Meridian Solar Farm

EN010169

Volume 5

Consultation

5.1 Appendix I: Section 47 Applicant's Response

APFP Regulation 5(2)(q)

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

March 2026

Table of Contents

1. Introduction 2

1.1. Section 47 Stage Two Consultation 2

2. Section 47 Consultee Applicant's Response Table 3

2.1. Community benefits 3
2.2. Connectivity 12
2.3. Construction 15
2.4. Cumulative impacts 47
2.5. Decommissioning 52
2.6. Environment 74
2.7. Indicative alignment of overhead line 91
2.8. Land parcels 98
2.9. Land use and agriculture 105
2.10. Landscape and visual impact 110
2.11. National Grid connection 116
2.12. Needs case and trust in the developer 122
2.13. Operational phase 152
2.14. Other non-grid infrastructure 156
2.15. People 177
2.16. Property 213
2.17. Public recreation and access 220

1. Introduction

1.1. Section 47 Stage Two Consultation

1.1.1. The Applicant received a total of 324 pieces of feedback to the Stage Two Consultation under Section 47 of the PA2008.

1.1.2. Section 2 of this Appendix presents the Applicant's response to the feedback received.

2. Section 47 Consultee Applicant's Response Table

2.1. Community benefits

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
Community Benefits	**Subsidised energy** The prospect of receiving cheaper electricity and lower energy bills was by far the most prominent preference displayed by respondents. Respondents also relayed concern that the immediate local area was not benefitting from the electricity produced, with respondents frustrated that other parts of the country would be receiving electricity from a development that was sited in their communities.	Respondents felt that local residents should benefit from cheaper electricity and energy bills or be provided with funds to contribute towards bills	N	As a NSIP, the Scheme is designed to contribute to the wider decarbonisation of the energy system and improve energy security across the country. While it does not offer individual bill reduction, it supports long-term environmental economic benefits, including stabilising energy prices and reducing reliance on fossil fuels. The Applicant remains committed to exploring ways the local community can benefit from the Scheme.
		Respondents felt that residents should be given free electricity	N	As a NSIP, the Scheme is designed to contribute to the wider decarbonisation of the energy system and improve energy security across the country. While it does not offer individual bill reduction, it supports long-term environmental economic benefits, including stabilising energy prices and reducing reliance on fossil fuels. The Applicant remains committed to exploring ways the local community can benefit from the Scheme.
		Respondent felt that residents should benefit from free night-time electricity	N	As a NSIP, the Scheme is designed to contribute to the wider decarbonisation of the energy system and improve energy security across the country. While it does not offer individual bill reduction, it supports long-term environmental economic benefits, including stabilising energy prices and reducing reliance on fossil fuels. The Applicant remains committed to exploring ways the local community can benefit from the Scheme.
		Respondents were concerned that energy produced by the project was being sent to other parts of the country and not being used by local communities	N	The Applicant understands this concern but confirms that once the electricity generated by the Scheme is fed into the National Grid, it then goes to areas of demand. This could be locally or nationally.
		Respondents were sceptical that the project would decrease their energy bills	N	The Scheme supports national efforts to meet net zero targets and energy security ambitions which would support the delivery of more affordable electricity.
		Respondent felt that South Holland District Council should receive improved business rates from the production of electricity	N	Solar farms are non-domestic property and are therefore rateable for business rates. As the Scheme is on agricultural land will pay *more* in business rates than agricultural land was before, because agricultural land is normally exempt, whereas a solar farm is rateable non-domestic property.
		Respondent enquired about the possibility of residents directly receiving cash incentives	N	The Applicant does not propose to use the community benefit fund to provide cash incentives to local residents.

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				The Applicant considers that a more appropriate use of funds would be to invest in local projects that current and future generations would have access to, therefore leaving a lasting legacy from the Scheme.
	Domestic renewable energy installation Residents would welcome the fund being used to provide grants or subsidies for the installation of domestic renewable energy facilities on the properties of residents local to the development. This was predominantly referring to domestic solar installations, although domestic wind turbines were also requested.	Respondents requested the provision of financial support to subsidise the purchase of domestic solar panels and battery systems	N	The Applicant is currently investigating how a community benefit fund could be managed and delivered independently. Once the Scheme is operational and the Community Benefit Fund is established, funds will be available for recommendations on where money could be used.
		Respondent believes that the expenditure from the public consultation period should have been directed towards funding domestic solar installation	N	Pre-application consultation is an essential part of the DCO process. The Applicant undertook a multi-staged programme of consultation and engagement to help build understanding, encourage greater participation in the development of the Scheme and provide opportunities for local views to influence the proposals. Details of the consultation undertaken can be viewed in the **Consultation Report** (Doc Ref. 5.1).
		Respondent requested the installation of small wind turbines in peoples' back garden	N	The Applicant is currently investigating how a community benefit fund could be managed and delivered independently. Once the Scheme is operational and the Community Benefit Fund is established, funds will be available for recommendations on where money could be used.
	Education initiatives Whilst educational initiatives didn't feature prominently, some residents believed that the establishment of youth programmes would have a positive impact on the local area, whilst the creation of educational materials that detailed significant local cultural and historical monuments was also mentioned.	Respondent believed that the provision of education materials on local significant monuments and areas of cultural heritage to schools and local residents would be useful	N	The Applicant is currently investigating how a community benefit fund could be managed and delivered independently. Once the Scheme is operational and the Community Benefit Fund is established, funds will be available for recommendations on where money could be used.
		Respondents requested the establishment of youth programmes	N	The Applicant is currently investigating how a community benefit fund could be managed and delivered independently. Once the Scheme is operational and the Community Benefit Fund is established, funds will be available for recommendations on where money could be used.
	EV charging No sentiment was expressed regarding either domestic or public EV charging points, yet one respondents commented on the	Respondent requested that project vehicles used in the construction phase be exclusively electric	N	The Applicant is committed to ensuring that emissions are kept as low as reasonably practical during the construction of the Scheme. The consideration of low emission vehicles and plant will be undertaken through the procurement stage of the Scheme.

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
	exclusive use of electric vehicles during the construction phase.			
	New jobs associated with the Scheme There was a distinct lack of confidence in the project creating jobs in the local area, rather many respondents were concerned that the development would negatively effect the agricultural sector and lead to a loss of employment in the area.	Respondent highlighted the potential for growth in local employment opportunities	N	The Applicant notes this comment.
		Respondents made specific reference to the creation of jobs in the healthcare sector/ NHS	N	The Applicant is investigating how a community benefit fund could be managed and delivered independently. Once the Scheme is operational and the Community Benefit Fund is established, funds will be available for recommendations on where money could be used.
		Respondents stated that they were sceptical that the scheme would facilitate permanent employment in the area	N	The Applicant notes that the Scheme will generate an element of permanent employment. As set out in **ES Chapter 14: Socio-Economics and Land Use** (Doc Ref. 6.1) it is estimated that there would be an estimated net gain of full-time equivalent jobs supported on the Site as a result of the Scheme, however, it is recognised that the level of permanent employment would not be significant.
		Respondents requested that local labour be used to carry out the construction of the project	N	The Applicant notes that the Scheme will seek to offer local employment opportunities where practical. The commitment to promote local employment is set out in the **Outline Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan** (Doc Ref. 7.17).
		Respondents indicated that they thought the project would come at a sacrifice of local jobs related to the agricultural sector	N	As set out in **ES Chapter 14: Socio-Economics and Land-Use** (Doc Ref. 6.1), any loss of agricultural sector employment is likely to be minimal, given how the farmland is managed within the Solar Development Areas. The Applicant also notes that there are no workers who are reliant on the farmland for full time employment. The Applicant further notes that the hosting of the Scheme will provide a diversified source of income for the land owners of agricultural land holdings, and their voluntary co-operation with the Scheme indicates that this proposed change in land use would not compromise the financial viability of the farm holding for landowners. As well as this, the Scheme would provide a benefit to the agricultural farm holdings in the form of a new and diversified form of income.
	Improved local infrastructure Requests surrounding local infrastructure predominantly focused on the improvement of the	Respondents requested funds for the improvement of local roads	N	The Applicant is currently investigating how a community benefit fund could be managed and delivered independently. Once the Scheme is operational and the Community Benefit Fund is established, funds will be available for recommendations on where money could be used.

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
	local road network alongside improving public transport systems.	Respondents requested improvements for public transport systems	N	The Applicant notes that no enhancement measures, such as improvements to public transport systems, are required for the Scheme given that there are not expected to be any significant traffic and access effects as a result of the Scheme. This is set out in **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref. 6.1).
		Respondent requested upgrades to broadband and phone signals	N	The Applicant is currently investigating how a community benefit fund could be managed and delivered independently. Once the Scheme is operational and the Community Benefit Fund is established, funds will be available for recommendations on where money could be used.
		Respondent requested the implementation of speed reduction initiatives	N	The Applicant notes that road safety has been considered in **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref. 6.1). An **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13) has also been prepared which sets out how construction traffic will be managed. Specific measures include the implementation of a temporary speed limit on the section of Barrier Bank in the proximity of access BB-01 and on Holbeach Drove Gate in the proximity of access HDG-01/HDG-02.
	Local community infrastructure There was no definitive agreed upon local community infrastructure within the feedback received. Rather, respondents displayed a variety of preferences, ranging from supporting local shops with direct grants, the creation of local mental health groups to the provision of sound mitigation for residents along the proposed construction traffic route, amongst others.	Respondent said they would prefer funds being directed towards supporting local shops	N	The Applicant is currently investigating how a community benefit fund could be managed and delivered independently. Once the Scheme is operational and the Community Benefit Fund is established, funds will be available for recommendations on where money could be used.
		Respondent stated a preference for play equipment to be installed in parks	N	The Applicant is currently investigating how a community benefit fund could be managed and delivered independently. Once the Scheme is operational and the Community Benefit Fund is established, funds will be available for recommendations on where money could be used.
		Respondent requested funds be allocated towards the repair of Trinity Court School	N	The Applicant is currently investigating how a community benefit fund could be managed and delivered independently. Once the Scheme is operational and the Community Benefit Fund is established, funds will be available for recommendations on where money could be used.
		Respondent requested funds be allocated towards improving or replacing currently existing community buildings	N	The Applicant is currently investigating how a community benefit fund could be managed and delivered independently.

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				Once the Scheme is operational and the Community Benefit Fund is established, funds will be available for recommendations on where money could be used.
		Respondent stated they would prefer funds be used to support further facilities for recreation and leisure (e.g. swimming pools)	N	The Applicant is currently investigating how a community benefit fund could be managed and delivered independently. Once the Scheme is operational and the Community Benefit Fund is established, funds will be available for recommendations on where money could be used.
		Respondents requested funds be reserved for mental health and wellbeing groups	N	The Applicant is currently investigating how a community benefit fund could be managed and delivered independently. Once the Scheme is operational and the Community Benefit Fund is established, funds will be available for recommendations on where money could be used.
		Respondent asked for funds to be funnelled to local healthcare infrastructure (Hospitals, GP surgeries etc)	N	The Applicant is currently investigating how a community benefit fund could be managed and delivered independently. Once the Scheme is operational and the Community Benefit Fund is established, funds will be available for recommendations on where money could be used.
		Respondent requested that funds be set aside to build a community hall in Crowland	N	The Applicant is currently investigating how a community benefit fund could be managed and delivered independently. Once the Scheme is operational and the Community Benefit Fund is established, funds will be available for recommendations on where money could be used.
		Respondent requested the fitting of double glazing and sound mitigation fixtures for residents on the proposed traffic route	N	The Applicant is currently investigating how a community benefit fund could be managed and delivered independently. Once the Scheme is operational and the Community Benefit Fund is established, funds will be available for recommendations on where money could be used.
	Local green infrastructure A wide variety of local green infrastructure was requested by respondents. A prominent theme was the creation of environmental mitigation/re-construction of habitats lost as a result of the project (including tree planting and wild	Respondents registered a preference for tree planting	N	The Applicant has considered where tree and hedgerow planting could be appropriate through the development of Landscape and Visual mitigation proposals. Further details can be found in **ES Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual** (Doc Ref. 6.1) and the **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16).
		Respondents expressed a wish for bridle paths to be created	N	During the development of the Scheme, the Applicant incorporated a proposal for a permissive path. Further details can be found in **Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan** (Doc Ref. 7.15) and the **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16).

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
	flower meadows). The creation of new PRoWs for walkers and cyclists also featured in the feedback.	Respondents asked for the creation of new walking routes	N	During the development of the Scheme, the Applicant has incorporated a proposal for a permissive path. Further details can be found in **Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan** (Doc Ref. 7.15) and the **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16).
		Respondents wanted new cycling routes to be created	N	The Applicant is currently investigating how a community benefit fund could be managed and delivered independently. Once the Scheme is operational and the Community Benefit Fund is established, funds will be available for recommendations on where money could be used.
		Respondents requested the creation of environmental mitigation to replace any habitats potentially lost during construction	N	The **OLEMP (**Doc Ref. 7.16) provides details of how existing and new habitats will be protected for the Scheme.
		Respondents requested the creation of new green spaces accessible to local families and children	N	The Applicant is currently investigating how a community benefit fund could be managed and delivered independently. Once the Scheme is operational and the Community Benefit Fund is established, funds will be available for recommendations on where money could be used.
		Respondents stated a preference for the creation of wild flower meadows	N	As set out in the **OLEMP (Doc Ref. 7.16)** species-rich grassland will be established on the Site outside of the Solar PV areas. The type chosen will include a diverse sward of grasses and wildflowers in order to increase biodiversity and enhance the value for wildlife.
		Respondent stated they would prefer the Applicant to not mitigate any visual impact through the creation of woodland, as tree coverage is not native to the local fenland environment	N	Mitigation planting proposals are presented within the **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16). Scattered shrub and tree planting is proposed along field boundaries to provide screening for the Solar Development Areas; however, no isolated blocks of woodland have been proposed. The planting strategy has been designed to provide screening whilst ensuring that the planting proposals are in keeping with the surrounding landscape character.
	Funding allocated to local groups/ councils Respondents offered a wide variety of suggestions regarding the allocation of funds to local groups and councils. Provision of funds to local community groups and the	Respondent believes money should be provided to local sports groups	N	The Applicant is currently investigating how a community benefit fund could be managed and delivered independently. Once the Scheme is operational and the Community Benefit Fund is established, funds will be available for recommendations on where money could be used.
		Respondent wanted funds to be given to the NHS	N	The Applicant is currently investigating how a community benefit fund could be managed and delivered independently.

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
	direct management of funds by local residents featured in several pieces of feedback, as did the preference of funds to be allocated to the local parish council. That said, there was some negative sentiment surrounding parish councils, with some respondents stating they did not trust the council to appropriately manage the funds. Moreover, a significant proportion of feedback displayed profound dissatisfaction with the amount of funds earmarked for the community benefit fund, deeming it to be an unsatisfactory number.			Once the Scheme is operational and the Community Benefit Fund is established, funds will be available for recommendations on where money could be used.
		Respondents wanted profits made by the scheme to be given to local community groups (e.g. Brownies)	N	The Applicant is currently investigating how a community benefit fund could be managed and delivered independently. Once the Scheme is operational and the Community Benefit Fund is established, funds will be available for recommendations on where money could be used.
		Respondents stated they would prefer the local parish council to not be in charge of the community fund	N	The Applicant notes that no decisions on the management of the Community Benefit Fund have been made; however, multiple options are being considered.
		Respondents were in favour of a local voting process to dictate how to best use the fund	N	The Applicant notes that no decisions on the management of the Community Benefit Fund have been made; however, multiple options are being considered.
		Respondents were unsatisfied with the amount of money reserved for the community benefit fund	N	The potential amount of the Community Benefit Fund is dependent on the design of the Scheme should it gain consent. The Applicant has indicated a potential sum that is considered reasonable and would make a substantial local contribution for existing and future generations.
		Respondent stated that funds should be given to the Meridian Action Group	N	The Applicant notes that no decisions on the management of the Community Benefit Fund have been made; however, multiple options are being considered.
		Respondent commented that funds could be administered by an arm of the Action on Energy Programme	N	The Applicant notes that no decisions on the management of the Community Benefit Fund have been made; however, multiple options are being considered.
		Respondents believe that local parish councils should be consulted and dictate how the fund is used	N	The Applicant notes that no decisions on the management of the Community Benefit Fund have been made; however, multiple options are being considered.
		Respondents believe that local residents should manage and administer the funds	N	The Applicant notes that no decisions on the management of the Community Benefit Fund have been made; however, multiple options are being considered.
		Respondent believed that the Crowland Hub should manage the fund	N	The Applicant notes that no decisions on the management of the Community Benefit Fund have been made; however, multiple options are being considered.

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
		Respondent believed that the money should be managed by local charities	N	The Applicant notes that no decisions on the management of the Community Benefit Fund have been made; however, multiple options are being considered.
		Respondent believed that the local wildlife trust should manage the fund	N	The Applicant notes that no decisions on the management of the Community Benefit Fund have been made; however, multiple options are being considered.
		Respondent believed that the local GP surgery at Crowland should benefit from the fund	N	The Applicant is currently investigating how a community benefit fund could be managed and delivered independently. Once the Scheme is operational and the Community Benefit Fund is established, funds will be available for recommendations on where money could be used.
		Respondents requested the establishment of specific local committees to manage the funds	N	The Applicant notes that no decisions on the management of the Community Benefit Fund have been made; however, multiple options are being considered.
		Respondent felt that funds should be given to the Crowland Gliding Club	N	The Applicant is currently investigating how a community benefit fund could be managed and delivered independently. Once the Scheme is operational and the Community Benefit Fund is established, funds will be available for recommendations on where money could be used.
	Rejection of community benefits The idea that the community benefit fund had been established to bribe residents was one that heavily featured in responses. Furthermore, many respondents, whilst not labelling the fund as a bribe, flat out rejected any form of community benefit, stating that developers could in no way provide any suitable benefit to local communities. Some pieces of feedback also expressed doubt over the applicant's ability and desire to follow through with proposed plans for community benefit	Respondents felt that the community benefit fund had been created in order to bribe residents	N	The Applicant believes that communities living closest to the Scheme should benefit from it. Setting up and delivering a community benefit fund is considered an appropriate mechanism to broaden the Scheme's benefits for existing and future generations.
		Respondents rejected all notion of any community benefits, believing there to be no suitable benefits that could be proposed by developers	N	The Applicant believes that communities living closest to the Scheme should benefit from it. Setting up and delivering a community benefit fund is considered an appropriate mechanism to broaden the Scheme's benefits for existing and future generations.
		Respondents were doubtful over the applicant's ability to actually provide the proposed community benefits	N	The Applicant is well funded and has the means to deliver benefits to communities living closest to the Scheme. Setting up and delivering a community benefit fund is considered an appropriate mechanism to broaden the Scheme's benefits for existing and future generations.

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
		Respondents rejected the community benefit fund and instead requested that the fund be linked to inflation for the full lifecycle of the project	N	The Applicant believes that communities living closest to the Scheme should benefit from it. Setting up and delivering a community benefit fund is considered an appropriate mechanism to broaden the Scheme's benefits for existing and future generations.

2.2. Connectivity

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
Connectivity	**Existing road infrastructure** Respondents expressed concerns that local roads are already unsuitable for current use and would be unable to accommodate additional construction traffic, leading to a worsening of congestion and further deterioration of existing infrastructure.	Respondents stated that the roads in the area are already unsuitable for current usage and would not be able to cope with the additional construction traffic generated by the scheme. They were concerned about further increases in traffic volumes worsening the situation	N	**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 **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13) sets out road condition surveys to be undertaken prior to, during, and following construction on roads directly serving as access points to the Scheme and routes to be used by heavy goods vehicles (HGV) or abnormal vehicles (AIL) during the construction phase. Where the surveys identify upgrades needed to undertake the construction of the Scheme, or following the construction phase then these works will be undertaken. Traffic during the operational phase would be minimal and not result in damage to surrounding highway and therefore would not give rise to ongoing congestion or deterioration of the local road network. 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). In terms of the concerns regarding the condition and maintenance of local dykes, the potential impact of the Scheme on flooding and drainage, including interactions with existing ditches and dykes, is assessed in **ES Appendix 11-3: Flood Risk Assessment (FRA)** (Doc Ref. 6.3) and **ES Chapter 11: Hydrology and Flood Risk** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The FRA recognises the presence of dykes within and surrounding the Order Limits and notes that these form part of the existing drainage network which is subject to regular inspection and maintenance regime by the relevant operators (Internal Drainage Boards). **ES Appendix 11-3: FRA** (Doc Ref. 6.3) concludes that, with the implementation of proposed mitigation, the Scheme would not materially increase flood risk with the Order Limits or in the surrounding areas, nor would it compromise the function or integrity of existing drainage features. As such, no increased risk to local infrastructure arising from flooding is anticipated as a result of the Scheme.
		Respondents expressed the belief that any increase in heavy vehicle movements would further damage the local road infrastructure and artificially increase safety risks		
		Respondents highlighted that already vulnerable dykes require regular maintenance to prevent flooding, suggesting further risks to local infrastructure		

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
	Public Rights of Way (PROW) Respondents raised concerns about the lack of footpath access within the scheme, the potential loss of important and well-used public rights of way, and safety risks from construction traffic on narrow routes such as Langary Gate Road which are regularly used for walking and horse riding.	Respondents highlighted a lack of footpath access within the scheme area Respondents highlighted the loss of important and popular public rights of way Respondents highlighted the potential of the Scheme to disrupt community connectivity Respondent notes that noise, vibration and other impacts on PROW could affect community health and wellbeing, particularly for vulnerable groups	N	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 during the operational phase are set out within the **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16). The **Outline PRoW-MP** (Doc Ref. 7.15) confirms that there are two temporary PRoW closures likely to be required during construction. PRoW Wstn/3/1 and PRoW Crow/12/1 are anticipated to require temporary closure for 4-6 weeks to facilitate construction works. The original PRoW route would be fully reinstated upon completion of the relevant works. No permanent closures or diversions to PRoW are proposed as part of the Scheme. The impact on the Scheme on severance to PRoW is assessed in **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref. 6.1) with residual impacts provided in **ES Appendix 15-2: Traffic and Transport Significance Assessment** (Doc Ref. 6.3). Overall, the effects are not considered to be significant for PRoW users. . No effects to the severance of PRoW are anticipated during the operational phase. The potential for noise to affect the amenity and wellbeing of PRoW users has been considered in **ES Chapter 13: Noise and Vibration** (Doc Ref. 6.1). Given their linear nature, ambient noise environment, transient usage, and the range of noise impacts expected, significant effects to the experience, health, and quality of life of users of PRoW as a result of noise emissions from the Scheme are not anticipated.
	Public access in and across the Scheme Respondents expressed concern that site access has not been fully investigated, with issues raised about narrow access roads being unsuitable for large vehicles and the lack of passing points due to the poor condition of roads.	Respondents raise concerns that site access has not been adequately investigated Respondents highlighted the lack of important potential passing points that would be required to accommodate an increase in local traffic	N	The Applicant has given consideration to narrow rural roads, passing points, traffic routing, timing, access points, and passing places required for the Scheme during the construction, operational, and decommissioning phases. A full and detailed assessment of potential traffic and transport impacts has been undertaken based on these within **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref. 6.1). As detailed in Section 2.9 of **ES Chapter 2: The Scheme** (Doc Ref. 6.1) and the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13), the Applicant has identified temporary highway works across the surrounding network which may be required for the construction of the Scheme. This includes the provision of passing bays along Martins Road and Langary Gate Road, which will be implemented through the CTMP during construction to be prepared in

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				accordance with **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13), which will be secured by way of a Requirement through the DCO.

2.3. Construction

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
Construction	**Construction traffic (i.e. HGVs; traffic management plans)** Respondents felt that road networks would need to be improved to support construction traffic, including making roads wider. They also thought construction traffic could further damage the road. Respondents were concerned about the size and volume of construction traffic, and thought this could bring disruption to the community and other road users, as well as generating health and safety concerns. Respondents questioned the Applicant's expertise in managing construction traffic and would like further details on the Applicant's plan.	Respondents felt that nearby roads would need to be wider to support construction traffic	N	**ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref 6.1) assesses the potential impact and likely significant effect of the Scheme on traffic levels during construction. In terms of managing construction traffic, the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13) includes mitigation measures to limit the impact of the Scheme on the local highway network. This includes incorporating passing places where vehicles have a risk of interacting with Local Road Users on sections of carriageway which are not wide enough to permit two-way traffic. The Applicant anticipates temporary passing places will be required on Martins Road (see Volume 2.6 Sheets 5&6) and Langary Gate Road (see Volume 2.6 Sheets 9-12). A temporary passing place strategy is to be agreed with LCC.
		Respondents felt that nearby roads would need to be upgraded to support the construction traffic	N	As set out in the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13), road condition surveys will be carried out pre-construction, during construction and post-construction to identify any defects to highways assets and verges arising from the Scheme, with any necessary reinstatement works carried out accordingly.
		Respondents felt that this scheme would bring disruption through the volume of construction traffic	N	**ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref 6.1) assesses the potential impact and likely significant effect of the Scheme on traffic levels during construction. The assessment concludes no significant effects are expected with the implementation of mitigation measures included within the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13).
		Respondents felt that construction traffic would cause further damage to nearby roads	N	As set out in the **OCMTP** (Doc Ref. 7.13), road condition surveys will be carried out pre-construction, during construction and post-construction to identify any defects to highways assets and verges arising from the Scheme, with any necessary reinstatement works carried out accordingly.
		Respondents felt that this scheme would bring increased health and safety concerns for the community due to its associated construction traffic	N	**ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref 6.1) assesses the potential impact and likely significant effect of the Scheme which includes consideration of road user and pedestrian safety. The assessment concludes no significant effects are expected with the implementation of mitigation measures included set out within the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13).

