with LHAs during the meeting in September 2025.
	General guidance We acknowledge that you will prepare a Transport Assessment (TA), Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) and Environmental Statement (ES) in support of the forthcoming	N	An **Outline CTMP** (Doc. Ref. 7.13) and **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access (**Doc Ref. 6.1) have been prepared with the DCO Application. As agreed in the scoping meeting with LHAs and NH in September 2025, a Transport Assessment Note (TAN) has been prepared in place of a full TA and is included as **ES Appendix 15-4** (Doc. Ref. 6.3).

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	planning application and look forward to receiving these for review.		
	Transport Assessment Due to the scale and nature of the proposed development, traffic generated from the proposed development is likely to have an impact on the SRN, in particular the A47 trunk road. As such, National Highways would expect to be consulted on the Transport Assessment which would form a key submission of any forthcoming planning application. We recommend that the Transport Assessment is undertaken in a staged approach with the contents and methodology scoped out with National Highways and Lincolnshire County Council in advance. However, as a starting point, we would suggest that the Transport Assessment be prepared in accordance with Planning Practice Guidance on Travel Plans, Transport Assessments and Statements (March, 2014). In addition, due to the proximity of the site to the SRN, the Transport Assessment should be produced in accordance with DfT Circular 01/2022: The Strategic Road Network and the Delivery of Sustainable Development.	N	As noted above, during the Transport scoping meeting (September 2025) it was agreed with LCC, PCC and NH that the Applicant would produce a TAN instead of a full TA in order to reduce duplication of information across a number of transport deliverables which support **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The TAN is compliant with Planning Practice Guidance on Travel Plans, Transport Assessments and Statements (March, 2014) and the DfT Circular 01/2022: The Strategic Road Network and the Delivery of Sustainable Development.
	In particular, the Transport Assessment may need to include the following to satisfy National Highways: 1. Development proposal details– information about the scale of the proposed development including any phasing, parking, access points, hours/days of operation (for employment uses), timescales for the construction period, and anticipated year of opening. 2. Trip generation – information about the anticipated levels of traffic the development would generate. This should include a breakdown of trips generated for the different land uses within the development site. The data should include an hourly breakdown with a separate breakdown for the SRN peak hours. These are often 08:00-09:00 (AM peak hour) and 17:00-18:00 (PM peak hour). However, the applicant may need to demonstrate that these are the true network peaks in this location.	N	Details on the Scheme can be found in **ES Chapter 2: The Scheme** (Doc. Ref. 6.1). The trip generation, trip distribution and traffic routing pertaining to the Scheme are discussed in section 15.8 of this chapter of the ES. The HGV, AIL and Staff trip routing are also shown in **ES Figures 15-3, 15-4 and 15-5** (Doc. Ref. 6.2). The Scheme is not expected to generate any impact on the SRN in the SRN AM or PM peak hours identified in the comment (08:00 – 09:00 and 17:00 – 18:00) as all trips to and from the site are expected to occur outside of these hours.

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	3. Trip assignment – information about traffic routings in relation to the SRN. This should be presented in absolute numbers and percentages. 4. Depending on the scale and distribution of new trips, it may also be necessary to indicate how traffic associated with the development proposal will impact on the SRN in the peak hours. These impacts should be considered for the site both as a standalone operation, and cumulatively with any wider committed developments. This is necessary to consider whether the development will result in material implications for SRN junctions. 5. Where further assessments are deemed necessary, these should be carried out for the development based on the year of opening. This is the opening year assessment and is to comply with DfT Circular 01/2022. Where the development is to be brought forward in phases, an opening year assessment for each phase will be required. As previously mentioned, we recommend the above assessment work is agreed in a staged approach with the first stage being to agree the trip generation and trip distribution of the various elements of the proposal. This will determine if any further assessments with respect of the SRN are required and the how these should be undertaken.		
	Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) We understand that a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) will be prepared to support this application. The CTMP should identify the period(s) during which construction activities will take place, the number of trips likely or be generated, the types of vehicles involved, and, for heavy construction traffic, an appropriate diversion route or traffic management plan to minimise local impacts. We welcome further information on the routing, timing and management of any special or abnormal deliveries or vehicular movements, as stated in Paragraph 13.10.5.	N	The **OCTMP** (Doc. Ref. 7.13) sets out details regarding abnormal loads, hours of working, access arrangements and compliance and enforcement measures. An information pack containing details on site contact information and complain procedures will be issued to all contractors once they have been confirmed.
	The CTMP should include, but is not limited to, the following details: 1. Hours of working, date works will commence and anticipated completion date/ duration.	N	The **OCTMP** (Doc. Ref. 7.13) sets out details regarding abnormal loads, hours of working, access arrangements and compliance and enforcement measures. An information pack containing details on site contact information and complain procedures will be issued to all contractors once they have been confirmed.

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	2. Anticipated average two-way daily traffic numbers associated with the construction phase of the project. 3. Confirmation of the intended construction access arrangements to and from the site from the SRN (A47). 4. The arrangements for routing of construction vehicles to and from the site. 5. Details of any special or abnormal deliveries or vehicular movements. 6. Site Contact Details responsible for ensuring Health & Safety and handling of complaints. With respect of a CTMP however, National Highways is content that the above can be undertaken post-planning consent ensured through a suitably worded planning condition.		

7.9. The Coal Mining Remediation Authority

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
The Coal Mining Remediation Authority	Thank you for your notification of the 18th September 2025 seeking the views of the Coal Authority on the above. The Coal Authority is a non-departmental public body sponsored by the Department for Energy Security and Net Zero. As a statutory consultee, the Coal Authority has a duty to respond to planning applications and development plans in order to protect the public and the environment in mining areas. The Coal Authority operates under the trading name of the Mining Remediation Authority. The Coal Authority are a statutory consultee under Schedule 1 of The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009, where projects fall within areas of past, present or future coal mining. The Planning team at the Coal Authority have reviewed the coal mining data we hold against the sites identified on the Scheme Location plan submitted for the Meridian Solar farm project. I can confirm that based on the areas identified for the project it does not lie in the defined coalfield.	N	The Applicant notes this acknowledgement and thanks The Coal Mining Remediation Authority for its consultation response.

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	On this basis we have no comments to make on this project and there is no requirement to consult with us further.		

7.10. Natural England

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
Natural England	Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development. Natural England's advice relating to the targeted consultation (24 September until 22 October 2025) is set out below. The comments made within our Section 42 statutory consultation response remain relevant for the project.	N	The Applicant thanks Natural England for its feedback to the targeted consultation and has set out its response below.
	Soil Survey Scope Where the order limits have been amended in various locations, further soil survey is likely required to inform soil handling, reinstatement and the detailed SMP. At the amended locations of the 400kV substation and BESS site (ref 25) and the 132kV substation (ref 31), Natural England query whether the ALC grade of the land was considered in the relocations, and whether the areas of BMV to be disturbed for the lifetime of the development have changed?	N	The location of the 400 kV On-Site Substation and the BESS Compound presented for statutory consultation has not changed, although the overall footprint of the compound has increased. This results in a corresponding increase in the extent of BMV land affected. However, the change reflects a balanced consideration of all relevant environmental and operational constraints. Consolidating all BESS units within a single location in this area provides operational efficiencies, improves emergency response readiness, and reduces impacts associated with traffic and transport and operational noise. It is therefore considered to represent an overall improvement in the Scheme design when assessed across the full suite of environmental factors. Further details are provided within **ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution** (Doc Ref. 6.1). In respect of the 132 kV substation, the revised location within Land Parcel C is situated on Grade 3b land based on the detailed ALC survey. As such, the relocation does not result in an increase in the disturbance of BMV land.
	Ornithology and Functionally Linked Land (FLL) At the amended locations of the 400kV substation and BESS site (ref 25) and the 132kV substation (ref 31), Natural England query whether ornithology survey data was considered in the relocations. Areas known to be valued FLL for SPA birds should be avoided as far as possible. The increased size of the Substation and BESS area may contribute to additional FLL	N	Ornithological data, including the location of FLL, has been considered in the development of the Scheme layout plan. Neither the 400kV On-site Substation and BESS Compound nor the revised location of the 132 kV On-Site Substation Compound on Land Parcel C are adjacent to FLL. Further information on design evolution and the consideration of alternatives is provided within **ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution** (Doc Ref. 6.1).

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	being lost for the lifetime of the project (see ref NE17 of NE's Section 42 response); this should be considered in the ES. With regards to the undergrounding of one section of the cable route (ref 15), this will require alternative construction processes to the remainder of the project; any potential impacts of this, primarily loss or disturbance to FLL, should be considered accordingly. For example, where Horizontal directional Drilling is used, there may be further implications for noise during construction.`		

7.11. Crowland Parish Council

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
Crowland Parish Council	In principle the Council objects to the industrialisation of the countryside from this proposal and particularly when one considers the cumulative effect of vast areas of PV panels, some in place some planned, pylons associated with this proposal and two or three routes of even larger pylons already planned to transmit power to other areas of the country through South Holland.	N	The Applicant thanks Crowland Parish Council; however, 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. 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.
	What is referred to as a small percentage of land to be lost together with the cumulative effect of other similar projects and feed for biomass renewable energy production results in a significant acreage of land being lost to food production endangering food security into the future. No evaluation has been undertaken to understand the amount of land already and potentially out of food production.	N	The Applicant thanks Crowland Parish Council; however, 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. 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.
	Whilst it does not form part of the actual application the council welcomes the enhanced proposals concerning community benefit. The latest indicated sum is much improved from the original proposals but should be further enhanced. As it is not a compulsory element some form of agreement needs to be in place to ensure that in the event of the application being granted provision of the fund would be guaranteed. The sum agreed should be index linked and made available in	N	The Applicant thanks Crowland Parish Council; however, 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. 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**

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	proportion to the area to be developed in each parish affected. However, there should be a clause to allow virement with all parties' agreement to enable major projects to be assisted where necessary. Annual under spend should not be subject to claw back but retained and invested for future projects. As they are an established elected body which has been around for a long time and are likely to continue to exist any administration body should include parish councils. A wide range of interests and organisations should be eligible for consideration for funding. Consideration should be given to assisting public buildings with energy costs.		**Response** (Doc Ref. 5.1). The Applicant considers that the feedback on the Scheme has been adequately addressed through those responses. The Applicant further thanks Crowland Parish Council for its consultation.

7.12. South Holland Internal Drainage Board

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
South Holland Internal Drainage Board	Planning and consenting Most of the proposed scheme, and most of the proposed added land (changes numbered 1-25, 27 and 33-38 in the consultation document) would be 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 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	N	The Applicant notes this comment and thanks South Holland Drainage Board for its feedback to the targeted consultation.
	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: 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 Section 23, Land Drainage Act 1991 Alteration of a watercourse Infilling of watercourse; installation or upgrading of culvert;	N	The Applicant notes the non-exhaustive list of works identified by the Board which would ordinarily require consent under the Board's byelaws and/or the Land Drainage Act 1991. The **Draft DCO** (Doc Ref. 3.1) includes provisions which disapply relevant land drainage byelaws and controls under the Land Drainage Act 1991 insofar as they would otherwise regulate works authorised by the Order. Accordingly, separate consents under the Board's byelaws or section 23 of the Land Drainage Act 1991 would not be required for works authorised by the DCO. The protection of the Board's assets and functions is secured through the drainage authority protective provisions contained in the draft DCO. In addition, the Applicant is continuing to engage with the Board in respect of whether bespoke protective provisions are sought to ensure that the Board's interests are appropriately protected.

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	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		
	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 detail 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). The Board will require detailed drawings to support any application for proposed works that require Board consent. Please note that this consenting requirement is outside of and in addition to the overall consent for the Scheme via a Development Consent Order.		The Applicant notes the Board's intention to continue engaging with the Scheme in respect of watercourses and drainage assets and acknowledges the request for further detail on proposed watercourse crossings. The Applicant notes that details of proposed watercourse crossing locations, purposes and types, together with supporting drawings and data, have recently been provided to the Board by email, including the Watercourse Crossing Schedule, associated drawings and shapefiles. The **Draft DCO** (Doc Ref. 3.1) includes standard protective provisions for drainage authorities and disapplies relevant land drainage byelaws and controls under the Land Drainage Act 1991 insofar as they would otherwise regulate works authorised by the Order. Accordingly, works authorised by the DCO would not be subject to separate consenting requirements under the Board's byelaws or section 23 of the Land Drainage Act 1991. Instead, the protection of the Board's assets and functions, and the approval of detailed information (including detailed drawings and construction methodologies), will be secured through the drainage authority protective provisions. The Applicant is also continuing to engage with the Board in respect of whether bespoke protective provisions are sought, which will further define the process for approval and protection. The Applicant will continue to engage constructively with the Board in accordance with those provisions.
	Land Ownership Thank you for providing a set of Change Plans, in addition to the Targeted Consultation booklet. The Change Plans you provided covered changes 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 12, 13, 16, 17, 21, 24, 25, 27 and 38. We have identified that some of the proposed changes to the Scheme affect parts of Board-owned land (including stretches of watercourses and land adjacent to these). Details are set out in Table 2 below. 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.	N	The Applicant notes the Board's comments regarding Board-owned land affected by the proposed changes. The **Draft DCO** (Doc Ref. 3.1) includes protective provisions for drainage authorities which regulate works affecting Board-owned land and secure the protection of the Board's assets and functions. Where permanent rights are required, these will be secured in accordance with the provisions of the DCO. The Applicant is also continuing to engage with the Board in respect of bespoke protective provisions.
	Board access to watercourses Some parts of the proposed added land overlap with the Board's access strips (as set out in Table 2). The Board has formal agreements with the land owners in these areas to	N	The Applicant notes the Board's comments regarding access strips and Board-maintained watercourses. The **Draft DCO** (Doc Ref. 3.1) includes protective provisions for drainage authorities which secure access to, and the protection of, Board-maintained watercourses and assets. The draft DCO also disapplies relevant land drainage byelaws, such that separate

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	ensure the Board can access the adjacent watercourses at any time. Whether or not a landowner access agreement is in place, the Board's byelaw 10 specifies that Board consent is required for any works within 9m of any Board-maintained watercourse. Please note that this applies to all Board-maintained watercourses (sometimes referred to as arterial watercourses), not only Board-owned watercourses.		consent under byelaw 10 would not be required for works authorised by the Order. The Applicant is continuing to engage with the Board on bespoke protective provisions.
	Habitat enhancement We note that the project proposes habitat reinstatement and enhancement at some locations, for example within Change 24 close to the proposed BESS and converter station. 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/or the opportunity to comment on, any habitat enhancement within 9m of any Board-maintained watercourses.	N	The Applicant notes the Board's comments regarding habitat enhancement near Board-maintained watercourses. The **Draft DCO** (Doc Ref. 3.1) includes protective provisions for drainage authorities which secure access for maintenance and regulate works in proximity to watercourses. The Applicant is also continuing to engage with the Board on bespoke protective provisions.
	Table 2: Board-owned land and Board access agreement areas potentially affected by the proposed changes to the Scheme – based on the 16no. Change Plans provided to the Board by the Scheme as part of the current Targeted Consultation. **(number allocated by SHIDB): CP1** • Location: Land west of Wiseman's gate • Change number (as shown in Targeted Consultation material): Change 2 • Is added land within SHIDB land ownership?: No • Is added land within area of SHIDB/landowner access agreement?: No **(number allocated by SHIDB): CP2** • Location: Land north of Holbeach Road • Change number (as shown in Targeted Consultation material): Change 4 • Is added land within SHIDB land ownership?: Yes – part of Lord's Drain	N	The Applicant notes Table 2 and the identification of Board-owned land and access agreement areas potentially affected by the proposed changes. These areas will be appropriately protected through the drainage authority protective provisions in the draft DCO and ongoing engagement on bespoke protective provisions.

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	• Is added land within area of SHIDB/landowner access agreement?: Yes – three access strips affected by order limits extension **(number allocated by SHIDB): CP3** • Location: Land north of Wool Hall Farm • Change number (as shown in Targeted Consultation material): Close to Change 4 • Is added land within SHIDB land ownership?: No • Is added land within area of SHIDB/landowner access agreement?: No **(number allocated by SHIDB): CP4** • Location: Land east of Wheat Mere Drain, north of High Road • Change number (as shown in Targeted Consultation material): Close to Change 4 • Is added land within SHIDB land ownership?: Yes – part of Wheatmere Drain • Is added land within area of SHIDB/landowner access agreement?: Yes – access strip along west bank of Wheatmere Drain **(number allocated by SHIDB): CP5** • Location: Land between Wheat Mere Drain and Swindler's Drove • Change number (as shown in Targeted Consultation material): Change 5 • Is added land within SHIDB land ownership?: No • Is added land within area of SHIDB/landowner access agreement?: No **(number allocated by SHIDB): CP6** • Location: Land crossing Broadgate, drain to west and part of drain to east • Change number (as shown in Targeted Consultation material): Change 6 • Is added land within SHIDB land ownership?: No • Is added land within area of SHIDB/landowner access agreement?: No		

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	(number allocated by SHIDB): CP7 • Location: Part of Broadgate and land to east, including part of drain north of buildings • Change number (as shown in Targeted Consultation material): Change 7 • Is added land within SHIDB land ownership?: No • Is added land within area of SHIDB/landowner access agreement?: No **(number allocated by SHIDB): n/a** • Location: North of Austendike Road • Change number (as shown in Targeted Consultation material): Change 8 • Is added land within SHIDB land ownership?: No • Is added land within area of SHIDB/landowner access agreement?: Yes - Small spur extends across access strips on west side of Claxton's drain **(number allocated by SHIDB): n/a** • Location: South of Austendike Road • Change number (as shown in Targeted Consultation material): Change 10 • Is added land within SHIDB land ownership?: No • Is added land within area of SHIDB/landowner access agreement?: Yes – added land extends over access strips north and south of Austendike drain, immediately south of Austendike Road **(number allocated by SHIDB): CP8** • Location: Part of West Gate and drain to west of West Gate • Change number (as shown in Targeted Consultation material): Change 12 • Is added land within SHIDB land ownership?: Yes – Board-owned drains to east and west of West Gate. Query Board ownership on west side of West Gate between drain and road. • Is added land within area of SHIDB/landowner access agreement?: Yes – access strip on west side of drain		

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	west of West Gate, and on east side of drain east of West Gate **(number allocated by SHIDB): CP9** • Location: West of Delgate Bank • Change number (as shown in Targeted Consultation material): Change 13 • Is added land within SHIDB land ownership?: Yes – Board-owned drain west of Delgate Bank • Is added land within area of SHIDB/landowner access agreement?: Yes – access strip along west side of drain. **(number allocated by SHIDB): CP10** • Location: North west corner of Sewage Works • Change number (as shown in Targeted Consultation material): Change 14 • Is added land within SHIDB land ownership?: No • Is added land within area of SHIDB/landowner access agreement?: No **(number allocated by SHIDB): CP10** • Location: Land south of Sewage Works • Change number (as shown in Targeted Consultation material): Change 16 • Is added land within SHIDB land ownership?: Yes – spur of added land extends into Board-owned drain (Moulton Mere) east of added land. • Is added land within area of SHIDB/landowner access agreement?: No, but access strip on east side of Moulton Mere drain **(number allocated by SHIDB): CP11** • Location: Land west of Delgate Bank • Change number (as shown in Targeted Consultation material): Change 17 • Is added land within SHIDB land ownership?: Yes – added land includes small section of Board-owned drain (Delgate Drain)		

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	• Is added land within area of SHIDB/landowner access agreement?: Yes, added land includes small section of access strip on west side of Delgate drain **(number allocated by SHIDB): CP12** • Location: Part of Delgate Bank and land to west and to east of Delgate Bank • Change number (as shown in Targeted Consultation material): Change 17 • Is added land within SHIDB land ownership?: Yes – added land includes small section of Board-owned drain (Delgate Drain) • Is added land within area of SHIDB/landowner access agreement?: Yes, added land includes small section of access strip on west side of Delgate Drain **(number allocated by SHIDB): CP13** • Location: Part of Crowland Bypass, crossing Wheat Mere Drain and part of field to east • Change number (as shown in Targeted Consultation material): Change 21 • Is added land within SHIDB land ownership?: Yes – Board owns Wheat Mere Drain • Is added land within area of SHIDB/landowner access agreement?: Yes, access strip along western side of Wheat Mere Drain and three lateral access strips crossing Crowland bypass within added land area **(number allocated by SHIDB): CP14** • Location: Field edge east of Crowland bypass • Change number (as shown in Targeted Consultation material): Change 24 • Is added land within SHIDB land ownership?: Yes – Board owns South Holland Main Drain (runs East-West along northern field boundary) and strip of land to south of this drain (just north of proposed new BESS / substation site, in third field north of Queen's Bank) • Is added land within area of SHIDB/landowner access agreement?: No		

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	(number allocated by SHIDB): CP14 • Location: Land immediately north of Queen's Bank and immediately east of Crowland bypass • Change number (as shown in Targeted Consultation material): Change 27 • Is added land within SHIDB land ownership?: No • Is added land within area of SHIDB/landowner access agreement?: Added land covers Board's access to Board-maintained drain along eastern edge of Crowland bypass **(number allocated by SHIDB): CP15** • Location: Land immediately south of South Holland Main Drain and immediately west of Gott's Drain, and additional strip of land north and west of South Holland Main Drain • Change number (as shown in Targeted Consultation material): Change 38 • Is added land within SHIDB land ownership?: Yes, additional land includes small part of Board-owned drain, South Holland Main Drain • Is added land within area of SHIDB/landowner access agreement?: Yes, access strip along western edge of Gott's drain **(number allocated by SHIDB): CP16** • Location: Land south of Langary Gate Farm and east of Fleet Drain • Change number (as shown in Targeted Consultation material): Change 38 • Is added land within SHIDB land ownership?: No • Is added land within area of SHIDB/landowner access agreement?: Yes, access strip along western edge of Fleet Drain		
	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 detail of proposed watercourse crossing locations, crossing purpose (e.g. temporary haul road crossings, permanent access crossings, overhead power cable crossings and any underground	N	The Applicant notes the Board's comments. Details of proposed watercourse crossing locations, purposes and types, together with supporting drawings, have recently been provided to the Board by email. The **Draft DCO** (Doc Ref. 3.1) includes protective provisions for drainage authorities and disapplies relevant land drainage byelaws and Land Drainage Act 1991 controls in respect of

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	crossings) and type (e.g. bridge or culvert). The Board will require detailed drawings to support any application for proposed works that require Board consent. Please note that this consenting requirement is outside of and in addition to the overall consent for the Scheme via a Development Consent Order.		works authorised by the Order. Accordingly, separate consenting under the Board's byelaws or section 23 would not be required. The Applicant is also continuing to engage with the Board on bespoke protective provisions.
	Cost recovery The Board will seek recovery of cost for time spent on this targeted consultation, in addition to other pre-application costs.	N	The Applicant notes this and thanks South Holland Drainage Board for its consultation.

7.13. Network Rail

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
Network Rail	To whom it may concern I write in respect of your consultation under Section 42 of the Planning Act 2008 (as amended). Having considered all details of this consultation, I can confirm that Network Rail wishes to make the following comments: Network Rail is a statutory undertaker responsible for maintaining and operating the railway infrastructure as well as both its associated assets and estates. Network Rail owns, operates, maintains, and develops the main rail network. Since Network Rail aims to protect and enhance the railway infrastructure, any proposed development from a third-party developer to be built either near the railway line or which could potentially affect our specific assets and/or land interests, will need to be carefully considered.	N	The Applicant notes this comment and the capacity in which Network Rail has responded.
	Impact on Infrastructure Since your proposal may involve interaction with Network Rail's operational railway, it is strongly advised that you take all potential areas of concern to Network Rail into account, in their documentation for consideration at planning. Therefore, it is imperative that Network Rail's Asset Protection team in the eastern region be consulted directly by you, to ensure that all risks to our railway infrastructure are safely managed from all	N	The Applicant notes this comment. The Applicant engaged with Network Rail during pre-application discussions and confirmed that Network Rail has no active land, assets or operational railway infrastructure within the Order limits, and that its interests are limited to historic rights only. Accordingly, it was confirmed that no protective provisions for Network Rail are required in the draft Development Consent Order.

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	construction-related activities associated with your proposed development.		
	Investigation and Mitigation Network Rail must understand the full impact of your proposed development on all our infrastructure in the vicinity. This further understanding should identify improvements and/or mitigations required to facilitate your proposed development. As such, these will need to be funded by you to ensure the safe and efficient running of our operational railway. A Basic Asset Protection Agreement and/ or a Structures Agreement /Asset Protection Agreement with Network Rail may be required before you can proceed with any design or construction work alongside, above or below Network Rail's Infrastructure. Therefore, we request that you engage with Network Rail's Asset Protection Eastern team (AssetProtectionEastern@networkrail.co.uk). Network Rail have their own standard protective provisions for third-party developments that could potentially have an impact on Network Rail's operational railways, land and/or assets, and these must be included on the face of the DCO, as a minimum. To request a copy of our protective provisions and discuss any other agreements that will need to be entered with Network Rail, it is recommended that you contact both [redacted]@networkrail.co.uk and [redacted]@networkrail.co.uk through each of their respective email addresses	N	The Applicant notes Network Rail's comments regarding investigation, mitigation and asset protection. The Applicant engaged with Network Rail during preapplication discussions and confirmed that Network Rail has no active land, assets or operational railway infrastructure within the Order limits / red line boundary of the Scheme, and that its interests are limited to historic rights only. On that basis, it was confirmed that the Scheme would not interact with Network Rail's operational railway and that no Basic Asset Protection Agreement, Structures Agreement or protective provisions for Network Rail are required in the draft Development Consent Order.
	Several legal and commercial agreements might also need to be entered, for example, method statements, connection agreements, property agreements as well as any other relevant legal and commercial agreements that are deemed necessary. Please note that this list is not exhaustive and will need to be reviewed after further details of the scheme are discussed between both parties. In addition, any easements required by you are required to go through Network Rail's business and technical clearance processes, as well as all other relevant rail industry processes. Please note that Network Rail reserves the right to change its position in relation to any further information received about	N	The Applicant notes Network Rail's comments regarding potential legal and commercial agreements. As confirmed through pre-application engagement, Network Rail has no active land, assets or operational railway infrastructure within the Order limits / red line boundary of the Scheme, and its interests are limited to historic rights only. On that basis, it was confirmed that the Scheme would not interact with Network Rail's operational railway, and that no easements, asset protection agreements, method statements or protective provisions for Network Rail are required in connection with the Development Consent Order.

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	your proposed DCO and/or its impacts on Network Rail's operational railways, land and/or assets.		
	On another note, you should be made aware of the likely possibility that you may be responsible for all charges and/or costs associated with Network Rail in relation to the proposed DCO. Thank you again for providing Network Rail with the opportunity to comment on this Section 42 Consultation. I trust that the above comments have been made clear, however, if you do require any further information or have any other queries, then please do not hesitate to contact me	N	As confirmed through pre-application engagement, Network Rail has no active land, assets or operational railway infrastructure within the Order limits / red line boundary of the Scheme, and its interests are limited to historic rights only. On that basis, no interaction with Network Rail's operational railway is anticipated and no protective provisions, agreements or associated cost recovery arrangements are required in relation to the Scheme.

7.14. Fenland District Council

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
Fenland District Council	Fenland District Council has reviewed the targeted consultation materials. At this stage, we have no further comments beyond those set out in our Relevant Representation of 4th June 2025 (attached again for reference).	N	The Applicant notes this acknowledgement.
	The issues raised in that response remain outstanding, particularly around • Cumulative construction impacts in the context of other major infrastructure projects; • The loss of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) agricultural land; and The need for meaningful community benefits – including nearby communities in Fenland.	N	Details of the approach and assessment of the cumulative effects are included in **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref. 6.1) Section 15.11. The ES includes a cumulative assessment of other proposed developments in the study area. The list of cumulative proposed developments for review has been agreed with the LHAs and includes the proposed developments listed. The cumulative assessment presented in **ES Chapter 5: Agriculture and Soils** (Doc Ref. 6.1) concludes that while there is an additive effect of multiple solar schemes, the proportion of agricultural and BMV land affected at a county scale is small and largely temporary, with permanent loss of BMV land minimal. On this basis, cumulative effects on agricultural land, food production and food security are assessed as not significant. The **OSMP** (Doc Ref. 7.14) sets out the careful stripping, storage and reinstatement of soils, and to decommissioning the Scheme in a manner that seeks to restore all agricultural land to its pre-development condition without degradation of the current ALC grade. The SMP will be prepared in accordance with the measures set out in the **OSMP** (Doc Ref. 7.14) and will be secured by way of Requirement in the **Draft DCO** (Doc Re. 3.1). Any minor post-restoration variability would be monitored and addressed as necessary.