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
		Respondents were concerned about the size of construction vehicles	N	The Applicant notes that vehicle, plant and machinery have been considered and assessed as necessary to construct, maintain and operate the Scheme. The use of LGVs, HGVs and AILs will be required to construct the Scheme. The routing of HGV and AILs is shown on **ES Figure 15-3: Heavy Goods Vehicle Routing** (Doc Ref. 6.2) and **ES Figure 15-4: Abnormal Indivisible Load Routing** (Doc Ref. 6.2).
		Respondents felt that construction traffic would increase emission and pollution volumes	N	**ES Chapter 6: Air Quality** (Doc Ref. 6.1) assesses the effects of the Scheme on air quality as a result of construction dust emissions, vehicle emissions, and non-road mobile machinery emissions. The assessment concludes no significant effects are expected with the implementation of mitigation measures set out within the **OCEMP (Doc Ref. 7.10)**
		Respondents felt that construction traffic would have a negative impact on wildlife	N	**ES Chapter 9: Ecology and Biodiversity** (Doc Ref. 6.1) considers the potential impacts and likely significant effects of the Scheme on wildlife and concludes no significant effects are likely, including from construction traffic, considering the peak traffic numbers to be generated by the Scheme and the proposed traffic routes. Mitigation measures have been included within the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13) to minimise the impact of construction traffic such as the inclusion of traffic management and monitoring measures.
		Respondents do not support the Applicant's traffic management proposals	N	The Applicant notes this comment. Since the PEIR, an **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13) has been prepared which provides further details regarding the Applicant's traffic management proposals.
		Respondents felt that construction traffic would bring increased noise pollution	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. With the implementation of proposed mitigation, no likely significant effects are anticipated at nearby sensitive receptors, with the exception of two locations. Potential significant effects could arise at one receptor at Broad Gate along the Grid Connection Route if Horizontal Directional Drilling activities are required at night-time for the diversion of third-party assets, and at properties along Langary Gate Road during periods of peak construction activity due to construction traffic noise. Construction noise will also be controlled through compliance with noise limits secured by a Requirement in the **Draft DCO** (Doc Ref. 3.1). In addition, whilst not mandatory for DCO projects, the Applicant proposes to apply for a Section 61 consent under the Control of

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				Pollution Act 1974 on a voluntary basis, where appropriate, to manage construction activities outside standard working hours. The **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13) 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.
		Respondent was pleased to see the Applicant's intention to reinforce the grass verges	N	The Applicant welcomes this comment.
		Respondent felt that the Applicant should organise cleaning services for residents due to fine soil deposits from getting vehicles getting on their property and vehicles	N	**ES Chapter 6: Air Quality** (Doc Ref. 6.1) assesses the effects of the Scheme on air quality as a result of construction dust emissions, vehicle emissions, and non-road mobile machinery emissions. The assessment concludes no significant effects are predicted. Standard good practice mitigation measures to control and minimise dust generation and tracking, such as those relating to construction traffic management and site housekeeping, are set out in the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10). With these measures in place, significant off-site dust deposition affecting residential properties or vehicles is not anticipated, and therefore the provision of routine cleaning services is not proposed.
		Respondents felt that an effective traffic management scheme should be enforced if the Applicant is successful in gaining permission for the development	N	Traffic management measures will be included within the detailed CTMP which is secured by a Requirement in the **Draft DCO** (Doc Ref. 3.1), which must be in substantial accordance with the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13) submitted with the DCO application.
		Respondents did not feel that the Applicant had sufficiently considered the impact of Scheme traffic on local roads, particularly during the construction phase. Further information and a comprehensive management plan was requested	N	The Applicant acknowledges concerns regarding the potential impacts and likely significant effects of construction traffic on local roads. A full and detailed assessment of traffic and transport effects, with particular regard to the construction phase, has been undertaken and is reported in **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref. 6.1). Traffic management and mitigation measures including construction traffic routing, timing, access arrangements and controls to minimize effects on the local highway network are set out in the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13), which provides the comprehensive management framework requested.
		Respondents felt that construction traffic should only be able to operate within set times each day	N	The impact of road traffic is assessed in **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The Scheme has been designed with multiple access points to distribute the construction traffic across the road network and avoid significant effects. The core working hours during construction are also timed so that the bulk of the traffic movements will occur outside the road network peak hours, as set out in the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13).

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
		Respondents were concerned about the length of time construction traffic would operate in line with the length of the development's construction as a whole	N	The Applicant acknowledges the concern regarding the length of time construction traffic would operate. Construction traffic effects, including their duration have been considered as part of the assessment reported in **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref. 6.1). Traffic management measures including controls on construction traffic routing, timing and phasing are set out in the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13), which will be implemented by the CTMP secured by way of Requirement in the DCO, to limit the duration and potential impacts of construction traffic on the local highway network.
		Respondents were concerned about the Applicant's consideration of drainage dykes	N	**ES Chapter 11: Hydrology and Flood Risk** (Doc Ref. 6.1) assesses the impact of the Scheme on existing drainage features. No significant effects are expected with the implementation of mitigation measures set out within the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref 7.10).
		Respondents felt that construction traffic would cause structural issues to nearby properties	N	The potential for traffic induced vibration and associated effects on nearby buildings has been assessed in **ES Chapter 13: Noise and Vibration** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The assessment concludes that, where roads are maintained in a normal condition, vibration generated by construction traffic would not result in significant effects or structural damage to properties. Traffic management and control measures detailed in the CTMP, prepared in accordance with the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13) and secured by way of Requirement in the DCO, will be implemented during construction to manage traffic and limit potential effects on the local highway network and surrounding receptors.
		Respondents felt that construction traffic would negatively impact other road users	N	The potential impacts and likely significant effects of road traffic are assessed in **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The assessment concludes no significant effects are expected, with the implementation of measures set out within the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13). Traffic management and control measures detailed in the CTMP, which will be prepared in accordance with the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13) and secured by way of Requirement in the DCO, will be implemented during construction to manage traffic and limit potential effects on the local highway network and surrounding receptors.
		Respondents were not concerned about increased construction traffic	N	The Applicant notes this comment.
		Respondents felt that the Applicant should return the roads to their original state following use	N	As set out in the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13), road condition surveys will be carried out pre-construction, during construction and post-construction to identify any defects to highways assets and verges arising from the

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				Scheme, with any necessary reinstatement works carried out accordingly.
		Respondents questioned the Applicant's expertise in traffic management	N	The Applicant acknowledges the concerns regarding the traffic management, but the Applicant remains confident in the level of assessments undertaken, with the traffic and transport assessment having been undertaken by qualified and experienced professionals. As stated in **ES Appendix 1-3 EIA Statement of Competence** (Doc Ref. 6.3) the Traffic and Access EIA Technical Discipline Lead is a specialist with substantial experience leading traffic and transport inputs for other solar DCO Schemes. In addition, the assessment presented in **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref. 6.1) has been prepared in consultation with the relevant highways authorities, including Highways England and Lincolnshire County Council.
		Respondents felt that the Applicant's communications on traffic management and routes are inaccessible	N	The Applicant provided information about traffic management and construction access routes within the PEIR, which was made available at statutory consultation. As a more accessible format, a Non-Technical Summary of the PEIR was also made available as part of the consultation materials. Further details on the information provided as part of the statutory consultation are provided in the **Consultation Report** (Doc Ref. 5.1). Since the PEIR, the Traffic and Access assessment has been finalised and is contained within **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref. 6.1). Traffic management measures are detailed within the **Outline CTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13). In terms of traffic management routes these are shown in **ES Figure 15-3 Heavy Goods Vehicle (HGV Routing)** (Doc Ref. 6.2), and **ES Figure 15-4 Abnormal Indivisible Load (AIL) Routing** (Doc Ref. 6.2)).
		Respondents felt that construction traffic would have a negative impact on biodiversity	N	**ES Chapter 9: Ecology and Biodiversity** (Doc Ref. 6.1) considers the potential impact and likely significant effect of the Scheme including from construction traffic on biodiversity which concludes no significant effects are likely. Mitigation measures have been included within the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13) to minimise the impact of construction traffic such as the inclusion of traffic management and monitoring measures.
		Respondents felt that the Applicant should use electric construction vehicles and machinery	N	The Applicant endeavours to minimise emissions from construction vehicles and machinery, as set out within the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10). The contractor appointed to construct the Scheme will consider the use of electric or low-emission vehicles, where appropriate and practicable,

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				having regard to availability, suitability and in line with the assessments set out in the Environmental Statement (Doc. Ref. 6.1) and the requirements of the DCO. As set out in **ES Chapter 6: Air Quality** (Doc Ref. 6.1), emissions from construction, traffic and plant have been assessed and with the implementation of standard mitigation measures set out within the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10), no significant effects are predicted.
		Respondents felt that residents should not face parking restrictions if their area is being imposed on by construction traffic	N	The impact of road traffic and potential implications for parking are assessed in **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The assessment concludes no significant effects are expected. Traffic management measures detailed in the CTMP which will be prepared in accordance with the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13), which will be secured by way of Requirement in the DCO, will be implemented to manage construction traffic impacts and limit potential impacts on local roads. On this basis, no parking restrictions for nearby residents are proposed or anticipated as part of the Scheme.
		Respondents felt that an increase in construction traffic would negatively impact house prices in the area	N	The potential impacts and likely significant effects of road traffic are assessed in **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The assessment concludes no significant effects are expected. Traffic management measures detailed in the CTMP, which will be prepared in accordance with the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13)and secured by way of Requirement in the DCO, will be implemented to manage construction traffic and limit potential impacts during the construction phase. Throughout the pre-application stage the Applicant has sought to assess and mitigate potential effects on neighbouring properties, including those relating to traffic, noise and air quality. The results of these assessments, along with proposed mitigation measures, 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.

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
		Respondents felt that road upgrades to support construction traffic would involve the removal of historically important features	N	The impact of the Scheme on the historic environment is assessed within **ES Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage** (Doc Ref. 6.1). No removal of historically important features is proposed as a result of the highway works.
		Respondent felt that the community and local council should face no additional charges for road upgrades to host construction traffic	N	The Scheme is being privately funded by the Applicant. There will be no charges imposed on the local community or councils.
		Respondents felt that unsuitable roads result in vehicle damage	N	As set out in the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13), road condition surveys will be carried out pre-construction, during construction and post-construction to identify any defects to highways assets and verges arising from the Scheme, with any necessary reinstatement works carried out accordingly.
		Respondent felt that the accumulated amount of construction traffic from this scheme and others in the area would be unacceptable	N	The effects of construction traffic, including cumulative impacts arising from other schemes, are assessed in **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The assessment concludes no significant effects are expected, except for potentially significant cumulative effects on road safety which have been identified on A151 Holbeach Road, A16 South of Crowland, A16 North of Peterborough, Hull's Drove (East), predominantly as a result of the cumulative schemes. These effects would only arise if construction peak periods for the Scheme and other cumulative projects were to overlap. The **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13) and the **Draft DCO** (Doc Ref. 3.1) provide the mechanism for additional traffic management measures to be implemented, where necessary, to mitigate such cumulative effects.
		Respondents supported a lower speed limit for traffic management	N	Traffic management measures detailed in the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13) will be implemented to limit construction traffic impacts including lowering speed limits where required such as Barrier Bank/Spalding Road.
		Respondents felt that the Applicant should create a financial reserve for any damage that appears following the end of the development	N	The Applicant is legally obligated to decommission the Scheme, in accordance with an approved Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (to be prepared in accordance with the **ODEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.12)) as secured by way of a Requirement in the DCO. The requirements of the DCO are enforceable and it is a criminal offence to fail to comply with these. The Proceeds of Crime Act 2002 also acts as a further deterrent, and elements of the installed solar PV represent a valuable asset meaning it would be in the Applicant's interest financially to decommission the site in order to sell or recycle the panels and other components. If the Applicant went into liquidation or receivership, its assets would be sold off to fund the decommissioning of the Scheme

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				that is required pursuant to the legal requirement of the DCO (in this context, it is relevant that the DCO is a piece of legislation, and therefore different to a planning permission). A decommissioning bond is not routine for energy DCOs and while similar arguments have been advanced requesting a decommissioning bond in the Examinations for most other solar DCOs, the Secretary of State has not required one for those made to date.
	Construction impact Respondents felt that the construction of the development would have a negative impact on agriculture in the area and the general land of the site. Respondents expressed concern about the length of the construction period and thought the local community would face disruption. Respondents felt that the construction of the development would have a negative impact on the environment, biodiversity and wildlife. Respondents felt that the construction of the development would negatively impact on road infrastructure.	Respondents felt that construction of the development would negatively impact the proposed land	N	The potential impact and likely significant effects of the Scheme on agriculture is assessed within **ES Chapter 5: Agriculture and Soils** (Doc Ref. 6.1) which considers potential construction phase impacts and identifies appropriate mitigation and restoration measures where required. The concern regarding the length of the construction period is noted. This has been considered in the **Environmental Statement** (Doc Ref. 6.1) with the impacts being temporary and managed through phasing and mitigation as set out within the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.1) and **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13) to limit the disruption to the local community. In relation to environmental effects, biodiversity and wildlife, a full Environmental Statement has been submitted as part of the DCO Application (Doc Ref. 6.1, 6.2 and 6.3). This includes **ES Chapter 9: Ecology and Biodiversity** (Doc Ref. 6.1) which assesses the potential impacts and likely significant effects of the Scheme on biodiversity and wildlife during construction, operation and decommissioning and sets out measures to avoid, reduce or mitigate effects on ecological receptors. Concerns regarding impacts on road infrastructure are addressed through the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13), which sets out road condition surveys to be carried out pre-construction, during construction and post-construction to identify any defects to highways assets and verges arising from the Scheme, with any necessary reinstatement works carried out accordingly. The CTMP will be prepared in accordance with the measures set out in the **O CTMP** (Do Ref. 7.13) will be secured by way of Requirement in the DCO.
		Respondents felt that the construction of the development would have a negative impact on agriculture	N	The likely significant effects of the Scheme on agriculture and soils are assessed within **ES Chapter 5: Agriculture and Soils** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The assessment acknowledges a likely significant effect from the long-term restriction of ALC Grade 1 and 2 land within the Solar Development Area. However, these effects would be temporary and the land can return to agricultural use following decommissioning. An **OOSMP** (Doc

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				Ref. 7.14) has been prepared, which sets out measures to minimise impacts on soils, including measures for soil handling, storage and reinstatement.
		Respondents felt that construction of the development would bring noise pollution	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. With the implementation of proposed mitigation, as set out within **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10), the assessment concludes that no likely significant effects are anticipated at nearby sensitive receptors, with the exception of two locations. Potential significant effects could arise at one receptor at Broad Gate along the Grid Connection Route, which would be affected if Horizontal Directional Drilling activities are required at night-time to facilitate the diversion of third-party assets, and at properties along Langary Gate Road during periods of peak construction activity due to construction traffic noise. Construction noise will also be controlled through compliance with noise limits secured by a Requirement in the **Draft DCO** (Doc Ref. 3.1). In addition, whilst not mandatory for DCO projects, the Applicant proposes to apply for a Section 61 consent under the Control of Pollution Act 1974 on a voluntary basis, where appropriate, to manage construction activities outside standard working hours. The CTMP, which will be secured by way of Requirement in the DCO and prepared in accordance with the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13), 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.
		Respondents felt that construction impacts would negatively affect and disrupt the local community	N	Impacts on surrounding residents and businesses during construction have been considered in the following technical chapters of the ES: **ES Chapter 14: Socio-economics and Land Use, ES Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual and ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref 6.1). Measures have been set out within the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10) and **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13) which would limit disruption to the local community as far as practicable.
		Respondents felt that the construction of the development would have a negative impact on the environment and biodiversity	N	A full Environmental Statement has been submitted as part of the DCO Application (Doc Ref. 6.1, 6.2 and 6.3). This includes **ES Chapter 9: Ecology and Biodiversity** (Doc Ref. 6.1) which assesses the impact of the Scheme on biodiversity and wildlife. The assessment concludes that

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				no significant adverse effects are expected, with the implementation of mitigation measures set out within the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10), **OOEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.11), **ODEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.12) and the **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16).
		Respondents felt that the construction of the development would have a negative impact on wildlife	N	**ES Chapter 9: Ecology and Biodiversity** (Doc Ref. 6.1) provides an assessment of the potential impacts and likely significant effects of construction on wildlife. The chapter concludes that no significant adverse effects are considered likely, with the implementation of mitigation measures set out within the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10), **OOEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.11), **ODEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.12) and the **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16)
		Respondents felt that dust or dirt would be a problem during the construction period	N	**ES Chapter 6: Air Quality** (Doc Ref. 6.1) assesses the effects of the Scheme on air quality as a result of construction dust emissions, vehicle emissions, and non-road mobile machinery emissions. The assessment concludes that no significant effects are considered likely, with the implementation of mitigation measures set out within the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10). Standard good practice mitigation measures to control and minimise dust generation are set out in the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10) and will be implemented during the construction phase through the CEMP, which will secured by way of Requirement in the DCO.
		Respondents felt that construction machinery would increase pollution	N	**ES Chapter 6: Air Quality** (Doc Ref. 6.1) assesses the effects of the Scheme on air quality as a result of construction dust emissions, vehicle emissions, and non-road mobile machinery emissions. The assessment concludes that no significant effects are considered likely, with the implementation of mitigation measures set out within the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10). Standard good practice mitigation measures to minimise dust and emissions from construction machinery are set out in the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10).
		Respondents expressed concern about the Applicant importing construction materials from abroad	N	The Applicant is committed to building sites with only manufacturers and contractors who have pledged to prevent modern slavery in the supply chain. The balance of system components are generally sourced from the UK and EU. We are a member of the Solar Energy UK and subscribe to their Responsible Sourcing Guidance and best practices. Full due diligence on all of the supply chain and materials will take place, and time is allowed for in the programme through to construction to allow this to happen, in accordance with the measures outlined within the **Outline Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan** (Doc Ref. 7.17). A final Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan which must be

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				prepared in accordance with the Outline plan is secured by way of a Requirement in the DCO. The environmental effects associated with construction have been assessed within the **Environmental Statement** (Doc Ref. 6.1). Measures to manage and mitigate environmental effects associated with construction will be implemented through the CEMP to be prepared in accordance with the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10), as secured by way of a Requirement in the DCO.
		Respondents felt that the Applicant should provide further information on the impact of construction	N	The impact of construction has been fully assessed within the technical chapters provided within the **Environmental Statement** (Doc Ref. 6.1). Good practice environmental mitigation measures have been set out within the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10).
		Respondents expressed concern about the length of the construction period	N	The construction phase is anticipated to be up to four years. The impact of construction has been fully assessed within the technical chapters provided within the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.1). Good practice environmental mitigation measures have been set out within the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10).
		Respondents expressed concern about the suggested construction hours	N	The Applicant has addressed potential impacts associated with construction activities throughout the technical assessments contained within the ES (Doc Ref. 6.1). The **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10) and **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13) set out measures intended to ensure that activities and traffic do not result in unacceptable impacts on local residents. Measures would include keeping to agreed construction working hours (Monday to Friday from 07:00 to 19:00 and Saturday 08:00 to 13:30), unless crucial to construction, and the management and scheduling of site deliveries to minimise congestion on the local road network. Operations that may take place outside of the core working hours are described in the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10) and **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13).
		Respondents felt that the construction of the development would negatively impact the local economy, work, and business in the area	N	The potential impacts and likely significant effects of the Scheme on the local economy, work and business have been assessed within **ES Chapter 14: Socio-economics and Land Use** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The chapter concludes that the Scheme would not give rise to any significant adverse socio-economic effects. In addition, the **Outline Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan** (Doc Ref. 7.17) sets out a variety of measures which the Applicant would pursue post-consent to maximise the socio-economic benefits of the Scheme, for example promoting local employment, apprenticeships and education.

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
		Respondents felt that construction of this scheme brought health and safety concerns	N	All works will be undertaken in accordance with relevant Health and Safety legislation and guidance.
		Respondents expressed concern about construction access	N	All site accesses have been assessed in **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref. 6.1) which concludes no significant effects are expected. There are measures included within the **OCTMP** (Doc. Ref. 7.13) which would limit impacts such as implementing a Delivery Management System to control bookings of HGV deliveries.
		Respondents questioned the applicants expertise in construction planning and assessment	N	The Applicant's technical team comprises experienced professionals in planning, design and environmental assessments. The Applicant's technical team's expertise for completing the Environmental Statement is set out within **ES Appendix 1-3: EIA Statement of Competency** (Doc Ref. 6.3). The Downing Renewable Developments team have extensive experience of design, consenting, constructing and operating renewable sites, and have a very experienced pipeline of internal staff, consultants and contractors for all projects.
		Respondents expressed concerns that construction traffic could harm road infrastructure	N	As set out in the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13), road condition surveys will be carried out pre-construction, during construction and post-construction to identify any defects to highways assets and verges arising from the Scheme, with any necessary reinstatement works carried out accordingly
		Respondents felt that the vibration from construction would be of concern	N	The impact of vibration is assessed within **ES Chapter 13: Noise and Vibration** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The chapter concludes that no significant vibration effects are expected with the incorporation of mitigation measures set out within the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10).
		Respondents expressed concern about the ability for the local area to accommodate construction workers coming from outside the community	N	The impact of the Scheme on the local accommodation sector has been assessed in **ES Chapter 14: Socio-economics and Land Use** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The assessment concludes that at peak workforce employment (855 FTE staff) and typical seasonal occupancy levels, 100% of the Scheme's construction workers could be accommodated in major hotels within 60-minutes' drive of the Scheme, therefore no significant effects are expected.
		Respondents felt that the construction of this scheme would damage heritage sites	N	The impact of the Scheme on heritage has been assessed in **ES Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The chapter concludes that there would be significant effects associated with disturbance of below ground archaeology, changes in the setting of six heritage assets, the historic landscape of the former precinct of Crowland Abbey, and the Fens and the Wash historic landscape character areas. . Upon

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				completion of the decommissioning phase, the effects on the setting of heritage assets as a result of the Scheme would cease. Good practice measures regarding the protection of heritage assets are set out within the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref 7.10), **OOEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.11), and **ODEMP** (Doc Ref 7.12). Furthermore, an Archaeological Management and Mitigation Strategy will be prepared to set out a programme of archaeological investigation, recording and reporting in consultation with the Archaeological Advisor of Lincolnshire County Council.
		Respondent felt that locals should be employed for construction work and maintenance	N	The **Outline Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan** (Doc Ref. 7.17) sets out a variety of measures which the Applicant would pursue post-consent to maximise the economic benefits of the Scheme, for example promoting local employment, apprenticeships and education.
		Respondents felt that the construction could damage properties	N	The construction phase is not expected to cause physical damage to properties. An assessment of potential impacts and likely significant effects with regards to vibration from construction traffic is presented within **ES Chapter 13: Noise and Vibration** (Doc Ref. 6.1). With the implementation of good practice measures, set out within the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10), no significant effects from vibration or damage to properties are considered likely. In terms of construction traffic, further measures are included within the **OTCMP** (Doc. Ref. 7.13) would limit impacts and disruption to the local community.
		Respondents felt that the construction phase of the development would negatively impact house prices	N	Throughout the pre-application stage, the Applicant has sought to identify and assess potential effects on neighbouring properties and has engaged with local residents as part of this process. The results of these assessments, along with proposed mitigation measures, are presented in the **Environmental Statement** (Doc Ref 6.1). Having regard to the conclusions of the ES, . 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.
		Respondents expressed concern about light pollution during the construction phase	N	Night-time visual effects from lighting have been considered within **ES Appendix 12-6: Visual Assessment** (Doc Ref. 6.3) and Section 12.8 of **ES Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual** (Doc Ref. 6.1). During the construction and decommissioning phases, temporary lighting may be

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				required to enable safe working where activities are undertaken outside of daylight hours. Temporary lighting will be designed as far as practical to reduce the potential for light spillage and glare outside of the Scheme. Lighting will not be required for the solar PV modules during the operational phase. Non-continuous sensor triggered infrared lighting would be positioned around critical electrical infrastructure within the BESS and On-Site Substation Compounds and Cable Sealing End Compounds for security purposes and emergency maintenance. Directional lighting would be used, directed away from Site boundaries. As such, lighting will be limited and is unlikely to result in significant visual effects at night-time. Good practice measures to minimise light spill off-site have been set out within the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10), **OOEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.11), **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16) and **ODEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.12).
	Construction of overhead line – General comments Respondents felt that the construction of overhead lines would have a negative impact on the environment and surrounding areas.	Respondent was opposed to the Applicant constructing pylons and OHLs	N	The selection of an overhead line as the preferred technology for the grid connection has been informed by national policy contained in the National Policy Statement for Electricity Networks (EN-5) which states that, outside of nationally designated landscapes, overhead lines should be the strong starting presumption for electricity networks in general, unless these would give rise to particularly significant landscape and visual effects.
		Respondents felt that the construction of OHLs would have a negative impact on the environment and surrounding area	N	**ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution** (Doc Ref. 6.1) and **the Design Approach Document** (Doc Ref. 7.3) describe the reasonable alternatives considered and the iterative design evolution process undertaken for the Grid Connection Route, including the assessment of alternative alignments, tower designs, and the potential for partial undergrounding. These documents explain the technical, environmental, and deliverability reasons that informed the selection of the proposed overhead line solution, alongside the measures embedded within the Scheme design to avoid or reduce environmental effects where practicable.
		Respondents felt that the OHLs were being constructed too high	N	The Applicant notes this comment. The height of the overhead line has been determined by technical and safety requirements, including the need to meet statutory electrical clearances as per the Energy Networks Association (ENA/43-8), Technical Specification 43-8, Issue 5 2019, Overhead Line Clearances.

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
		Respondent felt that the state of the roads would negatively impact the construction process for OHLs	N	The HGV routes for the Scheme are shown on **ES Figure 15-3: Heavy Goods Vehicle (HGV) Routing** (Doc Ref. 6.2), demonstrating that the roads to be used to construct the Grid Connection include the A16 Crowland Bypass, A151 High Road and B1165 Austendyke Road. As set out in the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13), road condition surveys would be carried out pre-construction, during construction and post-construction to identify any defects to highways assets and verges arising from the Scheme, with any necessary reinstatement works carried out accordingly. The measures set out would be implemented by the CTMP, which would secured by way of Requirement in the DCO.
		Respondent felt that the OHLs would negatively impact wildlife	N	The impact of the OHL's on wildlife has been assessed within **ES Chapter 9: Ecology and Biodiversity** (Doc Ref. 6.1) and **ES Appendix 9-14: Habitats Regulations Assessment Report** (Doc Ref. 6.3), including consideration of habitat loss, disturbance and species interactions, as relevant. Bird diverters have been specified on sections of the Grid Connection to minimize the risk of bird collisions with the overhead line. Subject to the implementation of the specified mitigation measures, the assessment concludes that no significant effects on ecology or biodiversity are expected.
	Construction of Solar PV Respondents expressed concern about the construction of Solar PV on quality agricultural land and felt that construction on alternative structures e.g. buildings or poorer quality land, was more appropriate.	Respondents felt that Solar PV should be constructed on alternative structures e.g. on buildings or on poorer quality land	N	The use of alternative locations for solar development, including rooftops and brownfield land, has been considered. Rooftop solar is an important part of the renewable energy mix and the Applicant supports its development on suitable rooftops where practicable. However, rooftop and urban brownfield sites alone cannot deliver the scale of generation required to meet national renewable energy targets, due to technical constraints such as orientation, shading, structural capacity and fragmented land ownership. Many brownfield sites are also more appropriately reserved for housing, employment or other forms of development in accordance with national planning objectives. Large-scale ground-mounted solar developments are therefore an important and necessary component of achieving the UK's solar generation ambitions. The site has been selected following an assessment of technical, environmental and planning considerations, and the effects of the development have been assessed and mitigated through the scheme design and accompanying Environmental Statement.

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
		Respondent felt that Solar PV materials should not be imported from abroad	N	Full due diligence on all of the supply chain and materials will take place, and time is allowed for in the programme through to construction to allow this to happen, in accordance with the measures outlined within the **Outline Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan** (Doc Ref. 7.17). A final Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan which must be prepared in accordance with the Outline plan is secured by way of a Requirement in the DCO.
		Respondent expressed concern about the number of Solar farms being constructed in the area	N	The Applicant's cumulative impact assessment has identified local developments that could have the potential to cause cumulative effects with the Scheme. Where practicable, the Scheme would coordinate with other developers to minimise the cumulative effects, particularly in the construction and decommissioning phases. A cumulative assessment with other developments is included at the end of each technical chapter within the ES (Doc Ref. 6.1). Of particular relevance, cumulative solar developments within Lincolnshire have been considered within the cumulative assessments presented within **ES Chapter 5: Agriculture and Soils** (Doc Ref. 6.1) and **ES Chapter 16: Other Environmental Topics, Section 16.6 Materials and Waste** (Doc Ref. 6.1).
		Respondents felt that construction of Solar PV would have a negative impact on community health and safety	N	**ES Chapter 10: Human Health** (Doc Ref. 6.1) provides an assessment of potential impacts and likely significant effects during construction, operation and decommissioning of the Scheme on health and wellbeing. The assessment concludes that with measures set out within the management plans submitted with the DCO Application, no significant effects on health and wellbeing are considered likely. Specifically, measures to minimise effects from increased disturbance, including dust and noise and vibration, are set out within the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10), **OOEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.11) and **ODEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.12). All construction activities will be undertaken in accordance with relevant Health and Safety legislation and industry guidance. **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref 6.1) details the Applicant's consideration of the effects of increased traffic levels during construction and proposed mitigation measures. Specifically, measures to manage construction traffic and protect road user safety are set out within the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13), which identifies how traffic impacts from the Scheme will be minimised.
		Respondents expressed concern about flooding of the area during ©ïñ PV construction	N	As stated within **ES Chapter 11: Hydrology and Flood Risk** (Doc Ref. 6.1) and **ES Appendix 11-3: Flood Risk Assessment** (Doc Ref. 6.3), the flood risk resulting from construction within the Site is not envisaged to

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				impact fluvial, tidal, groundwater, sewers, or artificial risk levels of flooding within or surrounding the Site. The increase in surface water runoff rates as a result of the with-Scheme scenario will be managed by the construction of sustainable drainage techniques proposed to mimic the pre-Scheme conditions detailed within **Appendix 11-4 Outline Drainage Strategy** (Doc Ref. 6.3) resulting in no impact to flooding from surface water sources within or surrounding the Site during the construction phase. Measures for the protection of the Site from flooding during construction, emergency readiness and response are also set out within the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10).
		Respondents felt that the construction of the ©Ï╕PV would bring disruption to the community	N	The concern regarding disruption to the community during the construction phase is acknowledged. There are measures included within the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10) and **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13) to minimise disruption to the local community.
		Respondents felt that construction of the ©Ï╕PV would damage good quality agricultural land	N	The impact of the Scheme on agricultural land is assessed within **ES Chapter 5: Agriculture and Soils** (Doc Ref. 6.1) which concludes that no significant effects are expected except on the soil resource within the Order Limits, however, a significant effect is acknowledged from the long-term restriction of ALC Grade 1 and 2 land within the Solar Development Area. Following decommissioning, land within the Order Limits can be returned to agriculture. Mitigation measures are included within the **OSMP** (Doc Ref. 7.14), including measures for soil handling, storage and reinstatement.
		Respondents felt that the construction of the ©Ï╕PV would negatively impact food security	N	The Applicant notes that the independent National Food Strategy Review concludes that solar farms do not present a risk to the UK's food security. The Scheme would enable agricultural use of the land, supporting farm diversification and the long-term viability of agricultural operations. Solar farms can continue to support agricultural activities, including grazing, and can support UK farmers in maintaining food production on other parts of their land. Furthermore, the Scheme presents less than 1% of agricultural land available in Lincolnshire.
		Respondents expressed concern about the construction of ©Ï╕PV on historically important land	N	The impact of the Scheme on heritage has been assessed in **ES Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The chapter concludes that there would be significant effects associated with disturbance of below ground archaeology, changes in the setting of six heritage assets, the historic landscape of the former precinct of Crowland Abbey, and the Fens and the Wash historic landscape character areas. Upon

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				completion of the decommissioning phase, the effects on the setting of heritage assets as a result of the Scheme would cease. Good practice measures regarding the protection of heritage assets are set out within the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref 7.10), **OOEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.11), and **ODEMP** (Doc Ref 7.12). Furthermore, an Archaeological Management and Mitigation Strategy will be prepared to set out a programme of archaeological investigation, recording and reporting in consultation with the Archaeological Advisor of Lincolnshire County Council.
		Respondents felt that the construction of the ©ÏÏ PV would negatively impact animal welfare	N	**ES Chapter 9: Ecology and Biodiversity** (Doc Ref. 6.1) assesses the potential impacts and likely significant effects of the Scheme on ecological receptors. The assessment concludes that no significant adverse effects are expected on ecology or biodiversity, with the implementation of the mitigation measures included within the management plans submitted with the DCO Application.
		Respondent felt that the construction of Solar PV would cause increased problems with glare	N	Glint and glare has been assessed within **ES Appendix 16-2: Glint and Glare Assessment** (Doc Ref. 6.3) and summarised within Section 16.4 of **ES Chapter 16: Other Environmental Topics** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The assessment concludes that no significant effects are expected on the basis of the proposed Scheme design.
		Respondent expressed concern that the construction of Solar PV would negatively impact the visual attractiveness of the area	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 minimise the potential visual effects through establishing a sensitively designed layout and appropriate embedded mitigation measures (e.g. targeted planting), as set out in the **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16).
		Respondents felt that the construction of the ©ÏÏ PV would be environmentally damaging	N	A full environmental impact assessment has been carried out as reported in Environmental Statement (Doc. Ref 6.1, 6.2. and 6.3). The Environmental Statement includes assessments of all relevant environmental topics, including for agriculture and soils, air quality, climate, historic environment, ecology and biodiversity, human health, water environment, landscape and visual, noise and vibration, traffic and other environmental topics. Measures to minimise effects from construction are set out within the relevant management plans submitted with the DCO Application, including the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10) and the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13). Where significant effects during the construction period have been identified, it is considered that all practicable mitigation has been included within the relevant management plans for the Scheme.

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
		Respondent felt that the construction of Solar PV would negatively impact property values	N	Throughout the pre-application stage, potential effects on neighbouring properties have been carefully considered and local residents have been consulted. The results of these assessments, along with proposed mitigation measures, 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.
	Construction of inter-array areas Respondents expressed concern that the construction of inter-array areas would bring disruption to the local community and negatively impact communities, wildlife and agriculture. They thought the scheme would be better placed away from these.	Respondents felt that the construction of inter-array areas would have a negative visual impact	N	The visual impact of the Scheme during the construction phase 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 the **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16). Due to the limited construction required to establish the Inter-Array Connections, the effects associated with these works are not likely to be significant.
		Respondent felt that the construction of inter-array areas would negatively impact historical sites	N	The impact of the Scheme on heritage has been assessed in **ES Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The chapter concludes that there would be significant effects associated with disturbance of below ground archaeology, changes in the setting of six heritage assets, the historic landscape of the former precinct of Crowland Abbey, and the Fens and the Wash historic landscape character areas. Upon completion of the decommissioning phase, the effects on the setting of heritage assets as a result of the Scheme would cease. Good practice measures regarding the protection of heritage assets are set out within the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref 7.10), **OOEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.11), and **ODEMP** (Doc Ref 7.12). Furthermore, an Archaeological Management and Mitigation Strategy will be prepared to set out a programme of archaeological investigation, recording and reporting in consultation with the Archaeological Advisor of Lincolnshire County Council.
		Respondents felt that the construction of inter-array areas would bring disruption to the local community	N	The concern regarding disruption to the community during the construction phase is acknowledged. There are measures set out within the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.1) and **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13) and would limit disruption to the local community.

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
		Respondents felt that the construction of inter-array areas would bring health and safety concerns.	N	All works will be undertaken in accordance with relevant Health and Safety legislation and guidance.
		Respondent felt that the construction of inter-array areas would negatively impact property prices.	N	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.
		Respondents require further information from the Applicant concerning soil compaction and flooding	N	Further information regarding soil compaction can be found in **ES Chapter 5: Agriculture and Soils** (Doc Ref. 6.1) and the **OSMP** (7.14). In terms of flooding, further information can be found within **ES Chapter 11: Hydrology and Flood Risk** (Doc Ref. 6.1) as well as **ES Appendix 11-3: Flood Risk Assessment** (Doc Ref. 6.3).
		Respondents felt that the construction of the inter-array areas would negatively impact the environment and wildlife	N	In terms of the impact of construction on the environment and wildlife, a full Environmental Statement has been submitted as part of the DCO Application (Doc Ref. 6.1, 6.2 and 6.3). This includes **ES Chapter 9: Ecology and Biodiversity** (Doc Ref. 6.1) which assesses the impact of the Scheme on biodiversity and wildlife and concludes that no significant adverse effects are expected with the implementation of mitigation measures set out within the management plans submitted with the DCO Application.
		Respondent felt that the construction of the inter-array areas would bring noise pollution	N	The impact of the construction of the Scheme on noise levels has been assessed within **ES Chapter 13: Noise and Vibration** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The assessment concludes that, with the incorporation of appropriate mitigation, the only significant construction noise effects are those associated with HDD at Broad Gate and traffic on Langary Gate Road. Mitigation measures to manage and limit these effects have been included within the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10) and **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13).
		Respondents felt that that construction of the inter-array areas would bring traffic issues	N	The impact of road traffic is assessed in **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The assessment concludes no significant effects

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				are expected. Traffic management measures are set out in the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13) and would be implemented through the CTMP, secured by way of Requirement in the DCO, to limit construction traffic impacts including on other road users.
		Respondents felt that inter-array areas would be better placed further away from communities, wildlife, and agricultural areas	N	The areas considered for the siting of Inter-Array Connections were determined by the location of the Solar Development Area parcels and the identification of appropriate routes to connect the parcels. Further information on the alternatives considered is provided within **ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution** (Doc Ref. 3.1).
		Respondents felt that the construction of inter-array areas would have a negative impact on agriculture	N	Impacts from the Inter-Array Connections have been considered within Section 5.8 of**ES Chapter 5: Agriculture and Soils** (Doc Ref. 6.1). Mitigation measures are included within the **OSMP** (Doc Ref. 7.14) to minimise impacts on agricultural land where practicable. No significant effects on agriculture and soils from the construction of the Inter-Array Connections are considered likely.
		Respondent felt that the inter-array areas were being constructed too high	N	The **Design Parameters** (Doc Ref. 7.4) provide flexibility for the height of the Overhead Inter-Array Connection. A minimum height of 6.7m above ground is required to meet technical and safety requirements, whilst a maximum height of 15m above ground has been specified to provide flexibility in the overhead line height in areas where greater clearance may be required.
	Construction of BESS/ On-site substation compound locations Respondents expressed concern about the potential for BESS/On-site substation compound construction to damage the land and negatively impact agriculture and food production. They felt that the current layout should not be permitted for construction.	Respondents felt that the construction of the BESS/On-site substation compound would damage the land	N	The construction of the BESS/On-site substation has been assessed in **ES Chapter 5: Agriculture and Soils** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The assessment concludes in a moderate adverse (significant) effect as a result of the long-term sealing of land by the On-Site 400kV Substation and BESS Compound, where it impacts on Grade 1 ALC land. This is due to the uncertainty over the long-term effects to the subsoil from compaction and the creation of anaerobic conditions, which may limit the ability to restore the soils back to the same ALC Grade. Mitigation measures are included within the **OSMP** (Doc Ref. 7.14) to limit impacts where practicable. Upon decommissioning, the land would be returned to agriculture. Overall the Scheme would support the long-term viability of agricultural businesses by providing diversification of income for the landowners. There is not considered to be a significant effect on food production, considering the small amount of land affected within the context of agricultural land available in Lincolnshire.
		Respondents felt that the construction of the BESS/On-site substation compound would negatively impact agriculture and food production	N	

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
		Respondents expressed concern about toxicity and water pollution coming from BESS/On-site substation construction	N	**ES Chapter 11: Hydrology and Flood Risk** (Doc Ref. 6.1) assesses the groundwater and surface water risks from the BESS and on-site substation. The assessment concludes the treatment of water is sufficient for the level of risk, noting that electrical equipment containing oils (e.g. transformers) will be self-bunded and SuDS lined to prevent infiltration. Further details are provided within **ES Appendix 11-4 Outline Drainage Strategy** (Doc Ref. 6.3).
		Respondents felt that the proposed layout should not be permitted for construction	N	The Scheme layout has been developed following a comprehensive design evolution process, informed by technical assessments and consultation. The layout has been updated since statutory consultation to minimize environmental effects, where practicable. The proposed layout, as presented within the DCO Application, and its environmental effects are assessed within the ES (Doc Ref. 6.1). Further information on design evolution and alternatives considered is set out in **ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution** (Doc Ref. 6.1).
		Respondent expressed concern about the Applicant's ability to stabilise the land for BESS/On-site substation compound construction	N	In accordance with the **Design Parameters** (Doc Ref. 7.4), structural components of the On-Site Substation and BESS Compounds would each be sited on a concrete foundation slab with a foundation depth up to approximately 2m, or piles to a maximum depth of 12m (in case of the substations) or 4m (in case of the BESS units). These parameters are considered to minimise the risk of ground instability. The detailed specification of suitable foundation design will be confirmed as part of the detailed design process for the Scheme, post-DCO consent.
		Respondent felt that the construction of BESS/On-site substation compounds would negatively impact wildlife and the environment	N	The impact of the construction of the BESS and on-site substation compounds on wildlife has been assessed within **ES Chapter 9: Ecology and Biodiversity** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The chapter concludes that no significant effects are expected, with the implementation of the mitigation measures established through the management plans submitted with the DCO Application.
		Respondent felt that the construction of the BESS/On-site substation compounds would disrupt communities e.g. through increased dirt, dust and noise	N	The impact of the construction of the Scheme (including the BESS and On-Site Substation) has been assessed within the Environmental Statement. In terms of dust this is assessed within **ES Chapter 6: Air Quality** (Doc Ref. 6.1) which concludes no significant effects. There are measures included within the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10) to limit dust impacts. In terms of noise, this is assessed within **ES Chapter 13: Noise and Vibration** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The chapter concludes no significant effects except for at Langary Gate Road due to construction traffic impacts and

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				Broad Gate residential receptors due to HDD activity, which is considered to be significant. It should be noted that this is based on a worst case assessment as the HDD plant has not yet been selected and therefore noise effects are likely to be overestimated. In terms of construction traffic impacts at Langary Gate Road, measures have been included within the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13) and **OCEMP** (Doc Ref 7.10) to reduce the impact on nearby communities as far reasonably practicable to an acceptable level such as controlling the routing, timing and scheduling of vehicle movements to avoid network peak hours.
	Air quality impacts – construction Respondents felt that the construction of the Scheme would have a negative effect on air quality. They thought that construction traffic in particular would contribute to this.	Respondent felt that specifically the construction of the OHL line would have a negative impact on air quality	N	The impact of the construction of the Scheme (including the OHL) on air quality (including dust emissions) has been assessed within **ES Chapter 6: Air Quality** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The assessment concludes that there would be no significant effects. There are mitigation measures included within the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10) to minimise dust and air quality impacts during the construction phase.
		Respondent felt that specifically the construction of the solar PV/inter-array areas would have a negative effect on air quality	N	The impact of the construction of the Scheme (including the solar PV/inter-array area) on air quality (including dust emissions) has been assessed within **ES Chapter 6: Air Quality** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The assessment concludes that there would be no significant effects. There are mitigation measures included within the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10) to minimise dust and air quality impacts during the construction phase.
		Respondent felt that the BESS/On-site substation compound construction would have a negative effect on air quality	N	The impact of the construction of the Scheme (including the BESS and On-Site Substation) on air quality (including dust emissions) has been assessed within **ES Chapter 6: Air Quality** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The assessment concludes that there would be no significant effects. There are mitigation measures included within the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10) to minimise dust and air quality impacts during construction.
		Respondents felt that the construction of the Scheme would have a negative effect on air quality	N	The impact of the construction of the Scheme on air quality (including dust emissions) has been assessed within **ES Chapter 6: Air Quality** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The assessment concludes that there would be no significant effects. There are mitigation measures included within the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10) to minimise dust and air quality impacts during construction.
		Respondents felt that construction traffic would have a negative effect on air quality	N	The impact of construction traffic on air quality has been assessed within **ES Chapter 6: Air Quality** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The assessment concludes no significant effects. Mitigation measures are included in the

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				OCEMP (Doc Ref. 7.10) and **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13) to limit air quality impacts related to construction traffic.
		Respondents felt that the Applicant should provide more information on poor air quality mitigation	N	Further details regarding air quality mitigation are included in **ES Chapter 6: Air Quality** (Doc Ref. 6.1), as well as the **OCEMP (**Doc Ref. 7.10) and **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13).
		Respondent felt that the production of construction materials would have a negative effect on air quality	N	The impact of the construction of the Scheme (including the solar PV/inter-array area) on air quality (including dust emissions) has been assessed within **ES Chapter 6: Air Quality** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The assessment concludes that there would be no significant effects. There are mitigation measures included within the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10) to minimise dust and air quality impacts during the construction phase. **ES Chapter 7: Climate Change** (Doc Ref. 6.1) has also considered embodied carbon from the production and transport of materials required to construct and maintain the Scheme. The greenhouse gas (GHG) assessment presented within **ES Chapter 7: Climate Change** (Doc Ref. 6.1) demonstrates that the benefits of generating renewable energy from the Scheme far outweigh the impact of the emissions generated over the lifecycle of the Scheme. The Scheme's operational phase will indirectly cause a reduction in atmospheric GHG concentration compared to the without-project baseline as it will displace energy that would otherwise have been generated by higher carbon sources. GHG emissions during construction, operation and decommissioning of the Scheme can be considered to be 'offset' by the net positive impact of the Scheme on GHG emissions and the UK's ability to meet its carbon targets. Considering emissions saved against a without-project baseline (2025 UK energy grid carbon factor), any emissions relating to the construction of the Scheme will be offset after four years of operation.
		Respondents felt that poor air quality could result in increased dust and dirt on residents' property	N	The impact of the construction of the Scheme on air quality (including dust emissions) has been assessed within **ES Chapter 6: Air Quality** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The assessment concludes that there would be no significant effects. There are mitigation measures included within the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10) to minimise dust and air quality impacts during construction.
		Respondents questioned the Applicant's expertise in assessing air quality	N	The air quality assessment presented in **ES Chapter 6: Air Quality** (Doc Ref. 6.1) has been undertaken by a qualified and experienced air quality professional. Refer to **ES Appendix 1-3: EIA Statement of Competence** (Doc Ref. 6.3) for details of the qualifications, experience and expertise of the individual responsible for preparing the assessment.

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
		Respondents felt that importing construction materials would have a negative impact on air quality	N	The impact of the construction of the Scheme (including the solar PV/inter-array area) on air quality (including dust emissions) has been assessed within **ES Chapter 6: Air Quality** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The assessment concludes that there would be no significant effects. **ES Chapter 7: Climate Change** (Doc Ref. 6.1) has also been considered the transport of materials required to construct and maintain the Scheme. The greenhouse gas (GHG) assessment presented within **ES Chapter 7: Climate Change** (Doc Ref. 6.1) demonstrates that the benefits of generating renewable energy from the Scheme far outweigh the impact of the emissions generated over the lifecycle of the Scheme. The Scheme's operational phase will indirectly cause a reduction in atmospheric GHG concentration compared to the without-project baseline as it will displace energy that would otherwise have been generated by higher carbon sources. GHG emissions during construction, operation and decommissioning of the Scheme can be considered to be 'offset' by the net positive impact of the Scheme on GHG emissions and the UK's ability to meet its carbon targets. Considering emissions saved against a without-project baseline (2025 UK energy grid carbon factor), any emissions relating to the construction of the Scheme will be offset after four years of operation.
		Respondents felt that BESS fires would have a negative impact on air quality	N	Potential air quality impacts from rare and unplanned events such as fire incidents involving BESS or substations have been considered. These events are unlikely but could result in short-term emissions that may affect nearby sensitive receptors. This has been assessed within **ES Appendix 16-4 Unplanned Emissions Assessment from Battery Energy Storage Systems (BESS)** (Doc Ref. 6.3). This document demonstrates that after a distance of approximately 200m from the fire, any toxic emissions would reduce to below the acute exposure guideline levels published by Public Health England. Given that the BESS Compound would be sited a minimum of 350m from residential receptors, concentrations will be below relevant health thresholds at any existing residential receptor location. The **OBSMP** (Doc Ref. 7.18) has been prepared for the Scheme to ensure that any fire risks relating to batteries are properly mitigated.
		Respondents felt that poor air quality from construction would negatively impact residents' health	N	The impact of air quality on health has been assessed in **ES Chapter 6: Air Quality** (Doc Ref. 6.1) and **ES Chapter 10: Human Health** (Doc Ref. 6.1).No significant effects have been identified with the implementation of mitigation measures set out within the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10) and the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13).

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
	Noise and vibration – construction Respondents expressed concern about the amount of disruption the noise pollution of the construction of this scheme would bring. They often reference noise pollution from traffic. Respondents felt that increased noise pollution in the area would result in decreased quality of life and health concerns for the community, as well as having negative impacts on animals and wildlife. Respondents expressed concern about the impact of vibration from construction on local residents and their property.	Respondents felt that the construction of the scheme would bring increased noise pollution to the area	N	The impact of the construction of the Scheme on noise levels has been assessed within **ES Chapter 13: Noise and Vibration** (Doc Ref. 6.1). With the incorporation of mitigation, the assessment identifies that the only significant construction noise effects are those associated with HDD activities and construction traffic on Langary Gate Road. Measures to minimise construction noise impacts are secured through the CEMP and CTMP, which would prepared in accordance with the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10) and **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13) and secured by way of Requirement in the DCO. Construction noise will also be controlled through compliance with noise limits secured by a Requirement in the **Draft DCO** (Doc Ref. 3.1). In addition, whilst not mandatory for DCO projects, the Applicant proposes to apply for a Section 61 consent under the Control of Pollution Act 1974 on a voluntary basis, where appropriate, to manage construction activities outside standard working hours.
		Respondents expressed concern about increased vibration from construction	N	The impact of vibration is assessed within **ES Chapter 13: Noise and Vibration** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The chapter concludes that no significant vibration effects are expected with the incorporation of mitigation measures included within the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10).
		Respondents expressed concern that construction traffic would create vibration	N	The impact of vibration is assessed within **ES Chapter 13: Noise and Vibration** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The chapter concludes that no significant vibration effects (including from construction traffic) are expected with the incorporation of mitigation measures included within the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10) and **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13).
		Respondents felt that increased noise from construction would be disruptive	N	The impact of the construction of the Scheme on noise levels has been assessed within **ES Chapter 13: Noise and Vibration** (Doc Ref. 6.1). With the incorporation of mitigation, the only significant noise effects are those associated with HDD at Broad Gate and traffic on Langary Gate Road. Measures have been included within the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10) and **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13) which would minimise the impacts. Construction noise will also be controlled through compliance with noise limits secured by a Requirement in the **Draft DCO** (Doc Ref. 3.1). In addition, whilst not mandatory for DCO projects, the Applicant proposes to apply for a Section 61 consent under the Control of Pollution Act 1974 on a voluntary basis, where appropriate, to manage construction activities outside standard working hours.
		Respondents expressed concern about the noise of construction of the OHLs	N	The impact of the construction of the Scheme on noise levels has been assessed within **ES Chapter 13: Noise and Vibration** (Doc Ref. 6.1).