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
			Details of the Applicant's approach to community benefits, education initiatives and wider socio-economic opportunities are provided in the **Planning Statement** (Doc Ref 7.1) and the **Outline Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan** (Doc Ref. 7.17).
	Since June, aside from a generic acknowledgement, a request for landscape information, and a very recent email requesting a brief meeting engagement with the Council has been limited. Given the scale of the proposal, this lack of structured dialogue is disappointing. We therefore encourage the project team to engage more consistently with the Council as the scheme progresses. In particular, we would welcome discussion of a Planning Performance Agreement (PPA) to ensure appropriate resourcing and to provide a clear framework for collaboration.	N	The Applicant notes the Council's comments regarding engagement and acknowledges the request for more structured dialogue as the Scheme progresses. The Applicant considers that engagement to date has been appropriate for this stage in the process and in line with the requirements of the PA2008 and relevant legislation and guidance. Subsequent meetings have taken place between the Applicant and officer's at Fenland District Council. The Applicant thanks Fenland District Council for its consultation and welcomes further discussions regarding the matters raised, if required.

7.15. Lincolnshire County Council

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
Lincolnshire County Council	Meridian Solar – Targeted Consultation 24 September - 22 October 2025 Thank you for your letter dated 22 September 2025 inviting Lincolnshire County Council (LCC) to comment as part of a targeted consultation exercise that is being carried out to gather feedback on a number of localised changes to the Scheme since the version shared within the Statutory Consultation. LCC as host authority has reviewed the information provided and set out the comments below. LCC responded to Meridian Solar Project Statutory Consultation, response dated 06 June 2025. Notwithstanding any comments raised in this response, please be advised that LCC's response to the Statutory Consultation of 6 June 2025 remains valid and should be read alongside the comments provided in this letter.	N	The Applicant notes this comment and thanks Lincolnshire County Council for its response to the targeted consultation.
	Order Limit Extension LCC note the extensions to the Meridian Solar Order Limits proposed within the consultation information booklet. The extensions to the Order Limits do not raise any 'new' issues.	N	The Applicant notes this comment. In terms of land drainage this is assessed within **ES Chapter 11: Hydrology and Flood Risk** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The **ES Appendix 11-3: FRA** (Doc Ref 6.3) includes consideration of the effects on the surface water drainage strategy and sets out measures to ensure that impacts are appropriately mitigated. **ES Appendix 11-4: Outline**

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	LCC would refer to previous comments made within the Statutory Consultation response, per topic areas. It is noted that the expansions do include some additional area of County Farms Land. As such, the inclusion of this additional land will inevitably increase the overall impact of the issues LCC previously highlighted. These issues include impacts upon land drainage and agricultural land. Lincolnshire Fire and Recuse (LFR) would need to ensure proposed changes to site layouts, access and egress are in line with minimum standards as outlined in the NFCC guidance.		**Drainage Strategy** (doc Ref. 6.3) incorporates sustainable drainage systems and pollution control measures to manage surface water. The mitigation measures to be followed during construction and decommissioning set out in the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10) and **ODEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.12) will be secured by the detailed CEMP and DEMP secured by way of Requirement in the **Draft DCO** (Doc Ref. 3.1). This includes measures to control fine sediment laden runoff and manage the risk from chemical spillages, physical damage to water features, any dewatering or flood risk during the works. In terms of agricultural land, this is assessed in **ES Chapter 5: Agricultural Soils** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The **OSMP** (Doc Ref. 7.14) includes measures to protect soil structure and function throughout construction and operation, including careful handling, storage, and reinstatement of soils. These measures are designed to ensure that the soil resource is safeguarded and that agricultural capability is not degraded over the lifetime of the Scheme. In response to the concern re. Lincolnshire FRS, as stated within the **OBSMP** (Doc Ref.7.18) the BESS compound will be in line with NFCC guidance. It will have security fencing with a minimum of two points of ingress / egress for first responders and will be clearly signed, with incident emergency response contact details, clear identification of BESS site hazards, details of site access arrangements such as key codes, which will be provided to the LFR.
	Ecology LCC would highlight the following in relation to ecology. 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. Where new drain / 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.	N	Ecological survey data has been 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)
	Agricultural Land Change (30) proposes the reconfiguration of the scheme layout of Parcel B to move solar PV panels away from areas at higher risk of flooding, with the land now proposed for habitat mitigation or enhancement instead. It is stated that updated surveys have confirmed that land in the central part of Parcel B where the panels are now proposed, previously assumed to be Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) Grade 1, is predominantly Grade 3a, with small areas of Grade 2. This has resulted in the proposal to move solar panels out of flood zone 3b. LCC would	N	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).

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	highlight that although the ALC grade previously assumed to be grade 1 is of a lower grade classification, grades 2 and 3a (very good quality agricultural land and good quality agricultural land respectively) are still classified as Best and Most Versatile (BMV) and LCCs stance remains that development of land classified as BMV should be avoided. LCC refers to more detailed comments within Chapter 9 of the statutory consultation comments.		
	Access LCC note the slight alterations proposed to be modified within this consultation. LCC are actively engaging with the applicant with regard to the revised scheme and have no comments to make during this consultation.	N	The Applicant notes and confirms this.
	Archaeology LCC has been actively engaging with the applicant regarding archaeological approach, the applicant has committed to trenching areas of change. LCC have no further comments at this stage.	N	The Applicant notes and confirms this.
	Hydrology and Flood Risk It is noted that large areas of the proposed Order Limits fall within flood zones 2 and 3 as shown within PEIR Volume II figure 8-1. Although the proposed Order Limits have altered, the extent of development occurring within Flood Zones 2 and 3 remains considerable. LCC notes the proposed changes to reconfigure the layout of parcel B and the relocation of one of the 132kV substations from land parcel B to C to move sensitive equipment away from land with higher flood risk. LCC notes the intention to provide a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) in support of the Environmental Statement (ES) which would address the applicants approach to, and results from, the sequential test. LCC would wish to see the applicants assessment of reasonably available alternative sites and how those were discounted in favour of the current proposed order limits which fall almost entirely within flood zones 2 and 3.	N	The **Flood Risk Assessment ES Appendix 11-3** (Doc Ref. 6.3) presents mitigation measures included within the design and demonstrates how the Sequential Test and Exception Test have been met. This is also summarised in the **Planning Statement** (Doc Ref. 7.1).
	Landscape and Visual AAH Consultants have reviewed the Meridian Solar Farm: Targeted Consultation (24th September - 22nd October 2025) on behalf of LCC, with regards to Landscape and Visual	N	The Applicant notes this comment.

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	matters. The Targeted Consultation document contains changes (post-PEIR) 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 (25th September EN010169) and Meridian Solar Targeted Consultation document (24th September -22nd October 2025). This review takes into account previous AAH comments (Refer to Meridian Solar Farm Technical Memos, TMO1: Landscape and Scoping Opinion, and TM02: Initial Viewpoint Comments, TM03: PEIR Comments), as well as meetings/discussions held with the Applicant team and any subsequent meeting minutes. 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.		
	BESS moved to 400kV substation to avoid housing adjacent to Land parcels A, C, D. The location selected to consolidate the BESS with a 400kV substation is characterised by an open landscape of flat fields, drainage ditches and long horizons with scattered boundary vegetation. The Site is located in the countryside between the small settlements of Crowland and Cowbit. The Site itself is a large, flat, square, arable agricultural field defined by South Holland Main Drain on its northern edge. This drain intersects with Wheatmere Drain which runs parallel to the A16 on the Site's western side. Smaller drains define the Site's boundaries on its southern and eastern sides. There is very little vegetation on the Site itself, boundaries are open with no fencing, and consist mainly of ditches and long marsh grasses. Adjacent to north western corner of the Site, the A16 is edged with vegetation which extends north, on both sides of the road, containing views of properties located on Peak Hill which are 350m to the north west of the Site. This vegetation consists mainly of native shrub species including dogrose and hawthorn. The only other properties near the Site are on Queen's bank 640m to the north east. These properties	N	The likely significant effects of the new BESS location on landscape and visual have been assessed within **ES Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual** (Doc Ref. 6.1).

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	have intervening shelter belts and garden vegetation which will reduce their visual exposure to the proposed development.		
	The A16 is a busy route mostly used by locals and freight; however, it is also likely to be used by some higher sensitivity receptors including tourists visiting local historic centres like Crowland. The traffic noise from the A16 detracts from the location's otherwise tranquil and undeveloped character. Visually, this location contributes to the perception of this landscape as an undeveloped and predominately agricultural landscape. There are no core paths on the Site or immediately adjacent to it, but further to the east, terminating at Eaugate Road, there is a Bridleway (Moul/7/1) running along the northern edge of the South Holland Main Drain. This route is part of an extensive network that reaches as far east as Kings Lynn and beyond. Looking at aerial photographs, although not officially core path, farm tracks continue along the South Holland Main Drain past the Site and there is a bridge, crossing at the Site's north western corner, allowing access to a track along Wheatmere Drain, and an underpass below the A16, which leads to other bridleways south of Cowbit. It seems likely that these are permissive routes that attract sensitive receptors like walkers and horse riders.	N	The traffic likely significant effects of the Scheme have been assessed within **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref. 6.1).
	This Site is very open; but as mentioned above, there is some localised vegetation on A16 verges, on the north western corner of the site, and this could be extended further south to limit views of the development from the A16, and the layby on its eastern side. However, it is unlikely that this approach will completely contain views of the proposal, and any vegetation added to this location, will change its character from open to more enclosed. There are no trees or woodland in the immediate vicinity and the flatness of the location precludes the use of bunding. Overall, the proposed Site is in an open and prominent location, between settlements, where development will change the rural character of this landscape. The proposal will introduce large man-made buildings with materials, scale and mass uncharacteristic of the location. Mitigation options are limited and the proposed BESS will be prominent in the local landscape and seen from the A16 and adjacent trackways. It is	N	The landscape and visual effects of the Scheme including the On-Site Substation and BESS Compound 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). As illustrated on Figure 1 Outline Landscape Masterplan of the OLEMP (Doc Ref. 7.16), existing vegetation will be retained and enhanced with new planting to provide screening for the BESS / on-site substation.

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	anticipated that the development proposal in this location will result in some significant change to landscape character and the visual setting.		
	Parcel B reconfigured to move solar away from flood zone The reconfiguration of the solar arrays relocates them approximately 500m further north and west into adjacent fields. The solar arrays will be located into two larger and more rectangular fields, with Cox's Drain on their western edge, and Whipchicken Farm on their south western corner. These fields are flat and arable, edged by drainage ditches, with very little vegetation, except isolated clumps of trees, around the farmhouse, and an island of trees around a square ditch, to the north east of the farm house. These fields form part of an open landscape with small clumps of trees on the distant horizon. These fields are mostly viewed at distance, with larger roads like the A16, located 800m to the west; the B116, located 1.7km to the south; and Martin's Road, located 1.1km to the east. Views from the east are contained by a tree lined linear embankment (which was a former railway line). A small access road called Whipchicken Road connects with Whipchicken farmhouse via an underpass below the A16. Whipchicken Road leads to Cox's Drain, a minor road, that passes the western side of the Site, connecting the B1166 in the south, and Queens bank in the north. Cox's Drain is not a through route, and is unlikely to be used by sensitive receptors like tourists.	N	The landscape and visual effects of the Solar Development Area 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). It is noted that the Whipchicken Farm buildings within the Site are semi-derelict agricultural buildings used for the storage of materials, with no residential use.
	The nearest PROW/ Bridleway is on Queens Bank 1.5km to the north east. There are few properties adjacent or close to the Site, other than Whipchicken farm. The nearest property beyond this is Thornbury Hall, off Whipchicken Road, 600m to the south west. Again, the conclusion is that there are few potentially sensitive receptors in this location. The proposed changes to the Solar arrays will bring them closer to Whipchicken Farm and cover more land to the north of the farm. This is likely to have a negative impact on the inhabitants of this property as it will replace their rural views of open fields with views of solar arrays. The proposed changes will also negatively impact on the island of trees north east of the farmhouse which will also become surrounded by solar	N	The landscape and visual effects of the Solar Development Area 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). It is noted that the Whipchicken Farm buildings within the Site are semi-derelict agricultural buildings used for the storage of materials, with no residential use.

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	arrays. It is unknown what this landscape feature is (maybe a duck decoy), and as it may have a historic significance, the impact of the development on it should be fully investigated. It will be appropriate to ensure that these features are protected by setbacks from the development and that links (or corridors) with the wider landscape are maintained.		
	Overall, this is an open, but not prominent location, with few main roads or properties in the vicinity. Where the Site can be seen, it will be viewed at distance and seen in the context of the wider landscape. It is anticipated that the modifications to the design proposal in this location are unlikely to result in significant effects on the wider landscape character or visual environment. However, there are localised features, like Whipchicken farm, and a possible duck decoy, that may require adjustments to the proposal to ensure that their setting in the wider landscape is respected.	N	The landscape and visual effects of the 132kV On-Site Substation in Parcel C 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). As illustrated on Figure 1 Outline Landscape Masterplans of the **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16), existing vegetation will be retained and enhanced with new planting to provide screening for the substation. It is noted that the Whipchicken Farm buildings within the Site are semi-derelict agricultural buildings used for the storage of materials, with no residential use and a possible duck decoy are not classed as landscape receptors.
	132kV substation moved from Parcel B to Parcel C to avoid flood zone The proposed relocation of the 132kV substation will see it moved from a location 300m south of Queens Bank Farm, to a location 1.2km further east and 400m west of Martins Farm (on Martins Road). The new location is a triangular shaped arable field that lies adjacent to a dismantled railway on its western side. This boundary is characterised by a raised embankment and a line of vegetation consisting of hawthorn and mature trees. The Site's southern boundary is also vegetated with a field ditch, hedgerow and a small triangular area of woodland off Hardy's Lane. The Site's eastern boundaries consist of a field ditch and a long hedgerow. This hedgerow also forms the western boundary of two smaller adjacent fields that lie adjacent to Martin's Farm. The Site's northern boundary is more open, with no vegetation, and a boundary defined by a field ditch.	N	The landscape and visual effects of the 132kV On-Site Substation in Parcel C 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). As illustrated on Figure 1 Outline Landscape Masterplans of the **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16), existing vegetation will be retained and enhanced with new planting to provide screening for the substation.
	Overall, this new location is better contained within the landscape by existing vegetation, including the former railway embankment, and is a better option than that previously selected. The Site is only open to views from the north (from Queen's bank) where there is potential to reinforce this	N	The landscape and visual effects of the 132kV On-Site Substation in Parcel C 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).