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				With the incorporation of mitigation, the only significant noise effects from the construction of the Grid Connection are those associated with HDD at Broad Gate. Measures have been set out within the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10) to minimise the impacts. Construction noise will also be controlled through compliance with noise limits secured by a Requirement in the **Draft DCO** (Doc Ref. 3.1). In addition, whilst not mandatory for DCO projects, the Applicant proposes to apply for a Section 61 consent under the Control of Pollution Act 1974 on a voluntary basis, where appropriate, to manage construction activities outside standard working hours.
		Respondents expressed concern about the noise of construction of the solar PV area	N	The impact of the construction of the Scheme on noise levels has been assessed within **ES Chapter 13: Noise and Vibration** (Doc Ref. 6.1). With the incorporation of mitigation, the only significant noise effects from the construction of the Solar Development Areas are those associated with peal construction traffic on Langary Gate Road. Measures have been set out within the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10) and **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13) to minimise the impacts. Construction noise will also be controlled through compliance with noise limits secured by a Requirement in the **Draft DCO** (Doc Ref. 3.1). In addition, whilst not mandatory for DCO projects, the Applicant proposes to apply for a Section 61 consent under the Control of Pollution Act 1974 on a voluntary basis, where appropriate, to manage construction activities outside standard working hours.
		Respondents expressed concern about increased noise due to construction traffic	N	The impact of the construction of the Scheme on noise levels has been assessed within **ES Chapter 13: Noise and Vibration** (Doc Ref. 6.1). With the incorporation of mitigation, the only significant noise effects are in relation to construction traffic are those associated with and the peak construction traffic on Langary Gate Road. Measures have been set out within the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10) and **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13) to minimise the impacts. Construction noise will also be controlled through compliance with noise limits secured by a Requirement in the **Draft DCO** (Doc Ref. 3.1). In addition, whilst not mandatory for DCO projects, the Applicant proposes to apply for a Section 61 consent under the Control of Pollution Act 1974 on a voluntary basis, where appropriate, to manage construction activities outside standard working hours.
		Respondents felt that increased noise from construction would negatively impact property values	N	The impact of the construction of the Scheme on noise levels has been assessed within **ES Chapter 13: Noise and Vibration** (Doc Ref. 6.1).

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				With the incorporation of mitigation, the only significant noise effects are those associated with HDD at Broad Gate and traffic on Langary Gate Road. Measures have been set out within the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10) and **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13) to minimise the impacts. Construction noise will also be controlled through compliance with noise limits secured by a Requirement in the **Draft DCO** (Doc Ref. 3.1). In addition, whilst not mandatory for DCO projects, the Applicant proposes to apply for a Section 61 consent under the Control of Pollution Act 1974 on a voluntary basis, where appropriate, to manage construction activities outside standard working hours. Throughout the pre-application stage the Applicant, potential effects on neighbouring properties have been carefully considered and local residents have been consulted. The results of these assessments, along with proposed mitigation measures, are presented in the **Environmental Statement** (Doc Ref 6.1). Due to the short-term nature of the significant noise effects during construction (lasting over a limited number of weeks). 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.
		Respondents were concerned about the length of time noise pollution will occur	N	The impact of the construction of the Scheme on noise levels has been assessed within **ES Chapter 13: Noise and Vibration** (Doc Ref. 6.1). As stated in **ES Chapter 2: The Scheme** (Doc Ref. 6.1) construction of the Scheme is anticipated to take up to 4 years. With the incorporation of mitigation, the only significant noise effects are those associated with HDD at Broad Gate and traffic on Langary Gate Road. Measures have been set out within the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10) and **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13) to minimise impacts. Construction noise will also be controlled through compliance with noise limits secured by a Requirement in the **Draft DCO** (Doc Ref. 3.1). In addition, whilst not mandatory for DCO projects, the Applicant proposes to apply for a Section 61 consent under the Control of

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				Pollution Act 1974 on a voluntary basis, where appropriate, to manage construction activities outside standard working hours.
		Respondents felt that increased noise pollution from construction would bring health concerns or reduced quality of life	N	The impact of noise pollution on health has been assessed within **ES Chapter 10: Human Health** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The chapter concludes that the likely effect on Human Health arising from impacts on noise and vibration during the construction phase of the Scheme are assessed to be not significant considering the short duration of the construction phase effects and the limited number of residential properties affected. Measures have been set out within the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10) and **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13) to minimise impacts. Construction noise will also be controlled through compliance with noise limits secured by a Requirement in the Draft DCO (Doc Ref. 3.1). In addition, whilst not mandatory for DCO projects, the Applicant proposes to apply for a Section 61 consent under the Control of Pollution Act 1974 on a voluntary basis, where appropriate, to manage construction activities outside standard working hours.
		Respondents questioned the Applicant's expertise in conducting noise assessments	N	The noise assessment presented in **ES Chapter 13: Noise and Vibration** (Doc Ref. 6.1) has been undertaken by an accredited expert. Refer to **ES Appendix 1-3: EIA Statement of Competence** (Doc Ref. 6.3) for details.
		Respondents felt that increased vibration from construction would have a negative impact on health	N	The impact of vibration from construction on health has been assessed within **ES Chapter 10: Human Health** (Doc Ref. 6.1). No significant effects are expected related to vibration, with the implementation of measures set out within the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10).
		Respondents felt that vibration could cause damage to personal property	N	The impact of vibration is assessed within **ES Chapter 13: Noise and Vibration** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The chapter concludes that no significant vibration effects (including damage to personal property) are expected within the incorporation of mitigation measures included within the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10).
		Respondents felt that increased noise from construction would harm wildlife and animals	N	Noise impacts from the construction of the Scheme on ecological receptors have been assessed within **ES Chapter 9: Ecology and Biodiversity** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The assessment concludes no likely significant effects with the implementation of the mitigation measures set out within the **O CEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10).
		Respondents were concerned about increased noise pollution through construction and weather combined	N	The assessment of impacts presented within **ES Chapter 13: Noise and Vibration** (Doc Ref. 6.1) has been undertaken with reference to baseline noise levels established from noise monitoring. Baseline noise monitors

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				were kept on-site for a week and therefore would have captured variation in baseline sound levels with varying weather conditions. With the incorporation of mitigation, the only significant noise effects are those associated with HDD at Broad Gate and traffic on Langary Gate Road. Measures have been set out within the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10) and **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13) to minimise the impacts. Construction noise will also be controlled through compliance with noise limits secured by a Requirement in the **Draft DCO** (Doc Ref. 3.1). In addition, whilst not mandatory for DCO projects, the Applicant proposes to apply for a Section 61 consent under the Control of Pollution Act 1974 on a voluntary basis, where appropriate, to manage construction activities outside standard working hours.
		Respondent expressed concern about the length of time vibration from construction will be felt	N	Vibration is assessed in in **ES Chapter 13: Noise and Vibration** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The chapter concludes that no significant vibration effects are identified with the implementation of measures set out within the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10). In terms of the length of time vibration from construction will be felt, this would be for a short-term temporary duration.
		Respondents expressed concern about noise pollution from the BESS/On-site substation construction	N	The impact of the construction of the BESS/On-site substation on noise levels has been assessed within **ES Chapter 13: Noise and Vibration** (Doc Ref. 6.1). No significant effects are expected associated with construction of the BESS / On-site substation compounds. Measures have been included within the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10) to minimise impacts. Construction noise will also be controlled through compliance with noise limits secured by a Requirement in the **Draft DCO** (Doc Ref. 3.1). In addition, whilst not mandatory for DCO projects, the Applicant proposes to apply for a Section 61 consent under the Control of Pollution Act 1974 on a voluntary basis, where appropriate, to manage construction activities outside standard working hours.
		Respondents felt that further information from the Applicant regarding noise impacts and assessment was required	N	An assessment of the impact of the Scheme on noise is presented in **ES Chapter 13: Noise and Vibration** (Doc Ref. 6.1). Measures have been set out within the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10) and **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13) to minimise impacts. Construction noise will also be controlled through compliance with noise limits secured by a Requirement in the **Draft DCO** (Doc Ref. 3.1). In addition, whilst not mandatory for DCO projects, the Applicant proposes to apply for a Section 61 consent under the Control of Pollution Act 1974 on a voluntary basis, where appropriate, to manage construction activities outside standard working hours.

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
		Respondents expressed concern that the environment and biodiversity would be negatively impacted by noise pollution from construction	N	An assessment of the impact of the Scheme on noise is presented in **ES Chapter 13: Noise and Vibration** (Doc Ref. 6.1) which concludes with the implementation of proposed mitigation, no likely significant effects were identified except for at one receptor at Broad Gate along the Grid Connection Route, which would be affected if Horizontal Directional Drilling activities are required at night-time for the diversion of third-party assets, and at at properties along Langary Gate Road during peak construction activity due to construction traffic noise. Measures have been set out within the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10) and **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13) to minimise impacts. Construction noise will also be controlled through compliance with noise limits secured by a Requirement in the **Draft DCO** (Doc Ref. 3.1). In addition, whilst not mandatory for DCO projects, the Applicant proposes to apply for a Section 61 consent under the Control of Pollution Act 1974 on a voluntary basis, where appropriate, to manage construction activities outside standard working hours. Noise impacts from the construction of the Scheme on ecological receptors have been assessed within **ES Chapter 9: Ecology and Biodiversity** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The assessment concludes no likely significant effects with the implementation of the mitigation measures set out within the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10).
		Respondent expressed concern that the environment and biodiversity would be negatively impacted by vibration from construction	N	Noise and vibration are assessed in the **ES Chapter 13: Noise and Vibration** (Doc Ref. 6.1) with regards to human receptors and **ES Chapter 9: Ecology and Biodiversity** (Doc Ref. 6.1) with regards to ecological receptors. The assessments concludes no likely significant effects with the implementation of the mitigation measures set out within the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10).
		Respondents expressed concern about noise pollution from construction travelling due to the flat landscape	N	An assessment of the impact of the Scheme on noise is presented in **ES Chapter 13: Noise and Vibration** (Doc Ref. 6.1). Noise modelling completed for the Scheme has considered the topography of the Site and the surrounding area. With the implementation of proposed mitigation, no likely significant effects were identified except for at one receptor at Broad Gate along the Grid Connection Route, which would be affected if Horizontal Directional Drilling activities are required at night-time for the diversion of third-party assets, and at at properties along Langary Gate Road during peak construction activity due to construction traffic noise. Measures have been set out within the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10) and **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13) to minimise impacts. Construction noise will

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				also be controlled through compliance with noise limits secured by a Requirement in the **Draft DCO** (Doc Ref. 3.1). In addition, whilst not mandatory for DCO projects, the Applicant proposes to apply for a Section 61 consent under the Control of Pollution Act 1974 on a voluntary basis, where appropriate, to manage construction activities outside standard working hours.

2.4. Cumulative impacts

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
Cumulative Impacts	**Cumulative impact** Respondents expressed feedback that demonstrated a concern for the amount of land that had been designated for use by renewable projects that would contribute towards the government's Clean Power 2030 nationally, and then more specifically within the county of Lincolnshire. Respondents also highlighted the potential cumulative impact of multiple renewable projects in Lincolnshire on the nation's food security, owing to developments sited on BMV land.	Respondents felt that the government was approving too much land around the country for renewable projects	N	The Applicant acknowledges the concern about cumulative land use. The need for renewable energy infrastructure, including solar developments, is established in national energy policy, including the National Policy Statements, which recognise the role such schemes play in meeting legally binding carbon reduction targets and supporting energy security. The Scheme has been designed and assessed in accordance with that framework and has been subject to a comprehensive EIA to consider its local environmental effects. The appropriateness of the use of land for the Scheme is therefore considered on its own merits, taking account of site selection, design, mitigation and the balance of impacts and benefits, rather than as part of a general approval of land for renewable development.
		Respondents were concerned at the number of renewable projects proposed for the Lincolnshire area	N	The Applicant's cumulative impact assessments have identified local developments that could interact with the Scheme to give rise to cumulative effects with the Scheme. Mitigation measures are incorporated to minimise cumulative effects, including coordination with other developers where relevant. The Applicant further notes that the potential cumulative effects arising from the interaction of the Scheme with other existing, consented and reasonably foreseeable developments have been assessed within the technical chapters of the **Environmental Statement** (Doc Ref. 6.1) which concludes that during construction, significant cumulative effects are associated with: heritage assets and the historic landscape due to the change of setting (refer to **ES Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage** (Doc Ref 6.1)), landscape and visual cumulative significant effects due to the totality of the change in the landscape considering the Scheme and all of the cumulative schemes together (refer to **ES Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual Effects** (Doc Ref. 6.1)) and also associated with construction traffic on the A151 Holbeach Road, A16 South of Crowland, A16 North of Peterborough and Hull's Drove East (refer to **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref. 6.1)). During operation, the only cumulative significant effects that would remain are associated with landscape and visual effects due to the totality of the change in the landscape considering the Scheme and all of the cumulative schemes together (refer to **ES Chapter 12:**

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				Landscape and Visual Effects (Doc Ref. 6.1)) and in relation to heritage assets and the historic landscape (refer to **ES Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage** (Doc Ref 6.1)). Mitigation has been incorporated to limit effects where practicable including visual screening as set out within the **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16).
		Respondents expressed concern about the cumulative impact of projects across Lincolnshire negatively affecting the country's food security owing to their siting on BMV land	N	The Applicant notes that Agricultural Land Classification surveys (ALC) have been undertaken to identify the grade of the land within the Sites and are reported in **ES Chapter 5: Agriculture and Soils** (Doc Ref. 6.1). Mitigation is included within the **Outline Soil Management Plan** (Doc Ref. 7.14) for the preservation of soil resource within the Site. Cumulative impacts, including a quantitative analysis, with other solar proposals in Lincolnshire are presented in Section 5.11 of **ES Chapter 5: Agriculture and Soils** (Doc Ref. 6.1) which concludes no significant effects are expected. It is estimated that cumulative solar schemes in Lincolnshire will account for approximately 3% of all agricultural land within Lincolnshire. An estimated 1.1 % of BMV land would be temporarily used and 0.02 % of BMV land permanently used across the identified solar projects. Whilst there is a measure of uncertainty around this proportion, it is indicative that the solar schemes represent a small proportion of agricultural and BMV land in the County. Whilst there is an additive effect of multiple cumulative schemes, the regional distribution and relative area of land use change means that the cumulative effects (impact of geographical scaling) from the use of agricultural land and BMV land are assessed as not significant.
	Inter project cumulative impacts Feedback demonstrated a firm belief amongst respondents that Lincolnshire had received more than its fair share of developments that involved the proposed use of pylons and overhead line technology. Respondents expressed frustration that Lincolnshire has become a popular location for the siting of solar developments, with some	Respondents commented that there were too many projects with involving the development of new overhead line infrastructure	N	The concern regarding the development of multiple overhead line projects is acknowledged. This has been assessed within the cumulative effects section of each technical chapter of the **Environmental Statement** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The Applicant is continuing to engage with NGET regarding the Grimsby to Walpole and Weston Marsh to East Leicestershire OHLs to limit impacts where practicable. An assessment of cumulative effects is presented within the technical chapters of the **Environmental Statement** (Doc Ref. 6.1).
		Respondent stated that the cumulative impact of pylons related overhead line technology in the area would negatively impact the area's phone signal strength and coverage	N	It is highly unlikely that pylons pose a risk to phone signal strength and coverage. This is because phone signal utilises high-frequency radio waves whereas power lines generate low-frequency waves and therefore these do not interfere with each other.

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
	suggesting that they are overwhelming the county. A few and criticised the applicant for contributing to the encirclement of communities and residents.	Respondents were concerned that Lincolnshire had become the site for a large number of solar projects	N	The Applicant is cognisant of other solar farms projects in the area and has undertaken assessments to consider the potential cumulative effect of this. The potential cumulative effects arising from the interaction of the Scheme with other existing, consented and reasonably foreseeable developments (including solar projects) have been assessed within the technical chapters of the Environmental Statement (Doc Ref. 6.1) which concludes that during construction, significant effects are associated with: heritage assets and the historic landscape due to the change of setting (refer to **ES Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage** (Doc Ref 6.1)), landscape and visual cumulative significant effects due to the totality of the change in the landscape considering the Scheme and all of the cumulative schemes together (refer to **ES Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual Effects** (Doc Ref. 6.1)) and also associated with construction traffic on the A151 Holbeach Road, A16 South of Crowland, A16 North of Peterborough and Hull's Drove East (refer to **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref. 6.1)). During operation, the only cumulative significant effects that would remain are associated with landscape and visual due to the totality of the change in the landscape considering the Scheme and all of the cumulative schemes together (refer to **ES Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual Effects** (Doc Ref. 6.1)) and in relation to heritage assets and the historic landscape (refer to **ES Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage** (Doc Ref 6.1)). Mitigation has been incorporated to limit effects where practicable including visual screening as set out within the **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16).
		Respondents criticised the project for encircling / entrapping local villages with solar parcels	N	The potential impacts and likely significant effects of the Scheme on landscape and visual have been assessed within **ES Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual Effects** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The Scheme design has evolved to take into account the proximity of receptors and to avoid or reduce encirclement effects where practicable. Setbacks are secured within the **Design Parameters** (Doc Ref. 7.4) and the LEMP, which would be prepared in accordance with the **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16), secured by way of Requirement in the DCO, to maintain an appropriate distance between the infrastructure and residential receptors. Planting and Habitat Management Areas are proposed within the vicinity of residential properties to reduce visual effects.

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				The Applicant has sought to mitigate landscape and visual impacts through screening with bands of native scattered trees and shrubs throughout the Solar Development Area. The **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16) and its accompanying Outline Landscape Masterplan set out the planting proposals for the Scheme.
	Intra project cumulative impact (i.e. impact of solar, BESS, inter-array and grid connections combined) Respondents stated that the applicant's development was aiding the process of what they deemed to be the industrialisation of the surrounding countryside through the installation of the solar PV panels and associated infrastructure. Some respondents suggested that the associated infrastructure would contribute to excess noise in the area, and that the cumulative effect of the solar farm and all related infrastructure would negatively impact house prices.	Respondents stated that the cumulative effect of the project and accompanying infrastructure would have a negative effect on house prices in the area	N	The impacts on property values are not a material planning consideration and are not assessed through the EIA process, which should instead focus on the assessment of residential amenity and environmental effects that are material considerations. 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).
		Respondents raised concerns over the cumulative impact of the site and associated infrastructure producing excessive noise in the surrounding area	N	The potential impacts and likely significant cumulative effects of the Scheme on noise are assessed within **ES Chapter 13: Noise and Vibration** (Doc Ref. 6.1) which concludes no significant effects are expected within the implementation of standard good industry practice. During construction, measures to control noise are secured within CMEP, which will be prepared in accordance with the **OCMEP** (Doc Ref. 7.10) and secured by way of Requirement in the DCO. During the operation of the Scheme, a detailed OEMP would be implemented which outlines measures to control noise during this phase. This document would be substantially in accordance with the **OOEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.11). The detailed management plans are secured by the Requirements under Schedule 2 of the **Draft DCO** (Doc Ref. 3.1). The Scheme layout has been optimised to locate noise-generating infrastructure as far as reasonably practicable from sensitive receptors, and buffer zones have been included within the **Design Parameters** (Doc Ref. 7.4) and **Works Plans** (Doc Ref. 2.3).
		Respondents felt that all of the combined infrastructure on the site was contributing to the industrialisation of the local area	N	The potential impacts and likely significant effects on landscape and visual as a result of the Scheme are assessed within **ES Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual** (Doc Ref. 6.1) which concludes significant effects, however by Year 15 with the maturing of mitigation planting the magnitude of visual effects would reduce compared to Year 1. The Scheme design has evolved to take into account the proximity of receptors and to reduce the perceived industrialisation of the area.

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				Setbacks are secured within the **Design Parameters** (Doc Ref. 7.4) and the **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16) to maintain an appropriate distance between the infrastructure and residential receptors. Planting and Habitat Management Areas are proposed within the vicinity of residential properties to reduce visual effects. The Applicant has sought to mitigate landscape and visual impacts through screening with bands of native scattered trees and shrubs throughout the Solar Development Area. The **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16) and its accompanying Outline Landscape Masterplan set out the planting proposals for the Scheme.

2.5. Decommissioning

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
Decommissioning	**Decommissioning phase (including life span of projects)** Respondents raised concerns that the applicant will be unable to restore the land to its previous quality and would be inarable. Respondents were not confident in the applicant's expertise in decommissioning and felt they needed further detail on the process. Respondents were concerned about the 40-year lifespan of the development and thought that all infrastructure, above ground and underground, should be removed in decommissioning. There were also concerns about the applicant's financial status, and questions were raised about the plans in place for the decommissioning process were the applicant to enter into administration.	Respondents felt that the project would render agricultural land inarable post-decommissioning	N	The Applicant notes that an assessment of the impacts of the Scheme on agriculture and soil is presented in **ES Chapter 5: Agriculture and Soils** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The assessment concludes that there is a significant effect on Best and Most Versatile (BMV) agricultural land during the Construction and Operational phases. However, this effect is temporary and reversible, with land reinstated following the Decommissioning phase. An **OSMP** (Doc Ref. 7.14) has been prepared as part of the DCO Application. This provides details of measures that would be implemented as part of the Scheme to ensure soils within the Order limits are protected from degradation and agricultural use can recommence following completion of the Construction phase along the Grid Connection Route and Inter-Array Connections and Decommissioning phase within the Solar Development Areas. Prior to the start of construction, a detailed SMP will be prepared, submitted to and approved by the local authority and is secured by the **Draft DCO** (Doc Ref. 3.1). This will be in substantial accordance with the **OSMP** (Doc Ref. 7.14).
		Respondents felt that in reality decommissioning wouldn't happen	N	The Applicant is legally obligated to decommission the Scheme, in accordance with an approved DEMPto be prepared in accordance with the **ODEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.12)) as secured by way of a Requirement in the DCO. The requirements of the DCO are enforceable and it is a criminal offence to fail to comply with these. The Proceeds of Crime Act 2002 also acts as a further deterrent, and elements of the installed solar PV represent a valuable asset meaning it would be in the Applicant's interest financially to decommission the site in order to sell or recycle the panels and other components. If the Applicant went into liquidation or receivership, its assets would be sold off to fund the decommissioning of the Scheme that is required pursuant to the legal requirement of the DCO (in this context, it is relevant that the DCO is a piece of legislation, and therefore different to a planning permission). A decommissioning bond is not routine for energy DCOs and while similar arguments have been advanced requesting a decommissioning

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				bond in the Examinations for most other solar DCOs, the Secretary of State has not required one for those made to date.
		Respondents suggested that a fund be created that is accessible post-decommissioning to pay for any damages caused during the process	N	If the DCO is granted, it will secure the decommissioning of the Scheme in accordance with approved requirements, including the removal of infrastructure and restoration of the land. Decommissioning will be carried out in accordance with an approved DEMP, based on the **ODEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.12), which sets out the measures to manage environmental effects and ensure appropriate restoration. On this basis, the Applicant does not consider that a separate fund is required to address potential impacts arising from decommissioning.
		Respondents suggested that a fund be created that is accessible before the development begins to pay for any damages caused during the process and during decommissioning	N	If the DCO is granted, it will secure the construction, operation and decommissioning of the Scheme in accordance with approved requirements. Potential impacts arising during construction will be managed through the implementation of an approved CEMP, based on the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10). Decommissioning will be carried out in accordance with an approved DEMP, based on the **ODEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.12), which will secure the removal of infrastructure and restoration of the land. All works will be undertaken in accordance with relevant legislative and regulatory requirements and are subject to enforcement through the DCO. On this basis, the Applicant does not consider that a separate fund is required to address potential impacts arising before, during or following the development of the Scheme.
		Respondents suggested that a fund be created that is accessible before the development begins to pay for decommissioning, should the applicant not have the funds available after the development is in place	N	The Applicant is legally obligated to decommission the Scheme, in accordance with an approved DEMP (to be prepared in accordance with the **ODEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.12)) as secured by way of a Requirement in the DCO. The requirements of the DCO are enforceable and it is a criminal offence to fail to comply with these. The Proceeds of Crime Act 2002 also acts as a further deterrent, and elements of the installed solar PV represent a valuable asset meaning it would be in the Applicant's interest financially to decommission the site in order to sell or recycle the panels and other components. If the Applicant went into liquidation or receivership, its assets would be sold off to fund the decommissioning of the Scheme that is required pursuant to the legal requirement of the DCO (in this context, it is relevant that the DCO is a piece of legislation, and therefore different to a planning permission).