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	boundary with new planting along an existing ditch. However, even with this new planting, the proposed substation buildings will still be seen, at distance, on the horizon; but at least its form will be broken up and better integrated into the landscape. From other directions, the existing planting will also help to break up the form of the buildings, and help to reduce their impact, but it will not completely contain views of the buildings. The substation will still bring change to this open landscape, but this is a Site that is relatively well suited to accommodating this.		As illustrated on Figure 1 Outline Landscape Masterplans of the **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16), existing vegetation will be retained and enhanced with new planting to provide screening for the substation.
	Parcel D reconfigured to move away from properties The reconfiguration of Solar panels in Parcel D will see one large array replaced by three smaller arrays, in the fields near Northwood Farm; and one larger array, re-located 2km further north, on Langary Gate Road, near the Decoy Bridge crossing of South Holland Main Drain. The three smaller arrays are defined by field ditches, with one array located to the west of Langary Gate Road, and two located to the east of it. Each smaller array is located within a narrow, rectangular parallelogram, shaped field, approximately 400 – 700m apart from the others. The larger array, located 2km further north, is in a wider and squarer parallelogram shaped field, on the eastern side of Langary Road, 300m north west of Glasshouse Farm on North Road.	N	The landscape and visual effects of the Solar Development Area are summarised within Section 12.8 of **ES Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual** and detailed within **ES Appendix 12-4: Landscape Assessment** (Doc Ref. 6.3) and **ES Appendix 12-6: Visual Assessment** (Doc Ref. 6.3). Figure 1 Outline Landscape Masterplans of the **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16) illustrates the landscape mitigation proposals in Parcel D, including buffers around Site boundaries, shrub and tree planting on field boundaries and areas adjacent to residential properties, which have been left undeveloped.
	There are several roads that run parallel with each other north / south past the proposed arrays. These include Holbeach Drove (B1168), which passes west of the smaller arrays, at approximately 500m distance, and the west of the larger array at 1.4km distance. Langary Gate Road which passes between the three smaller arrays, on their western and eastern boundaries, and along the eastern boundary of the larger array. North Road which runs from the settlement of Gedney Hill, east past the smaller arrays at approximately 500m distance, and east past the larger array at 200m distance. All of these roads will carry mostly local traffic, with the "B" road busier than the other routes. User of these roads are unlikely to be highly sensitive receptors, but it will help the arrays integrate with the wider landscape if some intermittent visual containment is provided along these roads. There are	N	The landscape and visual effects of the Solar Development Area are summarised within Section 12.8 of **ES Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual** and detailed within **ES Appendix 12-4: Landscape Assessment** (Doc Ref. 6.3) and **ES Appendix 12-6: Visual Assessment** (Doc Ref. 6.3). Figure 1 Outline Landscape Masterplans of the **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16) illustrates the landscape mitigation proposals in Parcel D, including buffers around Site boundaries, shrub and tree planting on field boundaries and areas adjacent to residential properties, which have been left undeveloped.

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	small blocks of woodland and vegetated boundaries in the locality which could be replicated to achieve this. Additionally, there is localised tree planting associated with nearby Fleet Coy Farm.		
	There are no PROWs close to the three smaller arrays, with the nearest PROW being (GEDH/4/1) near Gedney Hill Golf Club, located 700m south east. This route is screened from the arrays, by intervening settlement including Pinders Cross Farm. The larger northern array lies adjacent to South Holland Drain. This channel has PROW on both its sides (Bridleways – Flee/7/1 and Flee/38/2). The southern bridleway passes adjacent to the northern array's boundary. The South Holland PROWs are part of a wider network that extends far to the east with links to Kings Lynn and beyond. A setback on this boundary for mitigation planting would be beneficial, and would reduce views between the northern solar array site and the PROWs. This planting will also reduce the visual impact of the northern array on the adjacent property known as Travellers Rest located on the northern bank of South Holland Drain.	N	The landscape and visual effects of the Solar Development Area are summarised within Section 12.8 of **ES Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual** and detailed within **ES Appendix 12-4: Landscape Assessment** (Doc Ref. 6.3) and **ES Appendix 12-6: Visual Assessment** (Doc Ref. 6.3). Figure 1 Outline Landscape Masterplans of the **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16) illustrates the landscape mitigation proposals in Parcel D, including buffers around Site boundaries, shrub and tree planting on field boundaries and areas adjacent to residential properties, which have been left undeveloped.
	The properties close to the array locations are limited in number. Those close to the three smaller southern arrays include Cheviot House, Waltons Farm, Poplar Cottage, The Poplars and Northwood House Farm. Properties in the vicinity of the larger northern array include Travellers Rest and Glasshouse Farm. These properties are typically detached and located along Holbeach Drove Gate, Langary Gate Road or North Road. Most of these properties have gardens or grounds with vegetation that will limit views towards the arrays. Some of these properties are commercial premises and places of work and will not be used by sensitive receptors. Overall, the proposed reconfiguration will result in more arrays spread throughout this locality. The larger northern array is of a similar size to that originally proposed, meaning that the three smaller arrays will increase array coverage in this landscape. For this approach to work, undeveloped land around and between the arrays will need to be retained and enhanced with mitigation in keeping with the local context. There is potential for green corridors, boundary setbacks, boundary planting and small woodland blocks to be used to	N	The landscape and visual effects of the Solar Development Area 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). Figure 1 Outline Landscape Masterplans of the **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16) illustrates the landscape mitigation proposals in Parcel D, including buffers around Site boundaries, shrub and tree planting on field boundaries and areas adjacent to residential properties, which have been left undeveloped.

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	achieve this. Without mitigation, there is a danger that the dispersal of the panels into multiple locations will have a more wide spread negative impact both visually, and on landscape character, than the one single array as originally proposed.		
	Section of line undergrounded The undergrounding of a proposed section of the grid connection will result in the construction of two Cable Sealing End Compounds (CSECs). These compounds will appear as square fenced structures, containing electrical equipment, on either side of the existing overhead power line. The proposed site for the CSECs is in fields west of Moulton Mere drain, and west of Delgate Bank. Also in this locality, is a sewage works which will lie approximately 50m southeast of the northern CSEC, and 170m north east of the southern CSEC. The sewage works is accessed via a concrete road from Delgate Bank, and the proposed undergrounding will travel beneath this road as well as the overhead cabling.	N	It is acknowledged that undergrounding introduces new above-ground infrastructure (CSECs) The close proximity of the sewage works is also noted. The landscape and visual effects of the Cable Sealing End Compounds have been assessed 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). In terms of mitigation, it is not possible to propose tree and shrub planting to the north and south of the Cable Sealing End Compounds, as it would interfere with the overhead line and cabling infrastructure. However, screening planting has been proposed to the east and west of the compounds, as illustrated on Figure 1 Outline Landscape Masterplans of the **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16).
	The nearest properties to the proposed CSECs are located along Delgate Bank and include Swanpens Farm (350m northwest) which has extensive grounds which consist of multiple fenced equestrian fields surrounded by a ditch. These fields extend to within 150m of the northern CSEC. The next nearest property is Delgate lodge (200m to the south west) which is located in the southwest corner of the field containing the southern CSEC. This is a detached private property with a rear garden consisting of high fencing and mature tree planting. There are also several detached properties known as 'The Sycamores' which overlook the site from West Gate and are located 550m to the north east. Due mostly to distance, the view of the sewage works from West Gate is limited. The existing powerlines, near the proposed CSECs, appear as very small vertical elements on the horizon. The Fen Gate (B1357) passes the site 800m to the east, and from this route, the sewage works is also difficult to discern in the distance. It seems likely that the CSECs will also have very limited visual impact from these locations.	N	The landscape and visual effects of the Cable Sealing End Compounds 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). It is not practicable to propose tree and shrub planting to the north and south of the Cable Sealing End Compounds, as it would interfere with the overhead line and cabling infrastructure. However, screening planting for receptors has been proposed to the east and west of the compounds, as illustrated on Figure 1 Outline Landscape Masterplans of the **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16). The screening planting proposed will also benefit Swanpen Farm.
	Overall, the proposed CSECs will be located in a locality already influenced by man-made development with existing powerlines and a sewage works. This location is relatively	N	The landscape and visual effects of the Cable Sealing End Compounds 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**

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	remote with limited visibility from busier roads and adjacent properties. Those properties that are in the locality, are either sufficiently distant, or are visually contained by intervening garden or boundary vegetation. It will be appropriate to mitigate the visual impact of the proposal on Swanpen Farm by increasing the vegetation on the southern boundary of their fields, and by tree planting around the northern and southern CSECs to break up any cumulative impact between them and the sewage works.		**Assessment** (Doc Ref. 6.3). It is not possible to propose tree and shrub planting to the north and south of the Cable Sealing End Compounds, as it would interfere with the overhead line and cabling infrastructure. However, screening planting has been proposed to the east and west of the compounds, as illustrated on Figure 1 Outline Landscape Masterplans of the **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16).
	Refined location for Weston Marsh substation The refined location for the Weston March substation is generally described as 'Spalding Marsh' and is 800m north west of the A151 bypass around the village of Weston. The A151 is a main road connecting Spalding, and other larger towns to the east, like Holbeach, and also links with the A17, providing access to the north via Fosdyke, and the east towards Kings Lynn. The Site is also 1km to the east of the A16 which bypasses Spalding and passes to the west of the Site. The Site consists of two fields of agricultural land bordered by Rood's lane in the south. Rood's Lane is connected by a PROW (Wstn/3/1) to Wiseman's Gate further east and this link creates a route between the edge of Weston into central Spalding. The route of this PROW runs adjacent to the south eastern corner of the Site where a powerline crosses over the Site and Rood's Lane. The Site's western boundary is defined by Wykeham Lane which links with The Chase in the Site's north western corner. These roads provide access to Wakenham Farm, a private property, which has the ruins of the chapel of St Nicolas, Wykeham (Grade 1 listed) in its grounds. The chapel was formerly part of Wykenham Hall, a moated country residence for the Prior of Spalding. This site is characterised by the remnants of moats, mature trees and garden planting providing a setting for the protected ruins and the farm house. A linear block of mature trees is located outside the grounds of Wakenham Farm, on the Site's north western corner, and these trees, screen views towards the Site from the ruins and the farm. These trees may be a remnant of former moat, and care will need to be taken with any development near this feature to ensure heritage is properly protected.	N	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). The location of the Weston Marsh 400kV Substation has been determined by National Grid Energy Transmission (NGET) as part of the Grimsby to Walpole DCO application. The **Outline ProW-MP** (Doc Ref. 7.15) describes the proposals for the management of PROW Wstn/3/1 during the construction and decommissioning phases. During the operational phase, no management is expected to be required, and the PROW would remain in use. It is not considered that mitigation planting would be able to screen views of the Scheme from the PROW. Effects on Wykeham Chapel Scheduled Monument are assessed within **ES Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage** (Doc Ref. 6.1).

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	The Site's northern boundary is partially open to a field further north which lies adjacent to the eastern edge of the chapel ruins. The other half of the northern boundary is defined by a large field ditch which passes north/ south through the middle of the Site dividing it into two fields. The eastern boundary of the Site is also defined by a field ditch called Lord's Drain. All these field ditches are open with little vegetation and no boundary fencing. Other properties in the vicinity of the Site include Shepard's farm (300m to the north east), Wool Hall Farm (500m to the south), Home Farm (600m to the west) and Whitehouse Farm (600m to the south east). Most of these properties remain working sites and views towards Site are often contained by mature vegetation within their grounds. Baytree Garden Centre (marked as 'other tourist feature' on the OS) is located 850m from the Site on the southern side of the A151 bypass. Views towards the Site from this location are well contained by boundary vegetation between the garden centre and the A151.	N	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). The location of the Weston Marsh 400kV Substation has been determined by National Grid Energy Transmission (NGET) as part of the Grimsby to Walpole DCO application. The **Outline ProW-MP** (Doc Ref. 7.15) describes the proposals for the management of PROW Wstn/3/1 during the construction and decommissioning phases. During the operational phase, no management is expected to be required, and the PROW would remain in use. It is not considered that mitigation planting would be able to screen views of the Scheme from the PROW. Effects on Wykeham Chapel Scheduled Monument are assessed within **ES Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage** (Doc Ref. 6.1).
	Overall, this Site is in a more prominent edge of settlement location with PROW and main roads within its vicinity. It is likely that the substation will detract from the setting of the chapel ruins, but this site is not publicly accessible and it is visually well contained by mature vegetation. However, care will be required to protect this heritage asset during development and mitigation planting on the Site's northern boundary will be necessary. With regards to the PROW, is unclear how well this routeway is used, and mitigation adjacent to it will need to be compatible with the overhead powerlines and the prevailing character of the location which is open ditches. People in surrounding properties and on roads will mostly view the Site at distance with intervening boundary or verge vegetation limiting views. From the south and east looking towards the site, the development will benefit from the vegetated backdrop provided by Wakenham Farm and the chapel ruins site.	N	
	Comments on Order Limits changes: With regard to the landscape and visual issues: Order Limits changes (Pages 10-21)	N	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). The location of the Weston Marsh 400kV Substation has been determined by NGET as part of the Grimsby to Walpole DCO application.

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	1) See Above (Refined location for Weston Marsh substation). The land added will be adjacent to chapel ruins heritage feature and mature trees. Care will be needed to protect the heritage and trees in this location. Mitigation planting, development offsets and Root Protection Zones (RPZ) will be required to protect landscape character.		The **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16) describes the proposed landscape and ecological strategy for planting across the Site. Effects on Wykeham Chapel Scheduled Monument are assessed within **ES Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage** (Doc Ref. 6.1).
	2) The land added could be used for mitigation to reduce the visual impact of the development on users of the A151. Mitigation planting on boundaries should be considered to reduce visual impacts.	N	The **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16) describes the proposed landscape and ecological strategy for planting across the Site which includes mitigation planting on boundaries where practicable.
	3) The land added should allow access to site without vegetation removal. This is an important consideration in this area as existing vegetation limits views towards the development. Development offsets and RPZs likely to be required to preserve existing vegetation. Any vegetation lost should be reinstated in this location to maintain landscape character.	N	Access to the Site is set out within the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13). The access strategy has sought to use existing accesses and existing ditch crossings where practicable, to minimise the amount of works required. As stated in the **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16), the Scheme design minimises the need for the removal of mature trees across the Order Limits. Some removal and pruning of trees will be required to facilitate vehicle access during construction (and operation), and for installation and maintenance of new overhead lines. Where feasible and appropriate, trees of suitable species will be coppiced and protected to facilitate regeneration. An arboriculturist will advise on the appropriate management of trees to be pruned, coppiced or removed. In terms of development offsets, these are contained within the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10). RPZ's are defined within the **ES Appendix 12-8: Arboricultural Impact Assessment** (Doc Ref. 6.3).
	4) This section of the A151 is tree lined and an offset and RPZ will be required to protect the existing trees. Land added could be used for mitigation to reduce the visual impact of the development from the A16 and A151.	N	The **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16) describes the landscape and ecological strategy for planting across the Site. In terms of development offsets, these are contained within the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10). RPZ's are defined within the **ES Appendix 12-8: Arboricultural Impact Assessment** (Doc Ref. 6.3).
	5) Where compatible with overhead lines, mitigation planting on boundaries should be considered to protect landscape character.	N	The **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16) describes the proposed landscape and ecological strategy for planting across the Site. Mitigation planting on boundaries has been incorporated where appropriate/practicable.
	6) Limited road edge vegetation in this location. Temporary negative impacts on landscape or visual context anticipated.	N	The impact of the Scheme on landscape and visual is assessed within **ES Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16) describes the landscape and ecological strategy for planting across the Site. Mitigation planting on boundaries has been incorporated where appropriate/practicable.
	7) Field edge vegetation and disused railway in this location which should be protected and enhanced as likely wildlife corridor and important landscape feature.	N	The **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16) describes the landscape and ecological strategy for planting across the Site. In terms of development offsets, these are contained within the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10). RPZ's and vegetation removals are defined within the **ES Appendix 12-8: Arboricultural Impact Assessment** (Doc Ref. 6.3).

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	Mitigation planting, development offsets and Root Protection Zones (RPZ) will be required.		
	8) Limited road edge vegetation in this location. Mostly open field. Temporary negative impacts on landscape or visual context anticipated.	N	The impact of the Scheme on landscape and visual is assessed within **ES Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16) describes the landscape and ecological strategy for planting across the Site.
	9) Some mature road edge trees in this location that will need offsets and RPZs. Any vegetation lost should be reinstated in this location to retain landscape character.	N	The **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16) describes the landscape and ecological strategy for planting across the Site. In terms of development offsets, these are contained within the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10). RPZ's and vegetation removals are defined within the **ES Appendix 12-8: Arboricultural Impact Assessment** (Doc Ref. 6.3).
	10) This area contains a length of hedgerow that will require protection with offsets and RPZ. This is an important landscape feature that should be retained and enhanced.	N	The **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16) describes the landscape and ecological strategy for planting across the Site. In terms of development offsets, these are contained within the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10). RPZ's and vegetation removals are defined within the **ES Appendix 12-8: Arboricultural Impact Assessment** (Doc Ref. 6.3).
	11) Unknown third-party asset so difficult to comment. Aerial photographs suggest it will be a telegraph pole. Unlikely to have a significant landscape or visual impact.	N	The Applicant notes this comment.
	12) Visual impact on property on corner of Westgate 'The Cottage' with land added surrounding this dwelling. Development offsets likely to be required during operations. Reinstatement of damaged boundary vegetation will be required to maintain existing landscape character. Mitigation planting to boundaries to contain views from property will be required.	N	Offsets from the properties at Westgate have been maintained by the Scheme design. As illustrated on **ES Figure 2-4: Grid Connection Route Layout Plan** (Doc Ref. 6.2), the closest pylon to the properties is over 150m away. No removals of boundary planting surrounding these properties are proposed. The impact of the Scheme on landscape and visual is assessed within **ES Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual** (Doc Ref. 6.1).
	13) Limited road edge vegetation in this location. Temporary negative impacts on landscape or visual context anticipated.	N	The impact of the Scheme on landscape and visual is assessed within **ES Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16) describes the landscape and ecological strategy for planting across the Site.
	14) Habitat reinstatement and enhancement around the sewage treatment works welcomed. Corridors or green links to boundaries and other landscape features in the vicinity should be considered. Work could be linked and extend to the land around the proposed CSECs.	N	The **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16) describes the landscape and ecological strategy for planting across the Site. Planting around the boundaries of the CSECs is proposed to provide localised screening for the infrastructure. Furthermore, habitat reinstatement and enhancement buffers have been incorporated within the design for any watercourse crossings.
	15) See above.	N	The **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16) describes the landscape and ecological strategy for planting across the Site.
	16) Land extension will be adjacent to Moulton Mere Drain. Care will need to be taken to avoid pollution of watercourse and damage to surrounding vegetation.	N	The **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16) describes the landscape and ecological strategy for planting across the Site. Measures are included within the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10) to limit impacts on watercourses including Moulton Mere Drain including stand-offs (typically 10m) where

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	Mitigation planting and development offset should be used to avoid damaging this landscape feature.		practicable, fenced buffers, bank protection, sediment/pollution control, trenchless techniques at sensitive reaches and pre-works checks.
	17) There will be clear views of this land from the Roman road as there is minimal verge vegetation containing views in this location. The added land will bring development operations closer to properties on Roman Road. Mitigation planting on boundaries should be considered to reduce visual impacts.	N	The **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16) describes the landscape and ecological strategy for planting across the Site which includes mitigation planting on boundaries to reduce visual impacts. Due to the scale of the pylons, it is not considered possible to screen views of the infrastructure with additional planting. It is also noted that boundary planting already exists around the properties adjacent to Roman Road.
	18) There will be clear views of this land from the Roman road as there is minimal verge vegetation containing views in this location. The added land will bring development operations closer to properties on Roman Road. Temporary negative impacts on landscape or visual context anticipated.	N	The **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16) describes the landscape and ecological strategy for planting across the Site which includes mitigation planting on boundaries to reduce visual impacts. Due to the scale of the pylons, it is not considered possible to screen views of the infrastructure with additional planting. It is also noted that boundary planting already exists around the properties adjacent to Roman Road.
	19) There will be clear views of this land from the Roman road as there is minimal verge vegetation containing views in this location. Mitigation planting on field boundaries should be considered to reduce visual impacts.	N	The **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16) describes the landscape and ecological strategy for planting across the Site which includes mitigation planting on boundaries to reduce visual impacts. Due to the scale of the pylons, it is not considered possible to screen views of the infrastructure with additional planting. It is also noted that boundary planting already exists around the properties adjacent to Roman Road.
	20) The extension will incorporate an additional stretch of Broadgate Drove which provides access to an adjacent business Lucksbridge Horticulture Limited. Temporary negative impacts on landscape or visual context anticipated.	N	The impact of the Scheme on landscape and visual is assessed within **ES Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16) describes the landscape and ecological strategy for planting across the Site.
	21) The proposed construction compound is located adjacent to a disused railway line which is heavily vegetated and likely to be an important corridor for wildlife. Cowbit road is also heavily vegetated in this location and development should be offset with RPZs to protect existing vegetation. Any vegetation lost in this area should be re-planted and enhanced to protect this important landscape feature.	N	The **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16) describes the landscape and ecological strategy for planting across the Site. The illustrative layout of the Scheme shown in **ES Figure 2-4: Grid Connection Route Layout Plan** (Doc Ref. 6.2) has been designed to minimise the loss of, and avoid significant impacts on, existing vegetation. A minimum offset of 5-10m from existing vegetation boundaries (trees and shrubs) has been incorporated, where practicable. The access from A16 is proposed to upgrade an existing access in order to minimise vegetation removals, however, it is recognised that some removals will be required. Tree constraints and arboricultural impacts associated with the Scheme (including mitigation measures) are described in **ES Appendix 12-8: Arboricultural Impact Assessment** (Doc Ref. 6.3).
	22) As with 21 above. This section of the A16 has well vegetated verges. Offsets and RPZ will be required during works and vegetation lost to works should be re-planted. Habitat reinstatement and enhancement should	N	The **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16) describes the landscape and ecological strategy for planting across the Site. The illustrative layout of the Scheme shown in **ES Figure 2-4: Grid Connection Route Layout Plan** (Doc Ref. 6.2) has been designed to minimise the loss of, and avoid significant impacts on, existing vegetation. A minimum offset of 5-10m from existing vegetation boundaries (trees and shrubs) has been incorporated, where practicable. The access from A16 is proposed to upgrade an existing access in order to minimise vegetation

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	be extended into this area to support reinstatement work in area 24.		removals, however, it is recognised that some removals will be required. Tree constraints and arboricultural impacts associated with the Scheme (including mitigation measures) are described in **ES Appendix 12-8: Arboricultural Impact Assessment** (Doc Ref. 6.3).
	23) This location is very open and works access track and other development disturbance will be seen in the context of the wider landscape. Impact of track on adjacent Wheat mere Drain should be mitigated with an appropriate offset. Habitat reinstatement and enhancement should be extended into this area to support reinstatement work in area 24.	N	Measures are included within the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10) to limit impacts on watercourses included Wheat Mere Drain including stand-offs (typically 10m) where practicable, fenced buffers, bank protection, sediment/pollution control, trenchless techniques at sensitive reaches and pre-works checks.
	24) All habitat reinstatement and enhancement work supported as this will strengthen landscape character.	N	The **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16) describes the landscape and ecological strategy for planting across the Site.
	25) See above	N	The **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16) describes the landscape and ecological strategy for planting across the Site.
	26) Mature trees within the grounds of Queen's bank farm are close to the boundary of the existing the vehicle access track and will need to be protected from over head damage. Tree works will need to be agreed with owner or appropriate offset / RPZ. Re-instatement works of boundary vegetation will be required after completion of works to maintain landscape character.	N	The illustrative layout of the Scheme shown in **ES Figure 2-2 Indicative Solar Development Area and Inter-Array Layout Plans** (Doc Ref. 6.2) has been designed to minimise the loss of, and avoid significant impacts on, existing vegetation. A minimum offset of 5-10m from existing vegetation boundaries (trees and shrubs) has been incorporated. Tree constraints and arboricultural impacts associated with the Scheme (including mitigation measures) are described in **ES Appendix 12-8: Arboricultural Impact Assessment** (Doc Ref. 6.3). No tree removals within the grounds of Queen's Bank farm are proposed.
	27) Work related to a new bridge crossing over the A16 means that a new access track and new tree planting have been recently installed at this location. Proposed works will need to reinstate any disturbance to this new planting and protect the existing mature trees on site. These include a row of mature trees extending east along the northern side of Queens bank which starts near the entrance to the access track.	N	The illustrative layout of the Scheme shown in **ES Figure 2-2 Indicative Solar Development Area and Inter-Array Layout Plans** (Doc Ref. 6.2) has been designed to minimise the loss of, and avoid significant impacts on, existing vegetation. A minimum offset of 5-10m from existing vegetation boundaries (trees and shrubs) has been incorporated. Tree constraints and arboricultural impacts associated with the Scheme (including mitigation measures) are described in **ES Appendix 12-8: Arboricultural Impact Assessment** (Doc Ref. 6.3). The access from Queen's Bank to the field to the north will utilise an existing access in order to minimise vegetation removals, however, it is noted that minor removals will be required to accommodate visibility splays from the access.
	28) Land added to the extension of the order limits contains mature water edge vegetation consisting of mature willow trees and other native species. These are an important landscape feature and will need to be protected and possibly enhanced through habitat reinstatement and enhancement work.	N	No vegetation removals are proposed in this location and vegetation in this location will be retained and protected. The change to the Order Limits was made to align with existing landownership boundaries. The illustrative layout of the Scheme shown in **ES Figure 2-2 Indicative Solar Development Area and Inter-Array Layout Plans** (Doc Ref. 6.2) has been designed to minimise the loss of, and avoid significant impacts on, existing vegetation. A minimum offset of 5-10m from existing vegetation boundaries (trees and shrubs) has been incorporated. Tree constraints and arboricultural impacts associated with the Scheme