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				A decommissioning bond is not routine for energy DCOs and while similar arguments have been advanced requesting a decommissioning bond in the Examinations for most other solar DCOs, the Secretary of State has not required one for those made to date.
		Respondents questioned the applicant's expertise in decommissioning	N	The Application has been prepared by a team of suitably qualified and experienced specialists. Measures to manage the environmental effects associated with decommissioning are set out in the **ODEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.12), which will be secured by way of a Requirement in the DCO.
		Respondents felt that decommissioning could cause environmental harm	N	The Applicant notes that an assessment of the environmental impacts of the Scheme arising from decommissioning is presented in **ES Chapter 5 to Chapter 16** (Doc Ref. 6.1) with significant residual effects summarised in **ES Chapter 18: Summary of Likely Significant Effects** (Doc Ref. 6.1). An **ODEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.12) has also been prepared as part of the DCO Application. This provides details of measures that would be implemented via the DEMP (secured by way of Requirement in the DCO) as part of the Scheme to ensure environmental impacts across the Scheme are managed and mitigated as far as practicable. Prior to the start of the Decommissioning phase, a detailed DEMP will be prepared, submitted to and approved by the local authority. This requirement is secured by the **Draft DCO** (Doc Ref. 3.1), and the detailed DEMP will be in substantial accordance with the **ODEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.12).
		Respondent suggested that battery storage has a short life span	N	The operational phase of the Scheme is anticipated to last for 40 years, during which infrastructure would be maintained, inspected and replaced where required to ensure continued effective operation, as described in **ES Chapter 2: The Scheme** (Doc Ref. 6.1). Batteries typically have an indicative design life of approximately 10 to 15 years and are therefore assumed to be replaced as necessary during the operational life of the Scheme to maintain storage capacity. Any replacement of equipment would be undertaken in accordance with the **OOEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.11).
		Respondents think that solar panels have a short life span	N	Solar panels typically have an indicative design life of approximately 25 to 40 years and will be maintained, inspected and replaced where required during the 40-year operational life of the Scheme, as described in **ES Chapter 2: The Scheme** (Doc Ref. 6.1). Any replacement of equipment would be undertaken in accordance with the **OOEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.11).

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
		Respondents were concerned about the recyclability of materials	N	The potential impacts and likely significant effects on materials and waste are assessed in Section 16.5 of **ES Chapter 16: Other Environmental Topics** (Doc Ref. 6.1) which confirms the Scheme will apply the waste hierarchy, prioritising waste prevention, followed by preparing for reuse, recycling and recovery, with disposal to landfill only as a last resort. The potential for recycled content within the main construction materials is outlined in Table 16-5, and Table 16-15 provides estimates of the quantities of construction and decommissioning waste which are expected to be recyclable/recoverable by the Scheme. Recycling routes are currently available for component replacement waste, the assessment recognizes that recycling opportunities are likely to increase over time as the solar PV recycling market continues to develop in response to growing demand. A recovery rate of 70% has been assumed to be achievable for the purpose of the waste assessment.
		Respondents thought that the applicant has not provided enough information about the decommissioning of the project	N	The Applicant notes that information on decommissioning has been provided at multiple stages of the pre-application and application process. An information booklet issued as part of the Stage Two consultation explained the construction, operation and decommissioning the Scheme and signposted readers to further technical information. Since the PEIR, this information has been updated and is contained within the **Environmental Statement** (Doc Ref. 6.1). Details of decommissioning activities are provided within **ES Chapter 2: The Scheme** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The **ODEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.12) sets out the general principles that will be adhered to during the decommissioning phase.
		Respondents had concerns about the timeline of decommissioning	N	The decommissioning of the Scheme is anticipated to take up to approximately 24 months and would involve the dismantling and removal of above-ground infrastructure, including solar panels, mounting structures, substations, BESS, overhead lines and associated infrastructure, with below-ground infrastructure removed to an agreed depth with the relevant landowner. Decommissioning must commence within 40 years of the commencement of the Scheme's operation. Decommissioning would be undertaken in accordance with an approved DEMP, based on the **ODEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.12), which is secured by way of Requirement in the **Draft DCO** (Doc Ref. 3.1).

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
		Respondent expressed concern about the methods of battery disposal	N	The Applicant notes that battery disposal and recycling have been assessed within Section 16.5 of **ES Chapter 16: Other Environmental Topics** (Doc Ref. 6.1) explains that the UK market for lithium-ion battery recycling is being developed rapidly, driven by increased demand from electric vehicles and other lithium-ion battery users. A number of new investments have been announced, and an 80% recovery rate is reported. **ES Chapter 16: Other Environmental Topics** (Doc Ref. .6.1) assumes that specialist regional or national facilities would be in place at the time of component replacement and decommissioning, and these would be developed in response to demand generated by the UK-wide solar PV panel industry and the majority of waste components, including batteries, would be reused, recycled, or recovered with disposal to landfill avoided where practicable.
		Respondents felt that the underground work for the development should be removed during the decommissioning phase	N	As stated in **ES Chapter 2: The Scheme** (Doc Ref. 6.1) and in line with the **ODEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.12) all above-ground physical infrastructure would be dismantled and removed from the Solar Development Area, Inter-Array Connections and Grid Connection Route. This would include the removal of all PV panels, mounting poles, solar stations, substations, BESS, 400kV overhead line and pylons, CSECs, 132kV overhead line and poles. In addition, below ground infrastructure, such as concrete foundations to these elements, would be removed to a depth agreed with the relevant landowner from the area within the Order Limits and recycled or disposed of in accordance with good practice and market conditions at that time.
		Respondents had concerns about the 40-year lifespan of the development	N	The Scheme is considered temporary in nature, because the operational life of the Scheme will be a maximum of 40 years. Once the Scheme ceases to operate, it will be decommissioned in accordance with the **Draft DCO** (Doc Ref. 3.1). The impacts of decommissioning have been assessed throughout the **Environmental Statement** (Doc Ref. 6.1), and the **ODEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.12) which provides details and control measures that would be applied during the decommissioning activities. The **ODEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.1) is secured by the **Draft DCO** (Doc Ref. 3.1) with a requirement for a detailed DEMP to be prepared and approved prior to decommissioning.
		Respondent was concerned about other generation units like gas and oil being decommissioned during this project's lifespan, resulting in a supply shortage	N	The Applicant notes that matters relating to national energy supply and security are addressed through Government policy rather than by individual development proposals.

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				The Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy EN-1 (as designated) confirms that a diverse mix of electricity infrastructure is needed to deliver a secure, reliable, affordable and net zero consistent energy system during the transition to 2050. EN-1 recognises that the transition to a low-carbon energy system will involve changes to the existing generation mix over time, but makes clear that sufficient new energy infrastructure across a range of technologies must come forward to maintain security of supply. Decisions on the timing of decommissioning of fossil fuel generation, and the deployment of replacement capacity, are therefore matters for national energy policy and regulation rather than for individual NSIP applications. In this context, the Scheme would form part of the wider portfolio of energy infrastructure supported by national policy, contributing to overall generation capacity in line with the objectives of EN-1.
		Respondents questioned why the applicant would not renew the development instead of decommissioning	N	If the Applicant's DCO application is granted, this would allow the Scheme to be operational for 40 years, after which the Scheme would have to be decommissioned in accordance with the requirements outlined in the DCO application. The DCO does not provide for automatic renewal or extension of the Scheme beyond the consented operational period. Any proposal to extend, repower or replace the Scheme would be a separate matter and would require a new consent, to be considered against the planning policy, environmental information and regulatory requirements applicable at that time.
		Respondent felt that decommissioning would result in contamination of the land	N	An **ODEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.12) has been prepared as part of the DCO Application. This includes Table 3-6 which provides details of measures that would be implemented as part of the Scheme to ensure contamination of the land across the Order limits is mitigated as far as practicable. Prior to the start of the Decommissioning phase, a detailed DEMP will be prepared, submitted to and approved by the local authority and is secured by the Draft DCO. This will be in substantial accordance with the **ODEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.12).
		Respondent questioned the applicants' intentions to return the land to its original use post-decommissioning	N	As stated in **ES Chapter 2: The Scheme** (Doc Ref. 6.1) and in line with the **ODEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.12) all above-ground physical infrastructure would be dismantled and removed from the Solar Development Area, Inter-Array Connections and Grid Connection Route. This would

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				include the removal of all PV panels, mounting poles, solar stations, substations, BESS, 400kV overhead line and pylons, CSECs, 132kV overhead line and poles. In addition, below ground infrastructure, such as concrete foundations to these elements, would be removed to a depth agreed with the relevant landowner from the area within the Order Limits and recycled or disposed of in accordance with good practice and market conditions at that time.
		Respondents questioned whether the applicant would be able to last and financially uphold the project up until and including the decommissioning phase	N	The Applicant has confirmed it has access to sufficient funds to construct and operate the Scheme, as set out within the **Funding Statement** (Doc Ref 4.2) In respect of decommissioning, the Applicant is legally obligated to decommission the Scheme, in accordance with an approved DEMP (to be prepared in accordance with the **ODEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.12)) as secured by way of a Requirement in the DCO. The requirements of the DCO are enforceable and it is a criminal offence to fail to comply with these. The Proceeds of Crime Act 2002 also acts as a further deterrent, and elements of the installed solar PV represent a valuable asset meaning it would be in the Applicant's interest financially to decommission the site in order to sell or recycle the panels and other components. If the Applicant went into liquidation or receivership, its assets would be sold off to fund the decommissioning of the Scheme that is required pursuant to the legal requirement of the DCO (in this context, it is relevant that the DCO is a piece of legislation, and therefore different to a planning permission). A decommissioning bond is not routine for energy DCOs and while similar arguments have been advanced requesting a decommissioning bond in the Examinations for most other solar DCOs, the Secretary of State has not required one for those made to date.
		Respondents thought that the project should have a shorter lifespan		The proposed operational life of the Scheme is consistent with the design life of the infrastructure and with established industry practice for large-scale solar developments. This lifespan allows the Scheme to operate efficiently and deliver its intended benefits while remaining temporary in nature.
		Respondent felt that they needed more information on the general decommissioning process	N	The Applicant notes that information on decommissioning has been provided at multiple stages of the pre-application and application process. An information booklet issued as part of the Stage Two consultation explained the construction, operation and decommissioning the Scheme and signposted readers to further technical information.

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				Since the PEIR, this information has been updated and is contained within the **Environmental Statement** (Doc Ref. 6.1). Details of decommissioning activities are provided within **ES Chapter 2: The Scheme** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The **ODEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.12) sets out the general principles that will be adhered to during the decommissioning phase.
		Respondents thought that decommissioning would bring pollution to the area	N	Consideration of pollution as a result of the Scheme is presented, where relevant, in **ES Chapter 5 to Chapter 16** (Doc Ref. 6.1), including air quality, noise and vibration, and the water environment. An **ODEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.12) has been prepared as part of the DCO Application. This provides details of measures that would be implemented as part of the Scheme to ensure impacts from potential pollution sources across the Order limits are mitigated as far as practicable. Prior to the start of the Decommissioning phase, a detailed DEMP will be prepared, submitted to and approved by the local authority and is secured by the **Draft DCO** (Doc Ref. 3.1). This will be in substantial accordance with the **ODEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.12).
		Respondents felt that the overhead infrastructure, such as pylons, should be removed during decommissioning	N	The Applicant notes that all above-ground infrastructure would be dismantled and removed during the Decommissioning phase, including pylons and associated equipment. Decommissioning activities would be controlled through the **ODEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.12), with a detailed plan required to be approved prior to decommissioning, as secured through the draft DCO. Following completion of decommissioning, land within the Order Limits would be reinstated and returned to the relevant landowners. For the purposes of the ES, it has been assumed that land would be capable of being returned to its existing use, typically agriculture. .
		Respondents thought that the applicant should remove the concrete pylon bases during decommissioning	N	The land would be restored to its original use (typically agricultural) and returned to the relevant landowners once the Decommissioning phase is complete. All above-ground physical infrastructure would be dismantled and removed during the Decommissioning phase, including pylons and associated infrastructure. Decommissioning activities would be controlled through the DEMP, which would be prepared in accordance with the **ODEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.12), with a detailed plan required to be approved prior to decommissioning, as secured through the **Draft DCO** (Doc Ref. 3.1). In addition, below ground infrastructure, such as concrete foundations to these elements, would be removed to a depth agreed with the

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				relevant landowner from the area within the Order Limits and recycled or disposed of in accordance with good practice and market conditions at that time. Prior to the start of the Decommissioning phase, a detailed DEMP will be prepared, submitted to and approved by the local authority and is secured by the Draft DCO. This will be in substantial accordance with the **ODEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.12).
		Respondent questioned whether the benefits of a 40-year development outweigh the inconveniences it brings	N	Solar developments play a crucial role in the UK's energy landscape, especially in meeting renewable energy targets outlined in key government policies such as the National Policy Statements, including Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1) which confirms the urgent need for new low-carbon electricity generation to support energy security, affordability and the transition to net zero. In the UK, new solar farms occupy roughly four acres of land per MW of installed capacity. All solar farms in the UK currently account for 0.08% of total land use. Solar energy schemes, such as the Merdian Solar Farm can contribute significantly to reducing carbon emissions, increasing energy security, and promoting a greener future for the UK, supporting the decarbonisation of transport and heat sectors, through electrification.
		Respondents thought that the solar panels would be replaced during the 40-year lifecycle of this development	N	**ES Chapter 2: The Scheme** (Doc Ref. 6.1) provides the indicative design life for each component of the Scheme. The Solar PV Panels are assumed to have an indicative design life of 25 to 40 years. On this basis, the ES assumes that the Solar PV Panels would be replaced once during the Scheme's operational life, over a 12-to-24-month period with a small proportion requiring ad hoc replacement taking place outside of this period as part of routine maintenance.
		Respondent questioned whether the applicant would be the sole decommissioning body	N	The Applicant would be solely responsible for decommissioning the Scheme.
		Respondents thought that there should be a legally binding agreement to ensure the applicant will decommission the site responsibly, with consequences if not upheld	N	If the Applicant's DCO application is granted, this would allow the Scheme to be operational for 40 years, after which the Scheme would have to be decommissioned in accordance with the requirements outlined in the DCO, which is a legally binding order.
		Respondents questioned whether the applicant would return the land to its current state	N	The land would be restored to its original use (typically agricultural) and returned to the relevant landowners once the Decommissioning phase is complete. All above-ground physical infrastructure would be dismantled and removed during the Decommissioning phase , including pylons and associated infrastructure.

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				Decommissioning activities would be controlled through the DEMP, prepared in accordance with the **ODEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.12) and secured by way of Requirement in the DCO, with a detailed plan required to be approved prior to decommissioning, as secured through the In addition, below ground infrastructure, such as concrete foundations to these elements, would be removed to a depth agreed with the relevant landowner from the area within the Order Limits and recycled or disposed of in accordance with good practice and market conditions at that time.
		Respondent thought that the development should be in operation for longer than the expected 40-year lifecycle	N	If the Applicant's DCO application is granted, this would allow the Scheme to be operational for a maximum period of 40 years. This operational period is fixed by the DCO, which is a legally binding consent. At the end of the consented operational life, the Scheme would be required to be decommissioned in accordance with the requirements outlined in the DCO application.
		Respondents were concerned about the state of roads and volume of traffic during decommissioning	N	**ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref. 6.1) confirm that transport and access impacts resulting from increased construction traffic associated with the Scheme are considered to be negligible to minor (not significant). The decommissioning phase is anticipated to be shorter in duration and result in fewer road trips and, therefore, its impacts would be less than that experienced during the Construction phase. An **ODEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.12) has been prepared as part of the DCO Application. This provides details of traffic mitigation measures that would be implemented during the DTMP which would be developed by the Principal Contractor prior to decommissioning in consultation with the LPAs and adapted from the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13) to reflect the circumstances at that time. Prior to the start of the Decommissioning phase, a detailed DEMP will be prepared, submitted to and approved by the local authority and is secured by the Draft DCO. This will be in substantial accordance with the **ODEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.12)
		Respondents thought that the applicant would not remove every part of the development as part of the decommissioning phase	N	The land would be restored to its original use (typically agricultural) and returned to the relevant landowners once the Decommissioning phase is complete. All above-ground physical infrastructure would be dismantled and removed during the Decommissioning phase, including pylons and associated infrastructure. In addition, below ground infrastructure, such as concrete foundations to these elements, would be removed to a depth agreed with the relevant landowner from the area within the Order Limits and recycled

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				or disposed of in accordance with good practice and market conditions at that time. Decommissioning activities would be controlled through the DEMP, prepared in accordance with the **ODEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.12) and secured by way of Requirement in the DCO, with a detailed plan required to be approved prior to decommissioning, as secured through the Prior to the start of the Decommissioning phase, a detailed DEMP will be prepared, submitted to and approved by the local authority and is secured by the Draft DCO. This will be in substantial accordance with the **ODEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.12).
		Respondent questioned the enforcement of decommissioning regulations if overseas ownership takes place	N	Downing LLP's approach is to own, develop and manage these projects throughout their full lifecycle, rather than selling to a third-party operator once development consent has been granted. The decommissioning of the Scheme will be secured through the DCO, which is a legally binding consent. Measures to manage the environmental effects associated with decommissioning are set out in the **ODEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.12). A detailed DEMP, which must be approved by the local authority in accordance with the ODEMP is secured way of a Requirement in the **Draft DCO** (Doc Ref. 3.1). A change in ownership, whether in the UK or from overseas would not alter this requirement. The Applicant is legally obligated to decommission the Scheme, in accordance with an approved DEMP (to be prepared in accordance with the **ODEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.12)) as secured by way of a Requirement in the DCO. The requirements of the DCO are enforceable and it is a criminal offence to fail to comply with these. The Proceeds of Crime Act 2002 also acts as a further deterrent, and elements of the installed solar PV represent a valuable asset meaning it would be in the Applicant's interest financially to decommission the site in order to sell or recycle the panels and other components. If the Applicant went into liquidation or receivership, its assets would be sold off to fund the decommissioning of the Scheme that is required pursuant to the legal requirement of the DCO (in this context, it is relevant that the DCO is a piece of legislation, and therefore different to a planning permission). A decommissioning bond is not routine for energy DCOs and while similar arguments have been advanced requesting a decommissioning

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				bond in the Examinations for most other solar DCOs, the Secretary of State has not required one for those made to date.
		Respondent felt that decommissioning is used to gain approval but is not guaranteed	N	If the Applicant's DCO granted, this would allow the Scheme to be operational for 40 years, after which the Scheme would have to be decommissioned in accordance with the requirements outlined in the DCO application. The DCO does not provide for automatic renewal or extension of the Scheme beyond the consented operational period. Any proposal to extend, repower or replace the Scheme would be a separate matter and would require a new consent, to be considered against the planning policy, environmental information and regulatory requirements applicable at that time.
		Respondent thought that the development could be extended or repurposed	N	
		Respondent had concerns about air quality and light population during the decommissioning phase	N	An assessment of air quality from the Scheme is presented in **ES Chapter 6: Air Quality** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The assessments conclude that during the Construction phase no significant effects are expected in relation to air quality. Impacts during the Decommissioning phase are assumed to be similar to, if not less than, those during the Construction phase. Temporary lighting will be used during the decommissioning phase as described within **ES Chapter 2: The Scheme** (Doc Ref. 6.1). **ES Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual** (Doc Ref. 6.1) considers the effects from lighting. An **ODEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.12) has been prepared as part of the DCO Application. This provides details of measures that would be implemented as part of the Scheme to ensure environmental impacts, including air quality and lighting, across the Order Limits are managed and mitigated as far as practicable. Prior to the start of the Decommissioning phase, a detailed DEMP will be prepared, submitted to and approved by the local authority and is secured by the **Draft DCO** (Doc Ref. 3.1). This will be in substantial accordance with the **ODEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.12)
		Respondent questioned what financial guarantees are made for decommissioning	N	The decommissioning of the Scheme will be secured through the DCO, which is a legally binding consent. Measures to manage the environmental effects associated with decommissioning are set out in the **ODEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.12), which will be secured by way of a Requirement in the **Draft DCO** (Doc Ref. 3.1).d The Applicant is legally obligated to decommission the Scheme, in accordance with an approved Decommissioning Environmental

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				Management Plan (to be prepared in accordance with the ODEMP (Doc Ref. 7.12)) as secured by way of a Requirement in the DCO. The requirements of the DCO are enforceable and it is a criminal offence to fail to comply with these. The Proceeds of Crime Act 2002 also acts as a further deterrent, and elements of the installed solar PV represent a valuable asset meaning it would be in the Applicant's interest financially to decommission the site in order to sell or recycle the panels and other components. If the Applicant went into liquidation or receivership, its assets would be sold off to fund the decommissioning of the Scheme that is required pursuant to the legal requirement of the DCO (in this context, it is relevant that the DCO is a piece of legislation, and therefore different to a planning permission). A decommissioning bond is not routine for energy DCOs and while similar arguments have been advanced requesting a decommissioning bond in the Examinations for most other solar DCOs, the Secretary of State has not required one for those made to date.
		Respondent thought that decommissioning would disrupt the local community	N	As detailed in **ES Chapter 2: The Scheme** (Doc Ref. 6.1), the Scheme has been designed to minimise disturbance to local communities as far as practicable during the Construction, Operational, and Decommissioning phases. Impacts to communities during Decommissioning phase are considered in **ES Chapter 10: Human Health** (Doc Ref. 6.1) and **ES Chapter 14: Socio-Economics and Land Use** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The assessments conclude that during the Construction phase no significant effects are expected. Impacts during the Decommissioning phase are assumed to be similar to or less than those during the Construction phase. An **ODEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.12) has been prepared as part of the DCO Application. This provides details of measures that would be implemented as part of the Scheme to ensure disturbance to local communities across and surrounding the Order Limits are mitigated as far as practicable. Prior to the start of the Decommissioning phase, a detailed DEMP will be prepared, submitted to and approved by the local authority and is secured by the **Draft DCO** (Doc Ref. 3.1). This will be in substantial accordance with the **ODEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.12).
		Respondent thought that the negatives of construction, operation, maintenance and decommissioning outweigh the positives of the development	N	The Applicant notes that matters relating to national energy supply and security are addressed through Government policy rather than by individual development proposals.