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
			(including mitigation measures) are described in **ES Appendix 12-8: Arboricultural Impact Assessment** (Doc Ref. 6.3).
	29) Limited vegetation on Spalding Road / Barrier bank - but watercourses and ditches will require protection. This is an exposed landscape and development will be highly visible from the A16. Temporary negative impacts on landscape or visual context anticipated.	N	Measures are included within the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10) to minimise impacts on watercourses including stand-offs (typically 10m) where practicable, fenced buffers, bank protection, sediment/pollution control, trenchless techniques at sensitive reaches and pre-works checks. In terms of the landscape and visual impact, this is assessed within **ES Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual** (Doc Ref. 6.1) which concludes significant effects are expected where there are views directly into the Site. Works off Spalding Road / Barrier Bank would comprise the provision of an access route to Land Parcel A and the construction of the Underground Inter-Array Connection. As such landscape and visual effects would largely be associated with the temporary construction works. Boundary planting would be provided along Land Parcel A to screen views into the Site. Mitigation measures are set out in further detail in the **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16) to minimise impacts where practicable.
	30) See above.	N	See response above.
	31) See above.	N	The **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16) describes the landscape and ecological strategy for planting across the Site.
	32) This is a generally open and exposed landscape with naturalised fields of native vegetation and more vegetated ditches. Protection of this vegetation will be important to maintain this location's landscape character. There is potential for additional field edge mitigation planting and habitat reinstatement and enhancement work along Martins Road.	N	The illustrative layout of the Scheme shown in **ES Figure 2-2 Indicative Solar Development Area and Inter-Array Layout Plans** (Doc Ref. 6.2) has been designed to minimise the loss of, and avoid significant impacts on, existing vegetation. A minimum offset of 5-10m from existing vegetation boundaries (trees and shrubs) has been incorporated. Tree constraints and arboricultural impacts associated with the Scheme (including mitigation measures) are described in **ES Appendix 12-8: Arboricultural Impact Assessment** (Doc Ref. 6.3). The **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16) describes the landscape and ecological strategy for planting across the Site which includes proposed planting along Martins Road adjacent to the Scheme infrastructure.
	33) This location is strongly influenced by the nearby settlement of Waplode Drove, with smaller field patterns, small woodland blocks and more mature field edge vegetation. Additionally, there are more properties adjacent to this location. A PROW joins Back Bank adjacent to Highbury cottage. Additional care will be needed to limit development impacts on the receptors and landscape in this location. Development offsets and Root Protection Zones (RPZ) will be required to protect existing planting. Re-instatement works of boundary vegetation will be required after completion of works to maintain landscape character. Mitigation planting on field boundaries will help to reduce the visual impact on receptors in this location.	N	It is noted that Back Bank has been included within the Order Limits for infrequent use of the road to facilitate the construction of the Overhead Inter-Array Connection. The illustrative layout of the Scheme shown in **ES Figure 2-2 Indicative Solar Development Area and Inter-Array Layout Plans** (Doc Ref. 6.2) has been designed to minimise the loss of, and avoid significant impacts on, existing vegetation. A minimum offset of 5-10m from existing vegetation boundaries (trees and shrubs) has been incorporated. Tree constraints and arboricultural impacts associated with the Scheme (including mitigation measures) are described in **ES Appendix 12-8: Arboricultural Impact Assessment** (Doc Ref. 6.3). In the DCO Application, landtake at this location associated with the Overhead Inter-Array Connection has been substantially reduced to reflect the updated design.

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	34) This location is close to the northern edge of the settlement of Waplode Drove, there are many adjacent properties and although no official PROW, field edge tracks run between properties in some locations. Field sizes are smaller and boundaries are more vegetated. Additional care will be needed to limit development impacts on the receptors and landscape in this location. Development offsets and Root Protection Zones (RPZ) will be required to protect existing planting. Re-instatement works of boundary vegetation will be required after completion of works to maintain landscape character. Mitigation planting on field boundaries will help to reduce the visual impact on receptors in this location.	N	It is noted that this change relates to the provision of additional land to incorporate visibility splay for a haul route crossing with Chapel Gate road. The illustrative layout of the Scheme shown in **ES Figure 2-2 Indicative Solar Development Area and Inter-Array Layout Plans** (Doc Ref. 6.2) has been designed to minimise the loss of, and avoid significant impacts on, existing vegetation. A minimum offset of 5-10m from existing vegetation boundaries (trees and shrubs) has been incorporated. Tree constraints and arboricultural impacts associated with the Scheme (including mitigation measures) are described in **ES Appendix 12-8: Arboricultural Impact Assessment** (Doc Ref. 6.3). In the DCO Application, landtake at this location associated with the Overhead Inter-Array Connection has been substantially reduced to reflect the updated design. The works are proposed north of Whaplode Drove, with offsets from existing properties applied.
	35) This location is also strongly influenced by nearby settlement with smaller field sizes, more field edge vegetation and a greater density of scattered property. Additional care will be needed to limit development impacts on the receptors and landscape in this location. Development offsets and Root Protection Zones (RPZ) will be required to protect existing planting. Re-instatement works of boundary vegetation will be required after completion of works to maintain landscape character. Mitigation planting on field boundaries will help to reduce the visual impact on receptors in this location.	N	It is noted that this change relates to the provision of additional land to incorporate visibility splay for a haul route crossing with Dog Drove. The illustrative layout of the Scheme shown in **ES Figure 2-2 Indicative Solar Development Area and Inter-Array Layout Plans** (Doc Ref. 6.2) has been designed to minimise the loss of, and avoid significant impacts on, existing vegetation. A minimum offset of 5-10m from existing vegetation boundaries (trees and shrubs) has been incorporated. Tree constraints and arboricultural impacts associated with the Scheme (including mitigation measures) are described in **ES Appendix 12-8: Arboricultural Impact Assessment** (Doc Ref. 6.3). In the DCO Application, landtake at this location associated with the Overhead Inter-Array Connection has been substantially reduced to reflect the updated design. Offsets from existing properties have been applied.
	36) This is a busier 'B' road (B1168) with close proximity to adjacent settlements like Holbeach Drove, there is a high density of property scattered along this road, and gardens are well planted with mature vegetation. Additional care will be needed to limit development impacts on the receptors and landscape in this location. Development offsets and Root Protection Zones (RPZ) will be required to protect existing planting. Re-instatement works of boundary vegetation will be required after completion of works to maintain landscape character. Mitigation planting on field boundaries will help to reduce the visual impact on receptors in this location.	N	This change relates to the provision of additional land to facilitate construction access from Holbeach Drove for the Overhead Inter-Array Connection, which would be used infrequently. No boundary planting of existing properties is proposed to be removed along this road. The illustrative layout of the Scheme shown in **ES Figure 2-2 Indicative Solar Development Area and Inter-Array Layout Plans** (Doc Ref. 6.2) has been designed to minimise the loss of, and avoid significant impacts on, existing vegetation. A minimum offset of 5-10m from existing vegetation boundaries (trees and shrubs) has been incorporated. Tree constraints and arboricultural impacts associated with the Scheme (including mitigation measures) are described in **ES Appendix 12-8: Arboricultural Impact Assessment** (Doc Ref. 6.3).

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	37) The southern end of Langary Gate Road is in close proximity to the settlements of Holbeach Drove and Gedney Hill with adjacent land uses including Golf Clubs, Campsites and Plant Nurseries. Field boundaries are well vegetated in some locations along Langary Gate Road. Additional care will be needed to limit development impacts on the receptors and landscape in this location. Development offsets and Root Protection Zones (RPZ) will be required to protect existing planting. Re-instatement works of boundary vegetation will be required after completion of works to maintain landscape character. Mitigation planting on field boundaries will help to reduce the visual impact on receptors in this location.	N	The **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16) describes the landscape and ecological strategy for planting across the Site. The illustrative layout of the Scheme shown in **ES Figure 2-2 Indicative Solar Development Area and Inter-Array Layout Plans** (Doc Ref. 6.2) has been designed to minimise the loss of, and avoid significant impacts on, existing vegetation. A minimum offset of 5-10m from existing vegetation boundaries (trees and shrubs) has been incorporated. Tree constraints and arboricultural impacts associated with the Scheme (including mitigation measures) are described in **ES Appendix 12-8: Arboricultural Impact Assessment** (Doc Ref. 6.3).
	In conclusion, the Sites identified for the Meridian Solar project generally fall into two categories. There are more visually prominent locations, nearer to settlements and major roads, where the landscape value is lower, but where changes will be more noticeable; and there are locations that are more secluded and hidden from view, with a higher landscape value, where change will be less noticeable. Mitigation to preserve the quality of the landscape will be more important in secluded locations where the emphasis should be on habitat restoration and the preservation of important landscape features. In more visually prominent locations, the aim of mitigation will be reducing the visual impact of proposed development by containing and limiting views, or designing with less obtrusive materials. Both will require sensitive mitigation to preserve the landscape character and visual quality of the landscape, but the emphasis will vary.	N	Minimising landscape and visual effects of the Scheme has been an underlying design principle of the Scheme since the inception of the project, as further explained within the **Design Approach Document** (Doc Ref. 7.3) and **ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16) describes the landscape and ecological strategy for planting across the Site. In particular, the landscape mitigation strategy for the Scheme is based on the following principles: • Careful siting of the infrastructure in the landscape; • Conserving existing vegetation patterns, where practicable; and • Creating new green infrastructure to provide landscape screening and improve ecological and recreational connectivity. New planting has been specified to be in-keeping with the existing landscape character of the area and would include in the order of: • 13.8km of proposed band of shrubs; • 34.6km of proposed band of shrubs and scattered trees; • 1.6km of strengthened band of scattered trees; • 129.0ha of proposed species rich grassland; and • 650.0ha of proposed semi-improved grassland.
	The Council would be pleased to continue dialogue in relation to the main issues identified above throughout the programmed update meetings, expert topic groups or via subject specific meetings as required.	N	The Applicant thanks Lincolnshire County Council for its consultation. The Applicant welcomes continued dialogue regarding the Scheme.

7.16. Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk	Thank you for your letter of 18 September 2025 and for your invitation to respond to your targeted consultation on proposed changes to the Meridian Solar Farm scheme. It is noted that a number of changes to the Order Limits are being proposed to facilitate the development along with the undergrounding of a section of cabling, relocation of the BESS to the 400kV substation site, internal reconfiguration of the scheme within Parcel B and the relocation of the 132kV substation to Parcel C. 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.	N	The Applicant notes this comment and thanks the Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk for its response to the targeted consultation.
	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. The Borough Council of Kings Lynn and West Norfolk have no further comments to make at this time.	N	These factors have been assessed within **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref. 6.1) and controls have been put in place through the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref.7.13).

7.17. National Grid Electricity Transmission (NGET)

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
NGET	I refer to your information booklet regarding the Meridan Solar project's targeted consultation dated 24 September - 22 October 2025. This is a response on behalf of National Grid Electricity Transmission PLC (NGET). NGET welcomes the opportunity to comment on the Meridan Solar project's targeted consultation, which includes details of a series of localised changes including revisions to the draft Order Limits and design refinements. NGET previously	N	The Applicant notes this.

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	responded to Meridian Solar project's Stage 2 (statutory) consultation in Spring 2025. That representation is enclosed, and we confirm that NGET maintains its objection as set out in that letter. NGET is currently progressing the Grimsby to Walpole (G2W) project. G2W is critical national infrastructure and involves the construction of approximately 140 km of new overhead transmission lines from Grimsby to Walpole, associated new substations, and other associated required works. It is defined as a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP) and therefore an application for a Development Consent Order (DCO) is being prepared. The G2W project completed Stage 1 (non-statutory) consultation in March 2024 and Stage 2 (statutory) consultation in August 2025. The G2W project has been identified as one of several network upgrades that need to be accelerated to help meet increased government targets for offshore wind generation.		
	Interaction with Meridian Solar and engagement with Downing Renewables (the Applicant) The Meridian Solar project's targeted consultation information booklet identifies, at amendment number 1, an extension of the draft Order Limits to encompass the remainder of the field supporting the anticipated location of the Weston Marsh substation. As you are aware, NGET is undertaking a further targeted statutory consultation (anticipated to start in November 2025), which will provide additional design detail for Section 5 of the G2W proposals. In that context, aspects of the Meridian Solar project's targeted consultation are premature insofar as they address matters that remain subject to NGET's consultation and subsequent consideration of the resulting feedback.	N	It is noted that this comment relates to a point in time in the engagement between the Applicant and NGET, during the Applicant's targeted consultation held in September/October 2025, but prior to the opening of a further consultation by NGET on its Grimsby to Walpole Scheme in November 2025. For the latest position of the interactions between the two projects, the **Interrelationships with Other Infrastructure Projects Report** (Doc Ref. 7.2) should be referenced. The Applicant continues to engage with NGET. At the time the Applicant was preparing for its September/October targeted consultation, NGET had indicated it may be holding a further targeted consultation which may release more information on relevant elements of the Grimsby to Walpole project, but could not commit to the timeframes in advance of the Applicant's planned targeted consultation. Given the requirement for the project to progress in order to deliver critical national generation, and as required to do so through NESO's own Grid Reform, as well as the confirmation from NGET that the information released in its November 2025 targeted consultation was unlikely to be final anyway, the Applicant chose to proceed with its targeted consultation. Following both the Meridian Solar and NGET targeted consultations, we have continued to work together to ensure that both projects do not conflict and can be delivered.
	The Meridian Solar project's consultation does not correctly identify the currently preferred location of the G2W option for Weston Marsh substation infrastructure. During previous engagement with the Applicant, NGET has shared (on a without prejudice basis to the outcome of its own consultation) information regarding its preferred option for the Weston	N	At the time of the September/October Meridian Solar targeted consultation, NGET had not publicly released identified locations which would be able to be used in the public Meridian Solar targeted consultation. As noted in the response in the previous row, while NGET had suggested further information may be released in a forthcoming consultation, it had not provided any firm commitment at the time as to the timing of that consultation or the information to be released within it. This response to the Meridian Solar targeted