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				Solar developments play a crucial role in the UK's energy landscape, especially in meeting renewable energy targets outlined in key government policies such as the National Policy Statements, including Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1) which confirms the urgent need for new low-carbon electricity generation to support energy security, affordability and the transition to net zero. In the UK, new solar farms occupy roughly four acres of land per MW of installed capacity. All solar farms in the UK currently account for 0.08% of total land use. Solar energy schemes, such as the Merdian Solar Farm can contribute significantly to reducing carbon emissions, increasing energy security, and promoting a greener future for the UK, supporting the decarbonisation of transport and heat sectors, through electrification.
		Respondent questioned whether decommissioned equipment is properly disposed of	N	The Applicant notes that battery disposal and recycling have been assessed within Section 16.5 of **ES Chapter 16: Other Environmental Topics** (Doc Ref. 6.1) confirms the Scheme will aim to prioritise waste prevention, followed by preparing for reuse, recycling and recovery and lastly disposal to landfill as per the waste hierarchy. Potential recycled content for the main construction materials is outlined in Table 16-15 providing estimated quantities of decommissioning waste which are expected to be recyclable/recoverable by the Scheme. Recycling routes are generally available for component replacement waste at present, and it is likely that there will be even greater opportunities for recycling in the future, not least because the recycling market will have expanded to meet demand as solar PV installations increase. A recovery rate of 70% has been assumed to be achievable for the purpose of the waste assessment.
		Respondents questioned who would undertake decommissioning if the applicant could not.	N	Responsibility for decommissioning the Scheme rests solely with the undertaker. The Applicant is legally obligated to decommission the Scheme, in accordance with an approved DEMP to be prepared in accordance with the **ODEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.12)) as secured by way of a Requirement in the DCO. The requirements of the DCO are enforceable and it is a criminal offence to fail to comply with these. The Proceeds of Crime Act 2002 also acts as a further deterrent, and elements of the installed solar PV represent a valuable asset meaning it would be in the Applicant's interest financially to decommission the site in order to sell or recycle the panels and other components. If the

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				Applicant went into liquidation or receivership, its assets would be sold off to fund the decommissioning of the Scheme that is required pursuant to the legal requirement of the DCO (in this context, it is relevant that the DCO is a piece of legislation, and therefore different to a planning permission). A decommissioning bond is not routine for energy DCOs and while similar arguments have been advanced requesting a decommissioning bond in the Examinations for most other solar DCOs, the Secretary of State has not required one for those made to date.
		Respondents questioned whether the development could become abandoned.	N	The Applicant is legally obligated to decommission the Scheme, in accordance with an approved DEMP (to be prepared in accordance with the **ODEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.12)) as secured by way of a Requirement in the DCO. The requirements of the DCO are enforceable and it is a criminal offence to fail to comply with these. The Proceeds of Crime Act 2002 also acts as a further deterrent, and elements of the installed solar PV represent a valuable asset meaning it would be in the Applicant's interest financially to decommission the site in order to sell or recycle the panels and other components. If the Applicant went into liquidation or receivership, its assets would be sold off to fund the decommissioning of the Scheme that is required pursuant to the legal requirement of the DCO (in this context, it is relevant that the DCO is a piece of legislation, and therefore different to a planning permission). A decommissioning bond is not routine for energy DCOs and while similar arguments have been advanced requesting a decommissioning bond in the Examinations for most other solar DCOs, the Secretary of State has not required one for those made to date.
		Respondent would like confirmation of insurance that decommissioning will take place.	N	The Applicant is legally obligated to decommission the Scheme, in accordance with an approved DEMP (to be prepared in accordance with the **ODEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.12)) as secured by way of a Requirement in the DCO. The requirements of the DCO are enforceable and it is a criminal offence to fail to comply with these. The Proceeds of Crime Act 2002 also acts as a further deterrent, and elements of the installed solar PV represent a valuable asset meaning it would be in the Applicant's interest financially to decommission the site in order to sell or recycle the panels and other components. If the Applicant went into liquidation or receivership, its assets would be sold off to fund the decommissioning of the Scheme that is required pursuant to the legal requirement of the DCO (in this context, it is

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				relevant that the DCO is a piece of legislation, and therefore different to a planning permission). A decommissioning bond is not routine for energy DCOs and while similar arguments have been advanced requesting a decommissioning bond in the Examinations for most other solar DCOs, the Secretary of State has not required one for those made to date.
		Respondent thought that the applicant should consider the removal of broken materials from the ground following severe weather.	N	The removal of broken materials including from the ground following severe weather would be undertaken in accordance with the **OOEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.11) with a detailed plan required to be approved prior to the operational phase, as secured through the **Draft DCO** (Doc Ref. 3.1). Damaged components would be identified as part of regular maintenance inspections. Any broken or faulty equipment would be removed for recovery, recycling or disposal and replaced to ensure the continued effective operation of the Scheme. Decommissioning activities would be controlled through the **ODEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.12), with a detailed plan required to be approved prior to decommissioning, as secured through the **Draft DCO** (Doc Ref. 3.1).
		Respondents think that the applicant's decommissioning statement is not adequate	N	The Applicant notes that information on decommissioning has been provided at multiple stages of the pre-application and application process. An information booklet issued as part of the Stage Two consultation explained the construction, operation and decommissioning the Scheme and signposted readers to further technical information. Since the PEIR, this information has been updated and is contained within the **Environmental Statement** (Doc Ref. 6.1). Details of decommissioning activities are provided within **ES Chapter 2: The Scheme** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The **ODEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.12) sets out the outline general principles that will be adhered to during the decommissioning phase.
		Respondent was concerned about wildlife safety during the decommissioning phase.	N	Impacts to wildlife during the Decommissioning phase are considered in **ES Chapter 9: Ecology and Biodiversity** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The assessment concludes that during the Construction phase no significant effects are expected. Impacts during the Decommissioning phase are anticipated to be similar to those during the Construction phase. An **ODEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.12) has been prepared as part of the DCO Application. This provides details of measures that would be implemented as part of the Scheme to ensure disturbance to wildlife across and surrounding the Order limits are mitigated as far as

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				practicable. This includes standard ecological protection measures, as well as an Ecological Clerk of Works (ECoW) that would control and monitor decommissioning works. Prior to the start of the Decommissioning phase, a detailed DEMP will be prepared, submitted to and approved by the local authority and is secured by the **Draft DCO** (Doc Ref. 3.1). This will be in substantial accordance with the **ODEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.12).
		Respondent felt that additional jobs in the area would only be short term during the construction and decommissioning phases	N	For the purposes of the **Environmental Statement** (Doc Ref. 6.1), 855 construction staff per day have been assumed as the maximum peak construction workforce, accounting for concurrent works across the Solar Development Area, Inter-Array Connection, and the Grid Connection Corridor. Over the construction period, this would equate to an average of 184 gross FTE jobs on-site per day. Employment during decommissioning is expected to be similar to the construction phase. During the operational phase, it is anticipated that the Scheme would be manned by a nominal number of staff across the Solar Development Area (10 full time equivalent (FTE) staff), predominantly undertaking maintenance tasks. More details can be found in **ES Chapter 2: The Scheme** (Doc Ref. 6.1).
		Respondent wants a guarantee from the applicant that the land will be arable again	N	The land would be restored to its original use (typically agricultural) and returned to the relevant landowners once the Decommissioning phase is complete. All above-ground physical infrastructure would be dismantled and removed during the Decommissioning phase, including pylons and associated infrastructure. In addition, below ground infrastructure, such as concrete foundations to these elements, would be removed to a depth agreed with the relevant landowner from the area within the Order Limits and recycled or disposed of in accordance with good practice and market conditions at that time. Decommissioning activities would be controlled through the **ODEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.12), with a detailed plan required to be approved prior to decommissioning, as secured through the D**raft DCO** (Doc Ref. 3.1). Prior to the start of the Decommissioning phase, a detailed DEMP will be prepared, submitted to and approved by the local authority and is secured by the Draft DCO. This will be in substantial accordance with the **ODEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.12).

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
		Respondents felt that biodiversity would not return post-decommissioning	N	Any habitat creation and enhancement will remain for the lifespan of the Scheme. Upon decommissioning all physical infrastructure within the Order limits will be removed and the land returned to its former condition and land use. Some areas of habitat and biodiversity mitigation and enhancement may be left for species protection, but this will be up to the landowners at the time. An **ODEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.12) has been prepared as part of the DCO Application and includes that pre-decommissioning ecological surveys would be undertaken to inform the decommissioning strategy. Prior to the start of the Decommissioning phase, a detailed DEMP will be prepared, submitted to and approved by the local authority and is secured by the Draft DCO. This will be in substantial accordance with the **ODEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.12).
		Respondents thought that if this development fails and decommissioning of this development does not happen, it would become the government's responsibility	N	The Applicant is legally obligated to decommission the Scheme, in accordance with an approved DEMP (to be prepared in accordance with the **ODEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.12)) as secured by way of a Requirement in the DCO. The requirements of the DCO are enforceable and it is a criminal offence to fail to comply with these. The Proceeds of Crime Act 2002 also acts as a further deterrent, and elements of the installed solar PV represent a valuable asset meaning it would be in the Applicant's interest financially to decommission the site in order to sell or recycle the panels and other components. If the Applicant went into liquidation or receivership, its assets would be sold off to fund the decommissioning of the Scheme that is required pursuant to the legal requirement of the DCO (in this context, it is relevant that the DCO is a piece of legislation, and therefore different to a planning permission). A decommissioning bond is not routine for energy DCOs and while similar arguments have been advanced requesting a decommissioning bond in the Examinations for most other solar DCOs, the Secretary of State has not required one for those made to date.

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
		Respondents suggested that the applicant will extend the lease of the site instead of decommissioning	N	The Scheme is not reliant on the extension of any lease arrangement. If the Applicant's DCO application is granted, this would allow the Scheme to be operational for 40 years, after which the Scheme would have to be decommissioned in accordance with the requirements outlined in the **Draft DCO** (Doc Ref. 3.1). Land interests for the Scheme are secured either by agreement or, where necessary, through compulsory acquisition or temporary possession powers, which are time-limited and purpose-specific. The Applicant has no ability to extend the operational life of the Scheme through the continuation or extension of land rights, and any operation beyond the consented period would require separate development consent.
		Respondents questioned the logic of repeating damaging or disruptive activities during decommissioning, first experienced during construction	N	The Applicant acknowledges that decommissioning activities may be similar in nature to certain construction activities; however, the **Environmental Statement** (Doc Ref. 6.1) demonstrates that the effects of decommissioning would be similar to, or of a lesser magnitude than, those experienced during construction, reflecting the shorter duration, reduced intensity and lower levels of activity anticipated. Decommissioning would be carried out in accordance with a secured **ODEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.12), applying appropriate mitigation measures to manage potential effects. The Scheme would operate for a defined period of 40 years, after which decommissioning would be required in accordance with the DCO.
		Respondents thought that a combination of chemical waste, limited land maintenance and rainwater concentration will permanently damage the land	N	An **ODEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.12) has been prepared as part of the DCO Application. This provides measures that would be implemented as part of the Scheme to ensure environmental impacts, including contamination to the ground and water, across the Order Limits are managed and mitigated as far as practicable during all phases of the Scheme. This includes the appropriate management of materials, storage of chemicals, and emergency plans. Prior to the start of the Decommissioning phase, a detailed DEMP will be prepared, submitted to and approved by the local authority and is secured by the Draft DCO. This will be in substantial accordance with the **ODEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.12).
		Respondents thought that soil contamination would be significantly worse due to the 40-year lifespan of the development	N	An **Outline DEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.12) has been prepared as part of the DCO Application. This provides measures that would be implemented as part of the Scheme to ensure environmental impacts, including contamination to the ground and water, across the Order Limits are managed and mitigated as far as practicable during all phases of the
		Respondents thought that the materials of the development would result in the toxicity of the land	N	

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
		Respondents had concerns about chemicals from the maintenance of the development permanently damaging the land	N	Scheme. This includes the appropriate management of materials, storage of chemicals, and emergency plans. Prior to the start of the Decommissioning phase, a detailed DEMP will be prepared, submitted to and approved by the local authority and is secured by the Draft DCO. This will be in substantial accordance with the **ODEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.12).
		Respondents were concerned about the limited aeration of the soil during the 40-year life span of the development	N	An assessment of the impacts of the Scheme on agriculture and soil is presented in **ES Chapter 5: Agriculture and Soils** (Doc Ref. 6.1). During the operational phase of the Scheme, the change from predominantly arable farming to grassland cover would be beneficial to the structure of the soils within the PV array as trafficking by agricultural machinery would be reduced. The assessment concludes that the Scheme would result in a minor beneficial effect (not significant) to the soil. An **OSMP** (Doc Ref. 7.14) has been prepared as part of the DCO Application. This provides details of measures that would be implemented as part of the Scheme to ensure soils within the Order Limits are not degraded and farming activities can re-commence following completion of the Construction phase along the Grid Connection Route and Inter-Array Connections and Decommissioning phase within the Solar Development Areas. Prior to the start of construction, a detailed SMP will be prepared, submitted to and approved by the local authority and is secured by the **Draft DCO** (Doc Ref. 3.1). This will be in substantial accordance with the **OSMP** (Doc Ref. 7.14).
		Respondents were concerned about the return of wildlife following decommissioning	N	Any habitat creation and enhancement will remain for the lifespan of the Scheme. Upon decommissioning all physical infrastructure within the Order limits will be removed and the land returned to its former condition and land use. Some areas of habitat and biodiversity mitigation and enhancement may be left for species protection, but this will be up to the landowners at the time. An **ODEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.12) has been prepared as part of the DCO Application and includes that pre-decommissioning ecological surveys would be undertaken to inform the decommissioning strategy. Prior to the start of the Decommissioning phase, a detailed DEMP will be prepared, submitted to and approved by the local authority and is secured by the **Draft DCO** (Doc Ref. 3.1). This will be in substantial accordance with the **ODEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.12).
		Respondents thought that the 40-year life span of the project threatened food security	N	The Applicant notes that the independent National Food Strategy Review concludes that solar farms do not present a risk to the UK's

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				food security. The Scheme would enable agricultural use of the land, supporting farm diversification and the long-term viability of agricultural operations. Solar farms can continue to support agricultural activities, including grazing, and can support UK farmers in maintaining food production on other parts of their land. Furthermore, the Scheme presents less than 1% of agricultural land available in Lincolnshire.
		Respondent felt that the applicant should provide a legally binding index linked benefit to the community for the 40-year project lifespan	N	The Applicant is currently investigating how a community benefit fund could be managed and delivered independently. Once the Scheme is operational and the Community Benefit Fund is established, funds will be available for recommendations on where money could be used.
		Respondent was concerned that the applicant has not returned any of its other solar farms back into arable land	N	No solar farms delivered or operated by Downing LLP have yet reached the end of their operational life and therefore none have been decommissioned. The Applicant is committed to decommissioning the Scheme at the end of its operational life and returning the land to its previous use, as set out in the **ODEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.12), which will be secured by way of a Requirement in the **Draft DCO** (Doc Ref. 3.1). d
		Respondent was concerned about other developers not returning land to arable post-decommissioning	N	The Applicant cannot only comment on the practices of other developers or schemes. The application is assessed on its own merits. If consented, the DCO would require the Scheme to be decommissioned at the end of its operational life (40 years) and the land restored in accordance with the approved decommissioning requirements. These provisions would apply specifically to this Scheme and ensure that land within the Order Limits can be returned to agricultural use following decommissioning.
		Respondent thought that the site would be used for housing post-decommissioning	N	The Applicant does not propose housing or any alternative development on the Site following decommissioning. If consented, the Development Consent Order would require the Scheme to be decommissioned and the land restored in accordance with the **ODEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.12). Any future development of the land would be a matter for the landowner and subject to a separate planning process.
		Respondent wants the applicant to communicate with the community and rectify any issues during the decommissioning phase	N	It is expected the Applicant would appoint a Community Liaison Officer as a designated point of contact for any public concerns during the construction and decommissioning phases, and regular community updates would be provided through multiple channels to ensure residents are kept informed. This is set out as a requirement in the

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				CEMP and DEMP, which will be secured by way of requirement in the **Draft DCO** (Doc Ref. 3.1) and prepared in substantial accordance with the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10) and **ODEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.12).
		Respondent questioned whether funding would be granted to the community during the entirety of the project, not just during the operational term	N	The Applicant is currently investigating how a community benefit fund could be managed and delivered independently. The Community Benefit Fund would only be available once the Scheme is operational.

2.6. Environment

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
Environment	**Specific Reference to the PEIR:** Respondents stated that the PEIR itself did not feature enough detail, with suggestions that there was evidence of a lack of research on some accounts, ultimately leading to what was deemed to be uninformed conclusions. Respondents also stated they believed the PEIR had been set up to heavily favour the development's consent, with respondents stating they would have preferred an external, independent organisation to have undertaken the assessments. Within the PEIR itself, respondents felt that not enough research had been dedicated towards investigating the impact of the Applicant's development on surrounding wildlife habitats.	Respondents felt that inadequate research had been undertaken to support the conclusions found in the PEIR	N	The Applicant acknowledges the comment, however, respectfully disagrees that inadequate research has been undertaken to support the conclusions found in the PEIR. Whilst the PEIR is a 'point in time assessment' detailed research was undertaken which included a review of secondary information, previous environmental studies, publicly available information and databases, desktop studies, and physical surveys and monitoring. Since the PEIR, the technical assessments have been finalised and are contained within the **Environmental Statement** (Doc Ref. 6.1). For more details regarding the Assessment Methodology followed, refer to **ES Chapter 4: Overview of the EIA Process** (Doc Ref. 6.1).
		Respondents felt that the technical language used on the PEIR made it inaccessible for much of the public audience	N	As a more accessible format, a Non-Technical Summary of the PEIR was made available as part of the consultation materials. The stage two consultation information booklet also included a table explaining the potential effects and proposed mitigation of each topic within the PEIR in a simple and accessible way. Further details on the information provided as part of the statutory consultation are provided in the **Consultation Report** (Doc Ref. 5.1).
		Respondents stated that the PEIR was inherently heavily biased towards the development's consent and was therefore not fit for purpose	N	The Applicant disagrees that the PEIR was biased towards development consent. The PEIR (and the Environmental Statement) have been prepared by experienced specialists in accordance with industry guidance for the preparation of Environmental Statements. Details are provided in **ES Appendix 1-3: EIA Statement of Competence** (Doc Ref. 6.3). Subsequently, the **Environmental Statement** (Doc Ref. 6.1) has considered feedback received on the PEIR through consultation stages and through technical engagement with statutory stakeholders.
		Respondents complained that the PEIR had only been made available for viewing at venues with limited opening hours	N	The Applicant is confident in the adequacy of consultation delivered throughout the pre-application phase, as described and evidenced in the **Consultation Report** (Doc Ref. 5.1). The Applicant consulted with relevant local planning authorities on the draft Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC), which contained a list local information points that would host the physical documents of the consultation documents, including the PEIR and its Non-Technical Summary. Section 6.5 of the **Consultation Report** (Doc Ref. 5.1) details

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				the responses from local authorities on the Applicant's suggested approach to consultation and proposed information points included within the draft SoCC, as well as how the Applicant had regard to these comments. Furthermore, the Applicant provided a digital copy of the PEIR and its Non-Technical Summary (NTS) on the Documents page of the Scheme website, and made a physical copy of the PEIR available at each of the stage two consultation in-person events.
		Respondents would have preferred if the PEIR had been carried out by an independent, external organisation	N	The PEIR (and the Environmental Statement) has been prepared by experienced specialists in accordance with industry guidance for the preparation of Environmental Statements. Details are provided in **ES Appendix 1-3: EIA Statement of Competence** (Doc Ref. 6.3). Subsequently, the **Environmental Statement** (Doc Ref. 6.1) has considered feedback received on the PEIR through consultation stages and through technical engagement with statutory stakeholders.
		Respondents stated that the PEIR had been introduced too late in the consultation period for the public to provide adequate responses	N	The Applicant's PEIR and Non-Technical Summary of the PEIR were made available on the Documents page of the Scheme website, and at a local information point, on the day the stage two consultation commenced: 24 April 2025. The consultation ran for over six weeks and three days to take account of bank holidays during this period, which is in excess of the statutory minimum 28-days.
		Respondents stated that the mitigation strategies proposed in the PEIR were insufficient	N	Whilst the Applicant acknowledges the PEIR was 'a point in time' assessment, the Applicant disagrees that the mitigation strategies proposed in the PEIR were insufficient. The approach to mitigation is detailed fully within **ES Chapter 4: Overview of the EIA Process** (Doc Ref. 6.1).
		Respondents believed that the PEIR didn't sufficiently address human health and safety concerns	N	The Applicant disagrees that the PEIR didn't sufficiently address human health and safety concerns. A Human Health assessment was included within the PEIR. Since the PEIR, this has been finalised and is contained within **ES Chapter 10: Human Health** (Doc Ref. 6.1).
		Respondent stated that the PEIR did not sufficiently address the potential flood risks	N	The Applicant disagrees that the PEIR didn't sufficiently address potential flood risk concerns. A flood risk assessment was included within Section 11 of the PEIR. Since the PEIR, this has been finalised and is contained within **ES Chapter 11: Hydrology and Flood Risk** (Doc Ref. 6.1) and **ES Appendix 11-3: Flood Risk Assessment** (Doc Ref. 6.3).

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
		Respondents were concerned that the PEIR didn't fully address the issue of soil degradation	N	The Applicant notes that soil degradation was covered in Chapter 9: Agriculture and Soils of the PEIR. Since the PEIR, the assessment has been finalised and is presented within **ES Chapter 5: Agriculture and Soils** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The Applicant further notes that mitigation measures to avoid soil degradation during the construction, operation and decommissioning of the Scheme are included within the **OSMP** (Doc Ref. 7.14).
		Respondents were concerned that the PEIR had not fully investigated the short and long term effects of the development on wildlife and their habitats	N	The short and long term effects of the development on wildlife and their habitats were assessed within Chapter 7 Ecology and Biodiversity of the PEIR. Since the PEIR, the assessment has been finalised and is contained within **ES Chapter 9: Ecology and Biodiversity** (Doc Ref. 6.1).
		Respondents felt that the PEIR had focused too much on the ornithological impacts and not enough emphasis had been given to other wildlife	N	The Ecology and Biodiversity assessment presented in the PEIR considered impacts on a wide range of receptors include designated sites, habitats, bats, great crested newt and otter and water vole in addition to birds. Since the PEIR the assessment has been finalised and is presented within **ES Chapter 9: Ecology and Biodiversity** (Doc Ref. 6.1).
		Respondents felt that the PEIR did not fully address the impact that construction traffic and transport would have on the local area	N	Since the PEIR, Chapter 13: Traffic and Access has been finalised and is contained within **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref. 6.1).
		Respondent felt that there was a lack of detail included in the PEIR surrounding potential BESS fire risks	N	The potential for BESS fire risks was covered within Section 14.6. Major Accidents and Disasters within Chapter 14 of the PEIR. Since the PEIR the assessment has been updated and is presented in **ES Chapter 16: Other Environmental Topics** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The Applicant also notes there are measures set out within the **OBSMP** (Doc Ref. 7.18) to reduce the risk of a BESS fire.
		Respondents criticised the PEIR for not addressing the cumulative impact of the Applicant's development in conjunction with other developments in the area	N	Cumulative impacts were assessed within each technical chapter of the PEIR. Since the PEIR, the assessments have been finalised and are presented in **ES Chapters 5 to 16** (Doc Ref. 6.1).
		Respondent felt that the PEIR had unfairly categorised the land on which the development is to be sited	N	It is assumed that the comment relates to Agricultural Land Classification. As stated in **ES Chapter 5: Agriculture and Soils** (Doc Ref. 6.1) and **ES Appendices 5-2 and 5-3** (Doc Ref. 6.3) detailed soil surveys have been carried out across the Solar Development Area. The results show most of the land is Subgrade 3b land, with some areas of Grade 1, Grade 2 and Subgrade 3a. Refer to **ES Chapter 5: Agriculture and Soils** (Doc Ref. 6.1) for a detailed breakdown of the ALC grades across the Solar Development Area.

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
	Ecology Respondents were concerned that the Scheme was contributing to the large-scale loss of local wildlife's habitats. Respondents were also unsatisfied with the Applicant's proposed mitigation plans for wildlife currently inhabiting the local area. Concern also centred around the use of pylons and overhead line technology, with respondents deeming them to be detrimental to the local environment and likely to increase the amount of bird strikes in the area. The proposed use of fencing was also highlighted as potentially disrupting the local movement of animals.	Respondents felt that the Applicant was facilitating the loss and pollution of local wildlife habitats, which would have an overall net negative ecological impact.	N	The Applicant disagrees that the Scheme facilitates the loss and pollution of local wildlife habitats. The impact of the Scheme on wildlife is assessed within **ES Chapter 9: Ecology and Biodiversity** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The chapter concludes no significant adverse effects are expected. As part of the landscape design for the Scheme, new habitats would be provided to increase biodiversity compared to the existing baseline. 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), included as part of the DCO Application.
		Respondents felt that any potential environmental impacts were outweighed by the need for the UK to produce its own renewable energy	N	The Applicant notes this comment.
		Respondent felt that the development would have a net positive impact on the local environment	N	The Applicant notes this comment.
		Respondents stated that the Applicant had provided insufficient mitigation plans for wildlife currently inhabiting the proposed site	N	The Applicant disagrees that the Scheme provides insufficient mitigation for wildlife. 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 detailed within the **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16), included as part of the DCO Application. The impact of the Scheme on wildlife is assessed within **ES Chapter 9: Ecology and Biodiversity** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The chapter concludes no significant adverse effects are expected.

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
		Respondents were concerned that the pylons and OHL technology would have a direct negative impact on local wildlife	N	The impact of the Scheme on wildlife is assessed within **ES Chapter 9: Ecology and Biodiversity** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The chapter concludes no significant adverse effects are expected. 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).
		Respondents were concerned that the development negatively impact the lifecycle of nocturnal animals	N	The impact of the Scheme on wildlife (including nocturnal animals) is assessed within **ES Chapter 9: Ecology and Biodiversity** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The chapter concludes no significant effects are expected. Good practice measures relevant to managing impacts on ecological receptors during construction, operation and decommissioning are set out in the **OCMEP** (Doc Ref. 7.10), the **OOEMP** (Doc Ref 7.11), and the **ODMEP** (Doc Ref. 7.12).
		Respondents were concerned that the development would have a detrimental impact on the Fenland's ecology and unique environment	N	The impact of the Scheme on ecology is assessed within **ES Chapter 9: Ecology and Biodiversity** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The chapter concludes no significant effects are expected. Good practice measures relevant to managing impacts on ecological receptors during construction, operation and decommissioning are set out in the **OCMEP** (Doc Ref. 7.10), the **OOEMP** (Doc Ref 7.11), and the **ODMEP** (Doc Ref. 7.12).
		Respondents highlighted that pylons and OHL technology would increase the likelihood of in-air bird collisions	N	The impact of the Scheme on wildlife (including birds) 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 pylons and the 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).
		Respondents commented that the pylons and OHL technology would interfere with the migratory patterns of local birds	N	The impact of the Scheme on wildlife (including migratory birds) 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. For example, bird diverters have been specified where there is an elevated bird collision risk, as set out within **OOEMP** (Doc Ref 7.11) and the **Design Parameters** (Doc Ref. 7.4).
		Respondents were worried that the cleaning of the solar panels and the chemical used would damage the surrounding environment	N	As stated in **ES Chapter 11: Hydrology and Flood Risk** (Doc Ref. 6.1) the panels will be cleaned using clean water, with no added chemicals and therefore will not damage the surrounding environment. This is also included within the **OOEMP** (Doc Ref 7.11).

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
		Respondents commented that the presence of the 2.8m security fence and inter array corridors would act as an obstacle for local wildlife	N	As confirmed in **ES Chapter 2: The Scheme** (Doc Ref. 6.1), the security fencing is likely to be a deer wire mesh fence up to approximately 2m in height. Mammal gates would be provided, where required, to ensure ecological connectivity is maintained.
		Respondents stated the glint/glare from solar panels would increase the likelihood of bird collisions	N	The Applicant notes that the potential impact on birds caused by glint and glare during the operational phase has been assessed within **ES Chapter 9: Ecology and Biodiversity** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The assessment concludes there will be no significant residual effects on birds. The Applicant further notes that there is no evidence that current PV panel technology results in glint and glare effects for birds.
		Respondents were perturbed at the possibility of the solar panels increasing localised temperatures	N	In terms of the concern that solar panels increase localised temperatures, the Applicant notes that the potential for a microclimate to be created by solar panels is extremely unlikely, and a far lower risk than from other projects such as power stations.
		Respondents were concerned that the removal of local foliage was removing important carbon sinks	N	The Applicant notes that in response to the concern regarding vegetation removal, this will be kept to a minimum. Refer to the **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16) and **ES Appendix 12-8: Arboricultural Impact Assessment** (Doc Ref. 6.3). These documents demonstrate the extent of vegetation removal required and the mitigation committed with regards to replacement planting.
	Flooding and Flood Risk Respondents criticised the Applicant for siting the Scheme on a local flood plain and near a local watercourse that regularly floods. They also believed that the installation of solar panels and accompanying infrastructure would alter the underground drainage systems of the local fields to such an extent that the local flood risk would increase as a result. Respondents were also concerned that the solar panels themselves would contribute to an increase in surface water levels via rain-water run off, with the knock-on effect being increased flooding.	Respondents expressed concern that the development was sited on a local flood plain	N	**ES Chapter 11: Hydrology and Flood Risk** (Doc Ref. 6.1) states that the majority of the Solar Development Area is located within Flood Zone 3. Mitigation measures are included within **ES Appendix 11-3 Flood Risk Assessment** (Doc Ref 6.3), which establishes the mitigation requirements for flood risk. With these measures in place, the Scheme would not result in a significant effect with regards to flood risk on off-site properties and can remain operational in times of flood.
		Respondents felt that the siting of the Scheme on a flood plain and near a river raised significant safety concerns around batteries and accompanying electrical infrastructure	N	The Applicant acknowledges the concern regarding siting batteries and accompanying infrastructure within a Flood Zone. It is noted that area is assigned as a Flood Zone by the Environment Agency without the consideration of existing flood defences of the River Welland. The existing flood defences maintained by the Environment Agency provide protection from flooding up to a 1 in 1,000 year flood event. Furthermore, mitigation has been embedded into the Scheme to ensure the Scheme can operate safely even in a 1 in 1,000 year flood event, e.g. solar panels will be raised off the ground, solar stations will be raised above flood depths on plinths, bunded, or a flood defence will be provided. The BESS Compound and Substation will be protected by

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				bunding. Further details are provided within **ES Chapter 2: The Scheme** and **ES Chapter 11: Hydrology and Flood Risk** (Doc Ref. 6.1).
		Respondents felt that the proposal would significantly alter the drainage of the area and increase flood risk	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 no significant effects are expected with the implementation of measures included within **ES Appendix 11-4: Outline Drainage Strategy** (Doc Ref. 6.3).
		Respondent felt that the introduction of flood stilts would render any landscape mitigation null and void	N	The Applicant notes that, as stated in **ES Chapter 2: The Scheme** (Doc Ref. 6.1),flood protection would be provided in the form of plinths (similar to flood stilts), a bund or a flood protection wall. The maximum height of any plinths used to raise solar stations above flood depths would be 0.8 m, except for Parcel D-1, where the maximum height of plinths can be up to 1.35m. The maximum height of solar stations would be 4.3m above ground, except for Parcel D-1, where maximum height will be 4.85m. With the exception of Field D-1, the maximum height of solar stations would not exceed that of panels. Within Field D-1, the maximum height of solar stations may exceed the height of solar panels by up to 0.55m, however, the solar stations would be located away from Site boundaries and would be visible within the wider context of the solar infrastructure. Landscape planting in the form of trees and shrubs on Site boundaries would remain relevant with regards to screening views of the proposed infrastructure. The visual impact of the Scheme has been assessed within **ES Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual** (Doc Ref. 6.1), where the effects from the Scheme as a whole are considered.
		Respondents noted that the dykes that are proposed to be bridged over would require constant maintenance to avoid flooding	N	Mitigation measures to avoid flooding are summarised within **ES Chapter 11: Hydrology and Flood Risk** (Doc Ref. 6.1). Refer to the **Outline CEMP** (Doc Ref 7.10), the **OOEMP** (Doc Ref 7.11) and the **Outline DEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.12), and the **ES Appendix 11-4: Outline Drainage Strategy** (Doc Ref 6.3) for further details.
		Respondents queried whether soil compaction caused by solar panel installation would increase the local flood risk	N	The impact of the Scheme on flood risk is assessed within **ES Chapter 11: Hydrology and Flood Risk** (Doc Ref. 6.1), which concludes no significant effects are expected with the implementation of measures. In terms of soil compaction, the Applicant further notes that measures are included within the **OSMP** (Doc Ref. 7.14) to avoid this.
		Respondents thought that the installation of solar panels would weaken local flood defences	N	The impact of the Scheme on flood risk is assessed within **ES Chapter 11: Hydrology and Flood Risk** (Doc Ref. 6.1) and **ES Appendix 11-3:**

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				Flood Risk Assessment (Doc Ref. 6.3), which conclude no significant effects are expected with the implementation of mitigation measures. There are no direct effects or works proposed to existing flood defences.
		Respondents claimed that this site would be reclaimed by the sea within the next 50 years, rendering the Scheme inoperable	N	The impact of flooding on the Scheme has been assessed within **ES Chapter 11: Hydrology and Flood Risk** (Doc Ref 6.1) with the embedded mitigation within **ES Appendix 11-3: Flood Risk Assessment** (Doc Ref. 6.3). No significant effects are expected.
		Respondents pointed to the potential of the development increasing the concentration of surface water through run off, which they believed would increase the risk of flooding	N	The impact of the Scheme on surface water has been assessed within **ES Chapter 11: Hydrology and Flood Risk** (Doc Ref 6.1). The Solar Development Area Outline Drainage Strategy is presented in **ES Appendix 11-4: Outline Drainage Strategy** (Doc Ref 6.3) and has been developed to minimise flood risk through the proposed drainage measures, which have been detailed in the strategy report. Runoff from the Scheme would be managed to discharge at greenfield run off rates.
		Respondents were unsatisfied with the current mitigation plans surrounding flood risks	N	The Applicant notes this comment but confirms that details of proposed mitigation measures are detailed within **ES Chapter 11: Hydrology and Flood Risk** (Doc Ref 6.1), **ES Appendix 11-3: Flood Risk Assessment** (Doc Ref. 6.3) and **ES Appendix 11-4: Outline Drainage Strategy** (Doc Ref 6.3). These have been developed through engagement with the Environment Agency.
		Respondents were pleased with the flood mitigation that had been proposed	N	The Applicant welcomes this comment.
		Respondents felt that increased construction traffic would damage drainage channels and lead to flooding	N	Measures are proposed within the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.1) and **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13) to avoid construction traffic-related impacts.
		Respondent felt that the removal of Peatland as a natural source of drainage, would increase local flood risks	N	The Applicant notes that **ES Appendix 5-2 and 5-3** (Doc Ref. 6.3) confirms that no peatland was identified as part of the ALC surveys.
	Biodiversity Respondents maintained that the removal of wildlife habitat, through the installation of solar panels and accompanying infrastructure, would drive away animals that live, hunt and breed in the local area, significantly reducing wildlife biodiversity as a result. This was	Respondent was unsatisfied with the Applicant's proposals to safeguard local biodiversity	N	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

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
	also accompanied by concerns that the development of the Scheme would lead to the stunting of local floral biodiversity. Respondents were also skeptical that the Applicant would be able to implement biodiversity net gain in the local area.			set out within the **OLEMP** Doc Ref. 7.16), included as part of the DCO Application.
		Respondents felt that the Applicant's proposal would alter the landscape and soundscape of the area, causing local wildlife to be driven away. It was noted that long-term environmental changes would significantly reduce the area's biodiversity	N	The Applicant disagrees that the Scheme would cause local wildlife to be driven away. 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 detailed within the **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16), included as part of the DCO Application. The impact of the Scheme on wildlife (including birds) is assessed within **ES Chapter 9: Ecology and Biodiversity** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The chapter concludes no significant effects are expected.
		Respondents highlighted the pylons and OHL technology as having a direct negative impact on local biodiversity	N	The impact of the Scheme on local biodiversity 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. 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).
		Respondents were concerned that the construction of the Scheme would noticeably reduce the local floral biodiversity	N	The Applicant disagrees that the Scheme would reduce the local floral biodiversity. As part of the landscape design for the Scheme, new habitats would be provided to increase biodiversity (including flora) 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 detailed within the **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16), included as part of the DCO Application.

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
		Respondent felt that the Scheme would serve to increase local biodiversity	N	The Applicant welcomes this comment.
		Respondents questioned the validity of the Applicant's claim that the development would lead to a net biodiversity gain	N	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 detailed within the **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16), included as part of the DCO Application. Further details are provided within the **Biodiversity Net Gain Report** (Doc Ref. 7.9).
	Soils Respondents expressed concern that the presence of solar panels on arable land for 40 years would have a cumulative effect that would serve to decrease the fertility of the soil for future agricultural uses. Respondents pointed to the presence of sub-terranean concrete structures that would remain in place following decommissioning as potentially rendering the soil inarable. Respondents also expressed concern of the potential negative effects of soil compaction from the siting of solar panels and any potential leakage from malfunctioning or cleaning of solar panels leaching into the soil and damaging it's fertility.	Respondents pointed to the issue of soil compaction drastically changing the arable nature of local fields	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 Applicant also notes that during operation, there is likely to be an improvement in soil structure due to the period of suspended agricultural activities.
		Respondents stated that the long-term shading provided by the solar panels would have long-term negative consequences on the health of the soil	N	The impact of the Scheme on soil has been assessed within **ES Chapter 5: Agriculture and Soils** (Doc Ref. 6.1). There is no evidence that long-term shading would have negative consequences for the soil. The Applicant also notes that there is likely to be an improvement in soil structure due to the period of suspended agricultural activities.
		Respondents believed that the frequencies emitted by the solar panels would significantly impact soil health	N	The impact of the Scheme on soil has been assessed within **ES Chapter 5: Agriculture and Soils** (Doc Ref. 6.1). There is no evidence that the frequences emitted by the solar panels would impact soil health. In fact, during operation, there is likely to be an improvement in soil health due to the period of suspended agricultural activities.
		Respondents felt that the presence of solar panels for the proposed life cycle of 40 years would severely damage local soil fertility	N	The impact of the Scheme on soil has been assessed within **ES Chapter 5: Agriculture and Soils** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The Applicant further notes that there is likely to be an improvement in soil structure due to the 40 year period of suspended agricultural activities.

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
		Respondents were concerned that soil fertility would impacted by chemical leakage from the solar panels, through a combination of panel cleaning and panel malfunction	N	As stated in **ES Chapter 11: Hydrology and Flood RIsk** (Doc Ref. 6.1) the panels will be cleaned using clean water, with no added chemicals. This is also included within the **OOEMP** (Doc Ref 7.11). In terms of leakage through panel malfunction, solar panels are sealed and considered safe for their lifespan.
		Respondents pointed to the potential increase in soil erosion following a higher concentration of surface water due to solar panel run-off	N	Solar panels will not increase soil erosion due to surface water as they are not considered to alter the existing drainage regime. Land underneath solar panels will be sown as grassland, to minimize the risk of soil erosion.
		Respondents stated that the excess heat produced by the solar panels would remove the soil of valuable nutrients	N	The Applicant notes that the potential for a microclimate to be created by solar panels is extremely unlikely, and far lower risk than from other projects, such as power stations. The Applicant further notes that during operation soil health is likely to improve due to the 40 year suspension of agricultural activity.
		Respondents were concerned that the use of subterranean concrete structures would render the soil infertile post-decommissioning	N	As stated in **ES Chapter 2: The Scheme** (Doc Ref. 6.1) concrete foundations would be removed to a depth agreed with the relevant landowner from the area within the Order Limits and recycled or disposed of in accordance with good practice and market conditions at that time.
		Respondent said that they were satisfied with the soil restoration measures that were to be taken by the Applicant	N	The Applicant notes this comment.
	General mitigation Respondents remained unsatisfied with the Applicant's proposed mitigation plans to offset any visual impact from the Scheme. There were further concerns that proposed mitigation proposals for the Fenland area were inappropriate, giving the use of non-native woodland cover, an area that respondents state is not known for woodland cover.	Respondents were concerned that current mitigation plans for the Fenland area, where the Applicant is currently considering planting a non-native woodland cover, would have a detrimental impact on the surrounding area	N	Mitigation planting proposals are presented within the **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16). Scattered shrub and tree planting is proposed along field boundaries to provide screening for the Solar Development Areas; however, no isolated blocks of woodland have been proposed. The planting strategy has been designed to provide screening whilst ensuring that the planting proposals are in keeping with the surrounding landscape character.
		Respondents claimed stated that they were unsatisfied with the Applicant's proposed environmental impact mitigation plans	N	Further detail of the Applicant's proposed environmental impact mitigation plans are provided as part of the DCO Application. Please refer to the **Environmental Statement** (Doc Ref. 6.1, 6.2 and 6.3) and the various management plans included within **Volume 7: Other documents** such as the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref 7.10), the **OOEMP** (Doc Ref 7.11) and the **ODEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.12).

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
		Respondent said they would prefer the Applicant use local materials and labour in during the construction phase to reduce the Scheme's environmental impact	N	As set out within the **Outline Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan** (Doc Ref. 7.17), the Applicant will investigate measures to promote take up of jobs generated by the Scheme by local people, including requiring contractors to promote local employment during construction, operation and decommissioning. In addition, the Applicant will work with local partners to communicate purchasing and contracting opportunities arising from the Scheme to local businesses.
		Respondents were critical of the Applicant's visual impact mitigation plans	N	Further details regarding the Applicant's visual impact mitigation plans are provided within **ES Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual** (Doc Ref. 6.1) and the **Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (OLEMP)** (Doc Ref. 7.16).
	Watercourses Respondents pointed to the potentially harmful consequences for local watercourses from the leaching of cleaning materials or internal materials from the solar panels themselves.	Respondents highlighted the potential for local watercourses to be contaminated following a leakage of cleaning products or internal materials following a malfunction	N	As stated in **ES Chapter 11: Hydrology and Flood Risk** (Doc Ref. 6.1) the panels will be cleaned using clean water, with no added chemicals. This is also included within the **OOEMP** (Doc Ref 7.11). In terms of leakage through panel malfunction, solar panels are sealed and considered safe for their lifespan.
		Respondents requested the Applicant be responsible for any clean up required of local water courses post-contamination	N	The **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.1), **OOEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.11) and **ODEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.12) provide the framework for management of environmental impacts at construction, operation and decommissioning.
	Protected sites Respondents suggested that the Applicant's Scheme would serve to contribute to the permanent destruction of important and protected natural sites and SSSIs.	Respondents believe the Scheme is contributing to the destruction of SSSIs and important natural sites	N	The impact of the Scheme on SSSI's and important natural sites has been assessed within **ES Chapter 9: Ecology and Biodiversity** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The chapter concludes that no significant effects are expected with the implementation of mitigation measures committed to within the DCO Application.
		Respondents were disappointed that the costal saltmarshes had not been afforded further protection within the Applicant's mitigation plan	N	The Applicant assumes the respondent is referring to 'coastal and floodplain grazing marsh' priority habitat (rather than coastal saltmarsh). Coastal and floodplain grazing marsh is identified and assessed within **ES Chapter 9: Ecology and Biodiversity** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The chapter concludes no permanent impacts on these areas are proposed, with only temporary land-take / disturbance proposed. Reinstatement would be undertaken in line with LEMP, prepared in substantial accordance with the **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16), secured by way of Requirement in the **Draft DCO** (Doc Ref. 3.1)
		Respondent welcomed the Applicant's proposal to afford protection to Scheduled Monuments	N	The Applicant notes this comment.
	Alternatives and Design Evolution	Respondents deemed that the stated height of the pylons of 50m should be reduced		The 400kV overhead line has been designed in accordance with BS EN 50341-1 and BS EN 50341-2-9, as guided by NG TS 2.04 and ENA TS 43-12, which ensures statutory clearances to ground are met. The

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
	Respondents expressed displeasure that the Applicant's original proposal for the Scheme to occupy a site of 900 hectares had since been increases to the new proposed site of 1100 hectares.			design approach is consistent with existing 400kV and 132kV OHL's in the region and across the UK.
		Respondents criticised the Applicant for increasing the initial proposal from 900 hectares to 1100 hectares	N	The size of the Scheme site presented at the stage two consultation was consistent with the proposals the Applicant shared during its stage one consultation in 2024. At that time, the Applicant presented initial development areas totalling 'around 1,000 hectares (ha)'. Through ongoing engagement with landowners, surveys of the local area, and discussions with stakeholders, and to produce the most appropriate design for the scheme, the revised proposals shown at the stage two consultation were for a development of approximately 1,100 ha in total. However, of that 1,100 ha, only approximately 600 ha was required for a mix of photovoltaic (PV) solar panels, battery energy storage systems (BESS), substations and associated infrastructure.
	EIA Process Respondents were unsatisfied with the quality of the EIA that had been produced that informed the production of the PEIR.	Respondents doubted the quality of the EIA and the conclusions the assessments that it had made	N	The EIA has been undertaken by competent experts and in accordance with industry guidance. Details are provided in **ES Appendix 1-3: EIA Statement of Competence** (Doc Ref. 6.3). Furthermore, the Applicant has considered feedback received through consultations and technical engagement with statutory stakeholders to complete the assessments.
	Climate Change Respondents stated that, owing to what they deemed was the extended carbon payback period of the Scheme, the Applicant's proposal would contribute more to global carbon emissions rather than reducing them. Respondents remained sceptical about the theory of climate change, and felt that the UK's contribution to global emissions was so small that renewable projects would make little difference.	Respondents dismissed the notion of climate change, instead regarding global temperature change to be a naturally recurring phenomenon	N	The Applicant disagrees that global temperature change is a naturally occurring phenomenon. The impact of the Scheme on greenhouse gases is assessed within **ES Chapter 7: Climate Change** (Doc Ref. 6.1) which concludes that the overall GHG impact of the Scheme is beneficial and significant, as it will play a part in achieving the rate of transition required by nationally set policy commitments and supporting the trajectory towards net zero. The without-project baseline alternative of the current UK grid generation mix would result in substantially higher GHG emissions.
		Respondents stated that because the UK's contribution to global warming was so small, reduction in national emissions through renewable projects wouldn't have a significant impact	N	The Applicant disagrees that because the UK's contribution to global warming is so small, reduction in national emissions through renewable projects would not have a significant impact. The impact of the Scheme on greenhouse gases is assessed within **ES Chapter 7: Climate Change** (Doc Ref. 6.1) which concludes that the overall GHG impact of the Scheme is beneficial and significant, as it will play a part in achieving the rate of transition required by nationally set policy commitments and supporting the trajectory towards net zero. The without-project baseline alternative of the current UK grid generation mix would result in substantially higher GHG emissions.

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
		Respondents claimed that the extended carbon payback period for solar farms was such that it would take years for them to offset the carbon emissions produced in their production	N	The impact of the Scheme on greenhouse gases is assessed within **ES Chapter 7: Climate Change** (Doc Ref. 6.1) which concludes that the overall GHG impact of the Scheme is beneficial and significant, as it will play a part in achieving the rate of transition required by nationally set policy commitments and supporting the trajectory towards net zero. The without-project baseline alternative of the current UK grid generation mix would result in substantially higher GHG emissions. Considering emissions saved against a without-project baseline, any emissions relating to the construction of the Scheme would be offset after four years of operation.
	Landscape and Visual Respondents expressed significant distress at the prospect of the Applicant's development having a noticeable visual impact on the surrounding area and disrupting residents' current views and vistas from their homes and nature sites.	Respondent felt that the visual impact of the Scheme on the surrounding area would lead to residents permanently leaving the area	N	A full environmental impact assessment has been undertaken, including a Landscape and Visual Assessment (see **ES Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual** (Doc Ref. 6.1)). Mitigation measures, such as planting, have been incorporated into the Scheme to reduce the visual impact. Further details are provided within the **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16).
		Respondents believe that the Scheme will have a significantly detrimental visual impact on the surrounding countryside	N	The Applicant confirms that a full environmental impact assessment has been undertaken which includes a Landscape and Visual Assessment (see **ES Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual** (Doc Ref. 6.1). Mitigation measures such as planting have also been incorporated into the Scheme to reduce the visual impact. Further details are provided within the **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16).
	Noise Respondents expressed concerns that the Scheme and its associated infrastructure could significantly increase noise levels in the area. Given what respondents labelled the currently low levels of noise, residents felt that any increase would be especially noticeable and potentially disruptive.	Respondents complained that the Scheme would contribute significantly to an increase in local noise pollution	N	The impact of the construction of the Scheme on noise levels has been assessed within **ES Chapter 13: Noise and Vibration** (Doc Ref. 6.1). With the incorporation of mitigation, the Applicant notes that the only significant noise effects are those associated with HDD at Broad Gate (if required) and construction traffic on Langary Gate Road during peak construction. Measures have been included in the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10) and the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13) to minimise the impacts. Once the project is operational, no significant effects are expected.
		Respondents stated that the introduction of adverse noise pollution will have significantly disturb local wildlife	N	The Applicant confirms that the impact of the construction of the Scheme on noise levels has been assessed within **ES Chapter 13: Noise and Vibration** (Doc Ref. 6.1). With the incorporation of mitigation, the only significant noise effects are those associated with HDD at Broad Gate (if required) and construction traffic on Langary Gate Road during peak construction. Measures have been included within the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10) and **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13) to minimise the impacts. Once the project is operational, no significant effects are expected.

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				The Applicant further notes that temporary significant effects have only been identified during the construction phase for human receptors, it is not expected that the Scheme will result in adverse effects for wildlife.
		Respondents were concerned that noise produced from the site would have a negative affect on existing health conditions	N	The Applicant notes that the impact of noise pollution on health has been assessed within **ES Chapter 10: Human Health** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The chapter concludes that no significant effects on health of the community would occur, considering the short-term duration of construction noise and limited number of receptors affected. Measures have been included within the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13) and **OCEMP** (Doc Ref 7.10) to reduce the impact on nearby communities as reasonably practicable to an acceptable level such as controlling the routing, timing and scheduling of vehicle movements to avoid network peak hours.
	Vibration Respondents took issue with the potential vibrations produced by the solar panels themselves, agitating local wildlife and having negative health consequences for residents living in close proximity to the site.	Respondents highlighted that the Scheme and accompanying infrastructure would create vibrations that would disturb local wildlife	N	The Applicant notes that the impact of vibration from construction has been assessed within **ES Chapter 13: Noise and Vibration** (Doc Ref. 6.1). No significant effects are expected related to vibration with the implementation of mitigation measures set out within the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10).
		Respondents stated that vibrations produced from the Scheme's site would have negative health consequences on local communities	N	The Applicant notes that the impact of construction-related vibration on health has been assessed in **ES Chapter 10: Human Health** (Doc Ref. 6.1). No significant effects are expected from vibration with the implementation of mitigation measures set out within the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10).
	Socio-economics and land use Respondents were fearful that the Applicant's proposals would lead to the local area losing its rural countryside identity, owing to the installation of wide-scale infrastructure, consequently damaging house prices sited in close proximity to the Scheme.	Respondents stated that residential properties sited near large-scale solar installations would lose a significant portion of their value	N	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.

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
		Respondents stated that the surrounding area would lose its rural identity as a result of the Scheme	N	The Applicant notes this comment and confirms that a full environmental impact assessment has been undertaken which included a Landscape and Visual Assessment (See **ES Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual** (Doc Ref. 6.1). Mitigation measures such as planting have been incorporated into the Scheme to reduce the visual impact. Further details are provided within the **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16).
		Respondent questioned which energy suppliers would be taking advantage of the electricity provided by the project	N	Electricity generated by the Scheme will be exported to the national grid. The distribution and supply of electricity through the grid is the responsibility of the national electricity network operators and energy suppliers.
		Respondents believed that the influx of temporary workers living and working around local areas would cause social disruption in local hospitals, GPs, schools and dentists	N	The Applicant confirms that the impact of the Scheme on the social infrastructure has been assessed within **ES Chapter 10: Human Health** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The assessment concludes that no significant effects are expected due to the number of construction workers to be generated by the Scheme and the tendency for construction workers to maintain limited interaction with local social infrastructure.
		Respondents were concerned that if the Scheme was to receive development consent, it would set a precedent for the Applicant to increase the size of the project	N	If the Applicant receives development consent, the Scheme would have to be constructed, operated and decommissioned according to the requirements outlined within the DCO application.
	Traffic and access Respondents expressed dissatisfaction with the Applicant's traffic management plans, highlighting that the current local road infrastructure is insufficient to accommodate the anticipated increase in HGV construction traffic. They further indicated that this could lead to considerable disruption for local communities in their daily activities, potentially impacting their connectivity with neighbouring towns.	Respondents were concerned that existing road infrastructure was not of a sufficient level to allow for the proposed level of construction traffic	N	As stated in the **OCTMP** (Doc. Ref. 7.13), road condition surveys which will be carried out to identify any defects that arise to highways assets/verges during the construction phase of the Scheme for re-instatement.
		Respondents criticised the Applicant for the amount of construction traffic that would be produced, in turn causing significant disruption to local communities	N	The Applicant notes that the impact of road traffic is assessed in **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The assessment concludes no significant effects are expected. The Applicant further notes that traffic management measures are detailed in the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13) and will be implemented to limit construction traffic impacts, including on other road users.
		Respondents stated that the amount of construction traffic would significantly increase local emissions, counteracting any benefit from the Scheme	N	The Applicant notes that the impact of the construction of the Scheme on air quality has been assessed within **ES Chapter 6: Air Quality** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The assessment concludes no significant effects. The **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10) and **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13) include measures to minimise impacts associated with traffic emissions.