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	Marsh substation infrastructure. Additionally, the preferred corridor for the G2W project has been in the public domain since the start of the Stage 1 consultation (January 2024) and the refined updated corridor was publicised during the recent Stage 2 consultation (June-August 2025). In the forthcoming targeted consultation for G2W, the preferred location for the proposed Weston Marsh substation infrastructure will be publicly available. NGET therefore further objects to the Meridian Solar project's targeted consultation on the basis that it does not correctly identify the currently preferred location of the Weston Marsh substation infrastructure. The details of NGET's proposed infrastructure that Meridian Solar has presented as part of its consultation are inaccurate and inconsistent with NGET's preferred option. Therefore, these aspects of the Meridian Solar project must be revisited by the Applicant once the design for Section 5 of the G2W proposals is finalised following NGET's targeted consultation.		consultation was the first firm confirmation as to likely dates and information for NGETs forthcoming consultation. As such, and as detailed in the targeted consultation materials, Meridian Solar has, at all times, used the most up to date publicly accessible information available. NGET's further release of information on its substation infrastructure led to the additional targeted consultation held by Meridian Solar in January/February 2026 to incorporate that further information.
	Cumulative Impacts The Meridian Solar project's targeted consultation information booklet identifies, at amendment number 2, an extension of the draft Order Limits to include the remainder of the fields for overhead line construction and additional flexibility to the west of the village of Weston. This is an extension to their preferred corridor for the overhead line route to the Weston Marsh Substation infrastructure and confirms their intention for an overhead line parallel to G2W's preferred route. Since the Meridian Solar project's Stage 2 consultation (April-June 2025), there has been no update to the Applicant's PEIR (Alternatives and Design Evolution chapter), which states that "a preference was taken to following a similar route to [Grimsby to Walpole] rather than needing to cross it and create a further visual intrusion to the north-east". Therefore, the Applicant is maintaining an intentional overlap as a means of reducing landscape and visual impacts.	N	It is correct that the September/October targeted consultation did not result in a re-release of PEIR information. However, for Application, the Alternatives and Design Evolution chapter has been updated to include the changes to the Scheme consulted on as part of the Targeted Consultation. The updated chapter is contained within **ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution** (Doc Ref. 6.1). That chapter, as well as the Design Approach Document (Doc Ref 7.3) outline the routing approach taken for the Scheme, including outlining how this considered alignment with other projects like Grimsby to Walpole and how this complied with relevant routing guidance, including the Holford Rules. The routing of the Scheme's Grid Connection was also developed in direct engagement with NGET, including through routing workshops to ensure the two schemes were compatible. The Applicant welcomes continued engagement with NGET on this point to find a solution that works for both projects.
	The landscape and visual assessment work in the PEIR does not specifically assess the cumulative impact of this project and G2W in relation to the overhead line infrastructure running parallel to each other on the approach to the Weston Marsh	N	The Applicant refutes the position within this response that the PEIR did not sufficiently assess cumulative effects. At the time of the PEIR being produced, the Applicant had requested additional information from NGET on the routing of its Scheme, for the purposes of undertaking cumulative effects assessments, which was not provided. Therefore, Meridian

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	Substation infrastructure. Furthermore, although the G2W project is included in the Short List of Other Developments (for the project's cumulative impact assessment), and a temporary overlap in construction periods is stated as occurring between 2029-2033, based on a Q2 2027 submission for G2W, there is no mention of operational overlap. As such, the ongoing permanent effects of two 400kV overhead lines running parallel to each other, and any technical or operational challenges that may arise as a result of this, are not assessed. For these reasons, the Applicant cannot have properly taken into account the likely environmental effects of the chosen route when selecting its preferred option. Further, this means that the PEIR does not provide the information reasonably required for consultees to develop an informed view of the likely significant environmental effects of the Applicant's preferred overhead line route, including its cumulative effects with G2W, contrary to the requirements for preliminary environmental information under the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (see regulation 12, the definition in regulation 2, and Schedule 4). The PEIR is therefore insufficient and non-compliant and must be updated to assess the environmental effects of the preferred option (including operational cumulative effects) and re-consulted upon before the Applicant finalises its design.		Solar had no option other than to use the publicly available information of the corridor and preliminary swathe that featured in the G2W Stage 1 consultation. Using the publicly available information, the Applicant considered the likely significant effects of cumulative projects (including G2W) within the individual topic chapters of the PEIR and took the appropriate conservative, worst-case assessment approach that there would be likely significant cumulative effects from the routing of the projects at that time, so that stakeholders and the community were adequately informed of the likelihood of such impacts for their consultation. It should be noted that this is not dissimilar to the approach that the G2W project took, during their statutory consultation, which identified a list of projects where there could be cumulative effects and the relevant disciplines to be considered further (Route Wide Assessment – Volume 3, Part C, Chapter 10 Cumulative Effects – Appendices). Furthermore, it should be noted that comments regarding the compliance of the Meridian Solar PEIR were not made by NGET through their representation to our stage two consultation or any subsequent meeting. For the purposes of the application, the landscape and visual assessment includes an updated consideration of the G2W Scheme within its cumulative assessment, which takes into account the latest information available from NGET. The assessment is contained within **ES Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual** (Doc Ref. 6.1).
	Planning Policy Context National Policy Statement EN-1 (Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy) sets out the government's commitment to fully decarbonising the power system by 2035 and identifies a critical national priority (CNP) for the provision of nationally significant low carbon infrastructure. Furthermore, EN-5 (National Policy Statement for electricity networks infrastructure) clarifies that this CNP extends to electricity grid infrastructure, network reinforcement and upgrade works, and notes the important role that new grid projects have in contributing towards connecting low carbon infrastructure to the National Electricity Transmission System. The G2W project is therefore considered to be of critical national importance to facilitate the decarbonisation of the power system by 2035. NGET acknowledge that the Meridian Solar project is also considered to be of critical national importance and has clear	N	The Applicant supports the development delivery of the Grimsby to Walpole NGET project. It is a critical piece of infrastructure to allow for a significant amount of clean, home grown, secure energy to be connected to, and transported across the network to where it is required. It is important that the Grimsby to Walpole project work closely and collaboratively with those clean renewable projects to ensure that the most economic, efficient, and least impact designs are taken forward across the length of the project, and all projects are considered, including all the generators that provide the critical energy generation, and thus needs case to the Grimsby to Walpole project. The Applicant refutes the suggestion that the CNP of Grimsby to Walpole project is prioritised over that of Meridian Solar, and notes there is no policy basis for this suggestion. Rather, these projects cannot be designed in isolation, and the Applicant has been working with NGET since 2024 to ensure that all of the Meridian designs and assessments are available. This has included direct workshops between the parties to ensure the routing of both schemes are compatible, and neither alignment would prejudice the other.

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	policy support within the NPS's. However, if approved in this current design, it would obstruct a known emerging alignment for a transmission project which is integral to the country's transition to net zero by 2050. Without the high-voltage electricity transmission line proposed as part of the G2W project, the electricity transmission system in this area will lack the capacity to accommodate all the new renewable energy sources coming forward, including the Meridian Solar project.		The Applicant remains confident that its design and alignment would not obstruct Grimsby to Walpole. The Applicant remains committed to engaging with NGET to ensure this remains the case.
	Confirmation of Objection Given the above, NGET maintains its objection to the Meridian Solar project's proposed Grid Connection Route and further objects to the extension to the order limits, as shown in this targeted consultation document. The Meridian Solar project must be designed in a way that avoids conflict with the preferred location of future NGET apparatus in this area, given the criticality of the G2W project to the transmission of energy across the UK, as set out in the Clean Power 2030 report. The delivery of the G2W project is vital in enabling a number of renewable and low carbon projects to connect to the grid at this location, including the Meridian Solar project, and NGET therefore considers it to be in the interest of the Applicant to ensure that its scheme does not impede the delivery of G2W in any way.	N	The Applicant notes the objection raised by NGET made at that time. However, it is noted that the Applicant and NGET have further engaged on the matters raised and the interaction of both schemes. This included the further targeted consultation held by Meridian Solar in January/February 2026 to incorporate the substation siting locations released by NGET in November 2025. For the latest position of the interactions between the two projects, the **Interrelationships with Other Infrastructure Projects Report** (Doc Ref. 7.2) should be referenced.
	The Applicant has failed to have regard to NGET's consultation feedback and has failed to address the substantive concerns raised previously. The Applicant must re-design the Meridian Solar project, and that re-design must be informed by the final design of G2W. The G2W final design will only be confirmed following completion of NGET's targeted consultation on the Weston Marsh substation infrastructure and NGET's consideration of the feedback received in response to both that consultation and its earlier Stage 2 consultation. Following that re-design, the Applicant must fully assess the environmental effects of the revised design, including, in particular, the cumulative effects of the Applicant's scheme and G2W, and must then carry out further consultation on the revised design. NGET of course remains committed to working with the Applicant in a productive manner to seek to facilitate a design	N	The Applicant has demonstrated at all times a willingness to engage, share information, and work collaboratively with NGET to ensure as best chance as possible is provided to both projects to achieve consent and deliver critically important national infrastructure. The Applicant considers the design as presented in its September/October targeted consultation reflected the latest, publicly available, information on Grimsby to Walpole which it was able to take into account in its design at that time. That design has continued to evolve with the release of further information by NGET, as seen by the January/February 2026 targeted consultation held to incorporate the subsequently released substation siting location. However, the comment suggestions that the Applicant should not progress its design until Grimsby to Walpole has finalised its design are not accepted. The Applicant cannot be beholden to NGET's programme going forwards, and it has instead taken all reasonable steps to develop a flexible and informed design which should not impede the progress of the Grimsby to Walpole project. This application ensures the impacts, including all cumulative effects, are assessed and mitigated as required. This approach is the same as other projects connecting into the proposed Grimsby to Walpole infrastructure, such as the recently

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	which enables both parties to deliver successful and much needed energy generation and electricity transmission schemes.		consented Outer Dowsing windfarm, and an approach common across the transmission network. As NGET will be aware, NESO have identified the requirement for generation projects to actively progress in order to maximise success through the grid reform process. Meridian Solar is therefore unwilling to compromise the success of our own project to maximise the success of the G2W project.

7.18. North Lincolnshire Council

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
North Lincolnshire Council	Thank you for your email dated 22nd September 2025 giving North Lincolnshire Council (NLC) the opportunity to feedback on the Meridian Solar Farm Development Consent Order. I can confirm that after consultation with our internal technical consultees that North Lincolnshire Council has no comments or objections to raise in respect of this project with the proposed development not likely to result in any significant impact upon North Lincolnshire.	N	The Applicant notes this acknowledgement and thanks North Lincolnshire Council for its response to the targeted consultation.

7.19. South Holland District Council

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
South Holland District Council	Further targeted consultation to South Holland District Council under Section 42 and Section 44 of the Planning Act 2008 and Regulation 13 of Infrastructure Planning(Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 Thank you for your recent further targeted consultation in relation to the above. Sam Dewar of Dewar Planning Associates has been instructed to act as lead officer on behalf of South Holland District Council to comment on the further information related regarding the targeted consultation.	N	The Applicant notes this comment and thanks South Holland District Council for its response to the targeted consultation.
	Introduction The targeted consultation between 24th September 2025 and 22nd October 2025 sought consultee comments on the	N	The Applicant notes this summary provided by South Holland District Council.

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	changes as described within the 13-page information booklet 1. As explained within the booklet, the Applicant has made changes following the stage two (statutory) consultation, held between April and June 2025. It is also stated as result of survey information and design refinements the design has been amended. In total 38 changes are presented, and in summary the key amendments are as follows: • Battery Storage (BESS): All BESS units will now be located at the 400kV substation site to reduce potential noise impacts on nearby residential properties. • Substation Relocation: A 132kV substation has been moved from Land Parcel B to Land Parcel C to avoid an area with a higher risk of flooding. • Land Parcel B Reconfiguration: The layout of solar panels in Parcel B has been changed to avoid flood-risk areas. This was made possible after updated surveys showed the land was predominantly Grade 3a agricultural land, not Grade 1 as previously assumed. • Land Parcel D Reconfiguration: The layout has been reconfigured to remove one area of 18.4 ha due to historic sensitivity, while adding four new fields totalling 33.3 ha for solar panels. • Grid Connection: A section of the grid connection will be placed underground where it crosses an existing overhead line. • Weston Marsh Substation: The anticipated location for the National Grid's Weston Marsh substation, the project's connection point, has been refined to a smaller, more specific area		
	List of Consultees As part of the internal consultation process, the below consultees were contacted for comment: Internal: 1. Environmental Protection; 2. Planning Policy; 3. Conservation Assistant (Tree Preservation);	N	The Applicant notes the consultees contacted for comment.

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	4. Conservation Officer (Heritage); and 5. Senior Ecologist.		
	External Ward Councillors: • 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, 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.	N	The Applicant notes that external ward Councillors were contacted for comment.
	External Parish Councils: • 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.	N	The Applicant notes the external Parish Councils contacted for comment.
	Planning Policy 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	N	The Applicant notes the planning policies referenced.

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	have been formed over several years and have come from a significant evidence base. The South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036 (SELLP) was adopted jointly by South Holland and Boston Borough Council on the 8 March 2019. The relevant policies within the South East Lincolnshire Local Plan 2011-2036 are: Policy 2 'Development Management' – requires proposals to demonstrate sustainable development considerations have been met through a number of criteria. 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 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: • health and safety of the public; • the amenities of the area; or • the natural, historic and built environment; • by way of:		

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	• 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 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: • 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. 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. 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.		

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	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 Planning Act 2008 and relevant NPSs) but may be considered as a relevant consideration as below: 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: a) 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; b) recognise that some undeveloped land can perform many functions, such as for wildlife, recreation, flood risk mitigation, cooling/shading, carbon storage or food production; c) 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; d) 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 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 e) support opportunities to use the airspace above existing residential and commercial premises for new homes. In		

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	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: a) protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, sites of biodiversity or geological value and soils (in a manner commensurate with their statutory status or identified quality in the development plan); b) 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; c) maintaining the character of the undeveloped coast, while improving public access to it where appropriate; d) minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures;		

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	e) 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 f) remediating and mitigating despoiled, degraded, derelict, contaminated and unstable land, where appropriate.		
	Representations South Holland Planning Authority have sought responses to the targeted consultation internally from department officers, parish councils and Councillors. All consultees have the ability to and are actively encouraged to respond direct to the applicant as part of this process however we have presented any responses received. South Holland District Council do not have in house specialists or advisers for all areas therefore the below list of representations sets out the comments and advice received from internal consultees as well as external consultants employed by the Council. Where no comments have been received and no external consultant employed, this response will seek to comment generally on the topic areas where appropriate, however it is acknowledged that comments may be sent directly by the County Council and these will be endorsed by the Council. As the Council do not have a Landscape Officer, an external company was sought to respond on behalf of the Council, Terra Loci, who are Landscape Architects and specialise in Landscape Planning. This forms the main part of our consideration as the landscape impacts are particularly important to the Council. The comments received from internal and external consultees are summarised as follows:	N	The Applicant notes this and has responded to the comments received from internal and external consultees below.
	Landscape Visual Impact (Terra Loci, Landscape Architects appointed on behalf of the Council) In summary, the key concerns raised are:	N	In terms of the projects 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

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	Unacceptable Expansion: The project's footprint is being significantly enlarged, further industrializing a rural, agrarian area. Intensified Visual Impact: A much larger substation and battery facility at Weston Marsh will create a dominant and intrusive feature in an open, visually exposed landscape. Critical Lack of Mitigation: The developer has proposed no new or improved landscape screening (such as tree planting or earth bunds) to compensate for the massively increased scale of the project. This is seen as a major failure. Intrusive Infrastructure: The tall pylons for the overhead lines remain a key concern, and the author questions why undergrounding has not been considered in sensitive areas. The overall conclusion is that the Meridian Solar project has now exceeded an acceptable size and scale for its location. The author states that, in its current expanded form and without a serious commitment to new mitigation, the scheme cannot be supported.		Site within the draft Order limits in the PEIR was 2,121ha. As such the changes introduced during targeted consultation are not considered to represent a substantial expansion of the overall development. The battery facility at Weston Marsh remains part of the Grimsby to Walpole DCO, and the Scheme connects into it. The increased Order Limits at Weston Marsh provide flexibility for the final alignment of the Grid Connection, however, do not represent increased footprint for physical infrastructure such as the BESS. The proposed landscape mitigation strategy is described within the **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16). An outline landscape masterplan has also been provided as Figure 1 of the **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16) to illustrate how the landscape strategy could be implemented. **ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution** (Doc Ref. 6.1) and the **Design Approach Document** (Doc Ref. 7.3) describe the alternatives and design evolution considered for the Grid Connection Route, including reasons for the proposed alignment and tower design. These documents explain the technical, environmental, and deliverability reasons for selecting an overhead line rather than partial undergrounding.
	Environmental Protection In summary, while the relocation of some equipment to reduce noise is welcomed, the developer must provide: • Specific Noise & Visual Assessments: New reports are required to prove that the changes and additions will not negatively affect specific residential areas. • Commitment to Mitigation: Where moderate or high impacts (especially glint and glare) are identified, a clear plan to reduce them to a low level is demanded. • Cumulative Impact Analysis: The assessment must consider the combined construction impact on residents, factoring in another major project planned for the area.	N	The Scheme changes consulted on as part of the 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) and **ES Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual** (Doc Ref. 6.1) respectively. An updated glint and glare assessment has been undertaken and is provided within **ES Appendix 16-2: Glint and Glare Assessment** (Doc Ref. 6.3) which has considered the design parameters of the Scheme identified in **ES Chapter 2: The Scheme** (Doc Ref. 6.1). Following updates to the design parameters since statutory consultation, the updated glint and glare assessment concludes that no residual significant effects remain on residential properties. The ES includes a cumulative assessment of other proposed developments in the study area. The list of cumulative proposed developments for review has been agreed with the LHAs.
	Conservation Assistant (Tree Preservation) No comment has been received during the consultation period.	N	The Applicant notes this comment.
	Conservation Officer (Heritage) No comment has been received during the consultation period.	N	The Applicant notes this comment.
	Parish Councils	N	The Applicant notes this comment.

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	Due to parish council meeting dates, it is not always possible for them to comment in time. we have received comments from Gedney Parish and others are likely to comment directly.		
	Deeping St Nicholas Parish Council Deeping St Nicholas Parish Council strongly objects to the project's unexplained increase in land-take, which they label an "amendment by stealth." Their main concerns are the addition of 14.9 hectares for solar panels in Parcel D without proper justification and the lack of explanation as to why land already within the project's boundary cannot be used instead of acquiring more.	N	As stated in **ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution** (Doc Ref. 6.1) four additional fields in Parcel D were brought forward for development with solar PV panels, following comments received from landowners during Statutory Consultation. This included the addition of 33.3 ha. Field D4 (18.4 ha) was however removed from consideration for solar PV, owing to its historic sensitivity, with the option to use this land for habitat enhancement retained instead. Overall, this resulted in a net increase of 14.9 ha of solar PV panels across Parcel D. Additional buffers were also included around properties along Langary Gate Road, where no solar PV panels would be located, in order to avoid impacting on the residential visual amenity of these properties and to avoid significant glint and glare effects. Crown Estate land previously indicated as inter-array within Parcel D has been removed from the Order Limits. The Applicant further notes that remains confident in the consultation undertaken, and that the information presented was adequate for that stage in the process.
	Weston Parish Council The Parish Council's core argument is that the recent amendments, far from resolving issues, introduces new and significant adverse impacts on the parish. They maintain a strong objection, believing the project will cause unacceptable harm to the community, landscape, and local economy.	N	The impact of the amendments to the Scheme consulted on as part of the Targeted Consultation have been assessed within the Environmental Statement. Potential impacts to the community have been assessed within **ES Chapter 10: Human Health** (Doc Ref. 6.1), **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref. 6.1) and **ES Chapter 13: Noise and Vibration** (Doc Ref. 6.1). Potential impacts on the landscape have been assessed in **ES Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual** (Doc Ref. 6.1). Potential Impacts to the local economy have been assessed in **ES Chapter 14: Socio-Economics and Land Use (**Doc Ref. 6.1). As part of the landscape design for the Scheme, new habitats would be provided to increase biodiversity compared to the existing baseline. This would include converting areas of agricultural land around and beneath the solar PV panels into species rich grassland, providing new tree and shrub planting along field boundaries, and enhancing habitats next to watercourses. The Solar Development Area incorporates approximately 174ha of habitat management areas where no physical infrastructure is proposed. Out of this, over 150ha have been specifically set aside for the enhancement of habitats for farmland birds, such as skylark. The creation and subsequent management of habitats is set out within the **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16). The LEMP will be prepared in accordance with the measures set out in the **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16) and will secured by way of Requirement in the **Draft DCO** (Doc Ref. 3.1). The Applicant is also currently exploring how a community benefit fund could be administered to provide a positive and lasting contribution to local communities hosting the Scheme.

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	Ward Councillors Cllr Eldridge provided a draft response to us with some questions which we responded to. Cllr Eldridge will be providing her final comments directly to Meridian before the deadline. If these have not been received please let us know as they are important. No other comments have been received during the consultation period however Councillors have been advised to comment directly which is wholly expected due to a number of concerns raised during the process and in particular during a members briefing session held in May 2025.	N	The Applicant confirms that the comments referred to were received and have been responded to in **Appendix K – Targeted Consultation Applicant's Response**.
	Assessment of Targeted Consultation Landscape Impacts This Targeted Consultation introduces a series of material amendments to the Meridian Solar proposals, including expanded Order Limits across multiple parcels, reconfigured solar coverage (notably within Parcel D), and significant enlargement of the substation and collocated Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) site at the proposed Weston Marsh grid connection. Terra Loci are Landscape Architects appointed on behalf of the Council and have been consulted upon for advice regards the proposed changes to the scheme. The following comments are made having received their advice. While presented as localised refinements, these collectively represent a substantial expansion of the overall development footprint and a further intensification of large-scale engineered infrastructure within an already highly sensitive fenland landscape.	N	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 changes introduced during targeted consultation are not considered to represent a substantial expansion of the overall development. At targeted consultation stage, the BESS was relocated to the On-Site 400kV Substation near the A16 and Queen's Bank not the Weston Marsh 400kV Substation. The latter remains part of the Grimsby to Walpole DCO, and the Scheme connects into it. The increased Order Limits at Weston Marsh provide flexibility for the final alignment of the Grid Connection, however, do not represent increased footprint for physical infrastructure such as the BESS.
	From a landscape and visual standpoint, these changes cannot be regarded as minor. They increase both the physical and perceptual presence of the scheme within an area already approaching, and likely exceeding, its capacity to accommodate development of this scale and character. The latest mapping indicates numerous extensions to the Order Limits to accommodate additional solar panels, haul	N	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 changes introduced during targeted consultation are not considered to represent a substantial expansion of the overall development. The likely significant effects of the Scheme (including the BESS and substation) have been assessed within **ES Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The proposed landscape

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	routes and flexibility areas, resulting in a net increase in developable solar land. This expansion compounds the extent of transformation across an open, low-lying and visually exposed landscape. It effectively erodes what little undeveloped separation remained between solar parcels and associated grid infrastructure. The scheme as now described appears to exceed the landscape's ability to absorb further large-scale change without fundamentally altering its rural and agrarian character.		mitigation strategy is described within the **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16). An outline landscape masterplan has also been provided as Figure 1 of the **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16) to illustrate how the landscape strategy could be implemented.
	The relocation and concentration of all BESS and substation infrastructure at the 400 kV Weston Marsh connection point represents a marked intensification of permanent built form within an open fenland setting. The increased Order Limits encompass a significantly larger area than previously shown, introducing new hard infrastructure, security fencing and ancillary development. While the change may reduce potential noise effects elsewhere, it materially increases the scale, massing and visual dominance of development at Weston Marsh. This location is inherently sensitive, with limited existing containment and wide visual exposure. The expanded compound would likely become a prominent focal point in long and medium distance views, extending the influence of the grid connection corridor and contributing to a more industrialised character.	N	At targeted consultation stage, the BESS was relocated to the On-Site 400kV Substation near the A16 and Queen's Bank not the Weston Marsh 400kV Substation. The latter remains part of the Grimsby to Walpole DCO, and the Scheme connects into it. The increased Order Limits at Weston Marsh provide flexibility for the final alignment of the Grid Connection, however, do not represent increased footprint for physical infrastructure such as the BESS.
	These effects are intensified by the absence of any meaningful additional landscape mitigation. The consultation material makes no reference to new or enhanced planting, bunding, or design evolution to address the expanded footprint—despite previous consultation responses having already highlighted that the indicative mitigation proposals were insufficient. This omission is highly concerning and undermines confidence in the scheme's ability to deliver an acceptable residual effect. Further extensions of the Order Limits to provide flexibility for pylon locations, stringing areas and haul routes demonstrate ongoing uncertainty around the design and alignment of the overhead line. The pylons remain among the most intrusive and transformative components of the proposal. Given their height, vertical form and the open topography, it is doubtful that any planting could meaningfully mitigate their impact. The ES must	N	The proposed landscape mitigation strategy is described within the **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16). An outline landscape masterplan has also been provided as Figure 1 of the **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16) to illustrate how the landscape strategy could be implemented.

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	clearly justify the alignment and tower design and explain why partial undergrounding has not been adopted in sensitive sections.		
	Serious concerns remain about the landscape and visual implications of the Meridian Solar project. The scheme has already approached or exceeded the threshold of landscape capacity within this locality. Further expansion of its footprint or intensification of infrastructure cannot be supported. It is also deeply concerning that no additional mitigation has been proposed alongside this targeted consultation, despite clear evidence that the previously indicated measures were limited and would be insufficient to offset effects of this magnitude.	N	The Applicant notes this comment but confirms that 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 changes introduced during targeted consultation are not considered to represent a substantial expansion of the overall development. The proposed landscape mitigation strategy is described within the **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16). An outline landscape masterplan has also been provided as Figure 1 of the **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16) to illustrate how the landscape strategy could be implemented. The refinements introduced during targeted consultation were localised adjustments within the reduced Order limits to optimise layout and respond to consultation feedback. These changes do not constitute a substantial expansion of the overall development area. While they involve repositioning and refinement of infrastructure, they remain within the parameters assessed and do not materially increase the Scheme's scale or character beyond what was previously consulted upon.
	Concluding Remarks 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. 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.	N	The changes to the Scheme have been assessed within the Environmental Statement. In terms of landscape and visual and light impacts refer to **ES Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual** (Doc Ref. 6.1). Amenity noise and vibration is covered within **ES Chapter 13: Noise and Vibration** (Doc Ref. 6.1).
	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	N	The Applicant notes this comment and thanks South Holland District Council for its consultation response. The Applicant welcomes further engagement.

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	appreciated and therefore commented upon. It is only when the final submission is made that comments on specific impacts will be made. 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. 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. 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.		

7.20. Historic England

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
Historic England	Thank you for the targeted re-consultation on this scheme dated 18 September 2025. The proposed changes do not introduce new concerns for us in terms of additional likely significant effects upon the historic environment. They will require integration into your ongoing work on the assessment of impacts and proportionate design detailing / mitigation to address such impacts. Following the helpful summary of changes to the scheme from the consult document we can offer the following comments:	N	The Applicant notes this comment and thanks Historic England for its response to the targeted consultation.
	Proposed that all BESS is located at the 400kV substation site, reducing potential noise impacts for residential properties near Land Parcels A, C and D.	N	The Applicant welcomes this comment.

Consultee	Comment	Scheme Change (Y/N)?	Applicant's Response
	This is welcomed as it will be likely to reduce the extent of impacts upon the historic landscape.		
	Reconfigured the layout of Parcel B to move solar PV panels away from areas at higher risk of flooding, with the land now proposed for habitat mitigation or enhancement. The design of habitat mitigation or enhancement works should be integrated with the archaeological assessment work to prioritise co-benefits and avoid loss to significance.	N	Areas of planting have been developed in consultation with the heritage team. Assessment of potential effects as a result of environmental mitigation measures has been assessed within **ES Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage** (Doc Ref. 6.1) and will inform the development of the archaeological mitigation and management strategy which will be submitted during the examination and is secured by DCO requirement.
	Confirmed through updated surveys that land in Parcel B previously assumed to be Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) Grade 1 is predominantly Grade 3a, with small areas of Grade 2. No comment.	N	The Applicant notes this comment.
	Reconfigured the layout of Parcel D to remove one area of land from consideration for solar panels, include additional fields (including some previously shown as inter-array), and increase the distance of infrastructure from nearby properties Identified a section of our grid connection that will go underground where our route crosses an existing overhead line. Integrate this change into your ongoing work on the assessment of impacts and their proportionate design detailing / mitigation to address impacts.	N	The reconfiguration of Parcel D has been assessed within **ES Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage** (Doc Ref. 6.1) with the inclusion of mitigation where required.
	Refined our anticipated location of the proposed Weston Marsh substation, which will be delivered by National Grid Electricity Transmission (NGET) and is our identified point of connection. Noted.	N	The Applicant notes this comment and thanks Historic England for its consultation response.