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
		Respondents claimed that the increase in construction traffic would damage and dirty the facades of houses close to the traffic pathways	N	The Applicant notes that the impact of construction traffic has been assessed within **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The assessment concludes that no significant effects are expected. The Applicant further notes that traffic management measures are detailed in the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13) and will be implemented by the CTMP, secured by way of Requirement in the DCO, to limit construction traffic impacts such as staggered times for arrival of HGVs. No damage to houses as a result of construction traffic is expected.
		Respondents stated that an increase in construction traffic would reduce community connection to local towns	N	The Applicant notes that the impact of construction traffic has been assessed within **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The assessment concludes that no significant effects are expected. The Applicant further notes that traffic management measures are detailed in the **Outline CTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13) and will be implemented to limit construction traffic impacts such as scheduling deliveries outside of peak times.
		Respondents highlighted that any increase in construction traffic would have a negative effect on local biodiversity.	N	The impact of the Scheme on biodiversity has been assessed within **ES Chapter 9: Ecology and Biodiversity** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The chapter concludes that no significant effects are expected. Mitigation measures are included within the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10) and **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13) to limit impacts associated with construction traffic.
		Respondents were concerned that the current proposed traffic route would jeapordise the safety of the Meridian Stone.	N	The impact of the Scheme on the Meridian Stone has been considered within **ES Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage** (Doc Ref. 6.1) which concludes that no significant effects are expected.

2.7. Indicative alignment of overhead line

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
Indicative alignment of overhead line	**Indicative overhead line – southern section** Respondents voiced opposition to the southern section of the indicative overhead line due to its proximity to properties and potential impacts on local quality of life. Respondents were critical of the Scheme's proposed siting, believing that sites closer to the connection point should have been considered. Respondents remained wary of the connection corridor's reliance on National Grid's Weston Marsh substation, while others criticised the Applicant for what they believed to be a lack of transparency during the consultation phase surrounding the use of pylons and overhead line technology.	Respondents highlighted that were it not for the installation of overhead lines, they would otherwise have been supportive of the project	N	The selection of an overhead line as the preferred technology for the grid connection is guided by national policy contained in the National Policy Statement for Electricity Networks, EN-5, which states that the Government's position that outside of nationally designated landscapes, overhead lines should be the strong starting presumption for electricity networks in general unless these would give rise to particularly significant landscape and visual effects.
		Respondents protested that the southern section of the connection corridor was in too close proximity to residential properties	N	The Applicant notes that the narrative regarding the alignment of the Grid Connection Route is contained within the Design Approach Document. The route's proximity to properties and communities has been considered in the development of the alignment, and potential effects have been assessed in the **Environmental Statement** (Doc Ref. 6.1).
		Respondents provided an alternative suggested route for a part of the indicative overhead line. It was noted that the proposed alternative options, which re-route the overhead line away from Austendike and through Broadgate reducing the impact on consultees land.	N	The Applicant considers that the proposed overhead line alignment at Austendike Road is the most suitable option based on the results of environmental and technical surveys and the iterative design process undertaken. The Applicant considered a range of options when designing the Inter-Array Connections, using an iterative process informed by environmental, engineering and land considerations. Further information is provided within **ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution** (Doc Ref. 6.1) and the **Design Approach Document** (Doc Ref 7.3).
		Respondents were concerned about the southern section's impact on the quality of life in the surrounding areas	N	The Applicant notes that **ES Chapter 10: Human Health** (Doc Ref. 6.1) assesses potential effects of the Scheme on the health and wellbeing of local residents. The assessment takes a holistic approach to health and considers a wide range of health determinants which are relevant to quality of life and amenity. The assessment considers elements of the Scheme which could affect mental health (for example, changes in landscape and visual amenity, noise, access to open space and employment) as well as physical health. It is not anticipated that the Scheme would impact quality of life, with no significant effects identified for the general population with the implementation of the mitigation measures committed through the DCO Application.

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
		Respondents questioned why the Applicant had chosen to site the Scheme at such a distance from the connection point, when closer alternatives could have been considered	N	The justification and narrative for the selection of the land parcels for the Solar Development Area are contained within **Appendix D: Site Selection Report** of the **Planning Statement** (Doc Ref 7.1). The Applicant notes that in considering the site selection criteria, it is not considered that there are available alternative sites closer to the proposed location of Weston Marsh substation. The Applicant further notes that the Scheme relies on a connection to the proposed Weston Marsh substation as its point of connection to the National Grid.
		Respondents questioned the reliability of the proposed southern connection corridor, pointing out that its feasibility depends on a future connection to National Grid's Weston Marsh substation	N	
		Respondents felt that the role that pylons and overhead line infrastructure would play in the Scheme were downplayed during the Applicant's consultation period	N	The Applicant presented an indicative alignment for the overhead line within the stage two consultation materials, including consultation information booklet and interactive map on the Scheme website. This included the locations of where the overhead line and pylons could be located within the grid connection corridor. Information about the overhead line and pylons were included within the consultation information booklet, including rationale for the selection of the technology, expected size and dimensions for the pylons, as well as an example image of what a pylon and overhead line could look like.
	Indicative overhead line – northern section Respondents raise significant concerns about the northern section of the indicative line, highlighting potential negative impacts on local amenity, environment and wellbeing, as well as the visual intrusion of pylons. Some call for cables to be placed underground due to the landscape and resilience issues, while others question the site's distance when closer alternatives exist. Additional concerns include uncertainty over the connection corridor, aviation risks and the ability of overhead	Respondent highlighted that were it not for the installation of overhead lines, they would otherwise have been supportive of the Scheme	N	The selection of an overhead line as the preferred technology for the grid connection is guided by national policy contained in the National Policy Statement for Electricity Networks, EN-5, which states that the Government's position that outside of nationally designated landscapes, overhead lines should be the strong starting presumption for electricity networks in general.
		Respondents remained apprehensive about the northern corridor section's detrimental impact on local amenities and quality of life	N	The Applicant notes that **ES Chapter 10: Human Health** (Doc Ref. 6.1) assesses potential effects of the Scheme on the health and wellbeing of local residents. The assessment takes a holistic approach to health and considers a wide range of health determinants which are relevant to quality of life and amenity. The assessment considers elements of the Scheme which could affect mental health (for example, changes in landscape and visual amenity, noise, access to open space and employment) as well as physical health. It is not anticipated that the Scheme would impact quality of life or access to services, with no significant effects identified for the general population with the implementation of the mitigation measures committed through the DCO Application.

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
	lines to withstand future climate conditions.	Respondents consider the 12-13km of 50m pylons as highly intrusive and damaging to the land. They suggest the cables should be placed underground.	N	The selection of an overhead line as the preferred technology for the Grid Connection is guided by national policy contained in the NPS for Electricity Networks EN-5, which states that it is the Government's position that overhead lines should be the starting presumption for electricity networks. Further justification is provided in **ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The potential effects of the Grid Connection Route have been considered in the ES. The Applicant has carefully considered the feedback regarding the proposed underground cabling along the route, the available alternatives, and other relevant considerations. These include our duties and obligations under various legislation encompassing consideration of cost, environment, socio-economic and engineering factors. National Policy Statement (NPS) EN-5 makes clear (paragraph 2.9.20) that the government's position is 'that overhead lines should be the strong starting presumption for electricity networks developments in general, this presumption is reversed when proposed developments will cross part of a nationally designated landscape (i.e. National Parks, The Broads, or National Landscapes'. Where no such designations are present, nor is the area within the setting of such a designated area which may have engaged NPS EN-1 (paragraph 5.10.34) to also consider whether the use of underground cable was justified. Therefore, the starting presumption for the Grid Connection Corridor is an overhead line. In line with the policy in EN-5 (paragraphs 2.9.14 and 2.9.23) we have also considered (i) whether an overhead line in certain locations would likely result in particularly significant landscape and visual impacts (such that due consideration should be given to the costs and benefits of feasible alternatives to the overhead line: paragraph 2.9.14); and (ii) whether there is a high potential for widespread and significant adverse landscape and/or visual impacts (such that the case for undergrounding must be considered in accordance with paragraphs 2.9.24 and 2.9.25). A Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) has been undertaken, which assesses the likely significant landscape and visual effects from the Scheme. Whilst this assessment concludes that the introduction of an overhead line does give rise to significant adverse effects (in environmental impact terms), we do not consider this section in its entirety would meet the thresholds established by paragraphs

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				2.9.14 and 2.9.23 of Policy EN-5. The LVIA is presented in the **ES Chapter: 12 Landscape and Visual** (Doc Ref. 6.1). Therefore, whilst undergrounding the whole of the Grid Connection is not considered appropriate, our proposals do include underground cable where the Grid Connection Corridor must cross and existing 132 kV overhead line. Overhead line conductors and pylons are designed to withstand weather, such as high velocity winds, in accordance with British Standards (BS EN 50341-2-9). The technology used for the proposed assets is used by other overhead lines throughout the UK, which have a proven performance history within the last century. Routine inspections would be carried out on the proposed assets.
		Respondent was concerned about the resilience of overhead cables during periods of high wind velocity	N	The design and construction of the overhead line infrastructure will comply with relevant industry standards and guidance to ensure it is suitable for the range of environmental conditions expected, including periods of high wind. Further details of the grid connection infrastructure are provided in **ES Chapter 2: The Scheme** (Doc Ref. 6.1).
		Respondents questioned why the Scheme is located so far away when closer alternatives could have been considered	N	The Applicant notes that the justification and narrative for the selection of the land parcels for the Solar Development Area is contained within **Appendix D: Site Selection Report** of the **Planning Statement** (Doc Ref. 7.1). The Applicant further notes that in considering the site selection criteria, it is not considered that there are available alternative sites closer to the proposed location of Weston Marsh substation.
		Respondent questions the certainty of the proposed northern connection corridor, noting it is dependent on National Grid's substation connection to Weston Marsh	N	The Scheme is dependent on the Weston Marsh substation as the point of connection to the National Grid. The location of the Weston Marsh substation has now been published by National Grid as part of their targeted consultation for the Grimsby to Walpole project in November 2025.
	Indicative overhead line – mitigation Respondents raise concerns about the safety and visual impact of 50m pylons, with suggestions that undergrounding would be the most effective mitigation. Respondents believed that mitigation was not	Respondents suggested undergrounding the cable corridor as an effective strategy to mitigate flight safety risks to nearby airfields	N	Potential impacts on nearby airfields have been considered throughout the development of the Scheme. The Applicant has also consulted and engaged with airfields close to the Scheme as stated within Section 16.4. of **ES Chapter 16: Other Environmental Topics** (Doc Ref. 6.1).
		Respondents argue that mitigation is not possible due to the intended size of the pylon structures	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 Assessment** (Doc Ref. 6.3),

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
	possible owing to the size of the pylons and associated infrastructure.			with a summary provided within Section 12.8 of **ES Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual** (Doc Ref. 6.1). No mitigation planting is proposed for the overhead lines in the Overhead Inter-Array Connection and the Grid Connection Route. Given the scale and nature of the overhead lines, in combination with the flat and open landscape setting, landscape mitigation in the form of planting would not be effective for this project.
		Respondent suggested mitigation could include the sharing of pylons between applicants or additional screening measures such as increased tree planting in order to avoid greater cumulative impacts relating to other projects in the area	N	Cumulative effects assessment is presented within **ES Appendix 12-7: LVIA Cumulative Effects** (Doc Ref. 6.3) and summarised within Section 12.11 of **ES Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual** (Doc Ref. 6.1). Photomontages reflecting views of the proposed Grid Connection Route within the context of existing infrastructure and proposed cumulative overhead lines have been provided within **ES Figures 12-21 and 12-22** (Doc Ref. 6.2). **ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution** (Doc Ref. 6.1) and the **Design Approach Document** (Doc Ref. 7.3) provide a summary of the alternative designs and alignments considered, and the reasons for the proposed design. As stated in **ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution** (Doc Ref. 6.1) connecting directly to the Grimsby to Walpole overhead line was discontinued as NGET advised that it would not provide for a tee-in connection. No mitigation planting is proposed for the Grid Connection Route. Given the scale and nature of the overhead lines, in combination with the flat and open landscape setting, landscape mitigation in the form of planting would not be effective for this project.
	Widespread opposition to pylons due to design, scale and impacts Respondents raised widespread opposition to pylons, with many respondents objecting due to their design, scale and associated impacts. A number of people expressed a clear preference for underground cabling as an alternative to overhead pylons, while others focused on the visual intrusion and adverse effect pylons would have on the surrounding	Respondents stated a preference for the use of underground cabling instead of overhead pylons	N	The Applicant confirms that the selection of an overhead line as the preferred technology for the Grid Connection is guided by national policy contained in the NPS for Electricity Networks EN-5, which states that it is the Government's position that overhead lines should be the starting presumption for electricity networks. Further justification is provided in **ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The potential effects of the Grid Connection Route on have been considered in the ES.
		Respondents object to pylons, citing concerns about their visual impact and effect on the surrounding landscape	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 Assessment** (Doc Ref. 6.3),

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
	landscape. Concerns were also raised about the potential noise they could generate, alongside fears about possible health risks linked to their installation and operation. Some respondents highlighted the risks pylons may pose to sensitive equipment, which could in turn impact both business operations and personal use. In addition, opposition was voiced to the Applicant's continued reliance on pylon technology, with a preference expressed for developments to be located closer to grid connection points to minimise the need for such infrastructure.			with a summary provided within Section 12.8 of **ES Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The Applicant confirms that the selection of an overhead line as the preferred technology for the Grid Connection is guided by national policy contained in the NPS for Electricity Networks EN-5 which states that it is the Government's position that overhead lines should be the starting presumption for electricity networks. Further justification is provided in **ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution** (Doc Ref. 6.1).
		Respondents objected to pylons, raising concerns about the noise they would generate	N	The Applicant notes that noise generated by the Overhead Line pylons has been assessed in **ES Chapter 13: Noise and Vibration** (Doc Ref. 6.1). During operational phase no likely significant effects as a result of noise have been identified with the implementation of mitigation measures established within the ES.
		Respondents objected to pylons, citing potential health impacts associated with their installation and operation	N	Electric and magnetic fields (EMF) are produced whenever electricity is used or transmitted. Background EMFs are present in most homes, produced from household wiring and electrical appliances. Examples of these are presented in Section 16.3 of **ES Chapter 16: Other Environmental Topics** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The Applicant confirms that EMFs are assessed in **ES Chapter 16: Other Environmental Topics** (Doc Ref. 6.1) and within the **EMF Compliance Assessment** (Doc Ref. 7.8). The **EMF Compliance Assessment** includes an assessment of the potential EMFs from the Scheme against the exposure limits developed by ICNIRP and includes evidence on potential impacts from exposure to radiation. The approach has been agreed with UKHSA following the inclusion of DECC (2012) 'Power Lines: Demonstrating compliance with EMF public exposure guidelines A voluntary Code of Practice' guidance. As set out in Section 16.3 of **ES Chapter 16: Other Environmental Topics** (Doc Ref. 6.1), the UK policy on public exposure limits to EMF radiation is designed to comply with the 1998 International Commission on the Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) guidelines. No significant effects were identified in the EMF assessment, and levels of electromagnetic radiation from the Scheme are predicted to be well below 1998 ICNIRP reference levels at all surrounding locations where public exposure levels are relevant.
		Respondents highlighted the potential risk that pylons pose to sensitive equipment, possibly impacting upon business operations and personal use. It was noted that multiple		It is highly unlikely that pylons pose a risk to sensitive equipment and phone signal which could impact business operation and personal use. This is because phones use high-frequency radio waves whereas power

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
		overhead line corridors in proximity to one another may impact the quality of phone signal for local people		lines use low-frequency waves and therefore do not interfere with each other.
		Respondents voiced opposition to the Applicant's use of pylon technology and reiterated a preference for developments to be sited closer to connection points	N	The Applicant notes that the justification and narrative for the selection of the land parcels for the Solar Development Area is contained within **Appendix D: Site Selection Report** of the **Planning Statement** (Doc Ref. 7.1). In considering the site selection criteria, it is not considered that there are available alternative sites closer to the proposed location of Weston Marsh substation.
	Undergrounding – southern/northern section Respondents found the rationale and justifications for the use of overground pylons to be unconvincing, when they believe underground the cable corridor to be a feasible and less-intrusive alternative.	Respondents communicated a distinct preference for the implementation of underground cabling to reduce any impacts on residential and rural areas	N	The Applicant notes that the selection of an overhead line as the preferred technology for the Grid Connection is guided by national policy contained in the NPS for Electricity Networks EN-5 which states that it is the Government's position that overhead lines should be the starting presumption for electricity networks. Further justification is provided in **ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The potential effects of the Grid Connection Route on have been considered in the ES.
		Respondent noted that while some residents have suggested an underground route, they believe overhead lines are less expensive, less destructive and easier to maintain compared to undergrounding	N	The Applicant notes that the selection of an overhead line as the preferred technology for the Grid Connection is guided by national policy contained in the NPS for Electricity Networks EN-5 which states that it is the Government's position that overhead lines should be the starting presumption for electricity networks. Further justification is provided in ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution (Doc Ref. 6.1).

2.8. Land parcels

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
Land parcels	**Land Parcels A-D** Respondents raised significant concerns about the allocation and suitability of land parcels A-D for solar development. Respondents objected to the use of agricultural land due to risks to food security and increased carbon footprint and specific concerns about land parcel A being sited on a floodplain. Respondents highlighted the scale and placement of solar panels across parcels C and D as unsuitable given local road conditions and proximity to residential areas, with worries about negative impacts on quality of life.	Respondents object to the use of agricultural land for solar PV on land parcels A-D, warning it would risk jeapordising the UK's food security and increasing the national carbon footprint through increasing imports	N	Agricultural Land Classification surveys have been undertaken to identify the grade of the land within the Sites and are reported in **ES Chapter 5: Agriculture and Soils** (Doc Ref. 6.1) which identifies the extent of BMV land and considers the implications for agricultural use. The assessment identifies significant effects from the 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. This is considered to represent a significant adverse effect. In addition, part of the Scheme will involve the creation of hardstanding for associated infrastructure. All structures will be removed at decommissioning, and the land will be restored, but where this infrastructure is located on ALC Grade 1 or Grade 2 land, there is greater uncertainty about whether the land can be returned to its former ALC grade. Therefore, this is also considered to comprise a significant effect. Mitigation is specified within the **OSMP** (Doc Ref. 7.14), submitted with the DCO Application, which provides a comprehensive set of measures across the lifetime of the Scheme for the preservation of the soil resource within the Site. Potential cumulative effects on agricultural land and food security arising from the Scheme in combination with other solar developments in Lincolnshire have also been assessed and are reported in **ES Chapter 5: Agriculture and Soils** (Doc Ref. 6.1) which concludes no significant effects are expected. It is estimated that cumulative solar schemes in Lincolnshire would account for approximately 3% of all agricultural land within Lincolnshire. This is indicative that the solar schemes represent a small proportion of agricultural and BMV land in the County. The temporary and reversible nature of the development, together with continued agricultural use and restoration following decommissioning, ensures that the Scheme would not result in a long-term loss of agricultural productivity or give rise to increased carbon emissions associated with food imports.
		Respondents note that land parcel A is an unsuitable location due it's siting on a floodplain	N	As stated in **ES Chapter 11: Hydrology and Flood Risk** (Doc Ref.6.1), large parts of the land within the Order Limits, including the entirety of Land Parcel A, are within Flood Zone 3, but in an area benefiting from flood defences which provide protection up to the 1 in 1000 year flood

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				event resulting in a low long term flood risk. Substations that sit within the breach extents are bunded with 300mm freeboard provided to ensure they will remain operational in times of flood, therefore it is considered that there are no significant effects with regards to flood risk. in Further information is provided within **ES Appendix 11-3: Flood Risk Assessment** (Doc Ref.6.3) with regards to the mitigation included within the DCO Application for the protection of the Scheme from flood risk and to ensure that no significant off-site flood risk effects occur.
		Respondents emphasised what they believed to be the risks involved in siting land parcels A-D alongside residential areas, highlighting the potential negative effects on overall quality of life	N	The Applicant notes this comment and acknowledges this as a concern for neighbouring residents. Throughout the pre-application stage the Applicant has sought to assess potential effects to neighbouring properties and consult with local residents. The potential impacts and likely significant effects on health and wellbeing have been assessed within **ES Chapter 10: Human Health** (Doc Ref. 6.1) which concludes no significant effects with the implementation of mitigation measures included within the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10), **OOEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.11), **ODEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.12), **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13) and **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16) which are secured via the CEMP, OEMP, DEMP, CTMP and LEMP by Requirements in the **Draft DCO** (Doc Ref. 3.1). Furthermore, the Scheme has specified buffers around residential properties for the siting of infrastructure, as set out within the **Design Parameters** (Doc Ref. 7.4) and **Works Plans** (Doc Ref. 2.3), and would provide landscape screening, as set out within the **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16).
		Respondents commented on the inter-array area between Land Parcels C and D, suggesting it should be routed further north, away from nearby residential clusters, particularly Whaplode Drove. It was suggested that the current proximity between the proposed inter-array area and adjacent residential properties and land is unacceptable and would fragment the ecological landscape and cause long-term harm for residents	Y	Following statutory consultation, the Scheme has adopted the northern corridor for the Overhead Inter-Array Connection, which is further from residential properties compared to the southern option presented within statutory consultation materials. Further information on the alternatives considered and design evolution is provided within **ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution** (Doc Ref. 6.1). An assessment of potential impacts and likely significant effects associated with the selected Overhead Inter-Array Connection route is presented within the **Environmental Statement** (Doc Ref. 6.1). No significant effects from the Overhead Inter-Array Connection are considered likely, considering the small scale of works proposed.
		Respondent requested that the inter-array connection route be moved as far away as possible from their property and associated land along Dog Drove. It was noted that the	Y	Engagement with the respondent was undertaken during the stage two consultation, during which the concerns raised were discussed. Following consultation, the inter-array connection route was reviewed

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
		avoidance of their property would help to mitigate potential impacts of the Scheme on their quality of life and everyday activities		and refined. As a result, the proposed Scheme boundary has been amended and the inter-array connection route reduced so that it is now located to the south of the property.
		Respondent who overlooks parcel C near the scheduled monument, welcomed the buffer space this creates between their property and the PV area	N	The Applicant welcomes this comment.
		Respondents felt too much land is allocated to land parcels C and D, raising concern that its scale and proposed location is unsuitable given the poor quality of access routes required for the construction phase.	N	There is an urgent need to deploy large scale renewable energy projects in accordance with NPS EN-1[Error! Bookmark not defined.]. A smaller solar generation development would not deliver the same level of benefits associated with the Scheme in terms of electricity generation, energy security or climate change benefits. Furthermore, it is noted that the Scheme design with Land Parcels C and D includes large areas of habitat management. The Applicant has completed vehicle tracking and an access appraisal to identify suitable construction traffic routes and accesses to these land parcels. The proposed construction traffic routes and accesses are further set out within the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13).
	General/unspecified land parcel comments Respondents expressed opposition to the overall solar layout, with concerns that the irregular parcels and inter-array areas are at logger-heads with the local environment and represent an erosion of the region's identity. Respondents objected to solar PV being placed on high-quality agricultural land, citing risks to national food production and significant change to the surrounding landscape.	Respondents expressed support for renewable energy but stressed that solar PV should be located offshore or in remote areas to minimise disruption to people and wildlife	N	The Applicant has undertaken a three stage approach to site selection for the solar PV development areas. These include: Stage one: Identifying the opportunity area; Stage two: Consideration of constraints and opportunities; and Stage three: solar PV development area site selection. The location of the selected land parcels are considered suitable for a number of reasons, including good transport access for construction, being located close to the A16; there are limited sensitive receptors across the site, such as residential properties, and we believe effects could be mitigated; it is not located within or close to National Landscapes, National Parks or Green Belt; it is not located within internationally or nationally designated biodiversity sites, and more. Further details about the site selection process can be found in **Appendix D: Site Selection Report** of the **Planning Statement** (Doc Ref. 7.1) and **ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution** (Doc Ref 6.1). The potential impact and likely significant effects of the Scheme on people have been assessed within the ES which includes **ES Chapter 10: Human Health** (Doc Ref. 6.1).No significant effects are considered likely with the implementation of mitigation measures established through the management plans of the DCO Application. The potential impact and likely significant effects on wildlife have been assessed within **ES**

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				Chapter 9: Ecology and Biodiversity (Doc Ref. 6.1) which concludes no significant effects are expected with the implementation of mitigation measures established through the management plans of the DCO Application. It is therefore considered that the location of the Scheme is acceptable. Mitigation measures are included within the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10), **OOEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.11), **ODEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.12), **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13) and **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16) which are secured by the CEMP, OEMP, DEMP, CTMP and LEMP by Requirements in the **Draft DCO** (Doc Ref. 3.1).
		Respondents object to the proposed solar layout in its entirety, noting it spans irregular parcels and inter-array areas would be out of character with the environment and a fundamental erosion of the region's identity	N	The potential impact and likely significant effects of the Scheme (including irregular parcels and inter-array areas) on landscape and visual amenity has been assessed within **ES Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual** (Doc Ref. 6.1). Whilst the assessment concludes significant effects, mitigation has been included to reduce impacts where practicable such as careful siting of infrastructure including PV panels and BESS, conserving existing vegetation patterns, and the inclusion of species rich grassland, new trees and shrubs which considers the character of the local areas whilst providing screening as detailed within the **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16).
		Respondents warned of the potential consequences of solar PV being located on high-quality agricultural land. They argued it sacrifices food production, sets a dangerous precedent for future developments and permanently alters the landscape	N	Agricultural Land Classification surveys have been undertaken to identify the grade of the land within the Sites and are reported in **ES Chapter 5: Agriculture and Soils** (Doc Ref. 6.1) which identifies the extent of BMV land and considers the implications for agricultural use. The assessment concludes significant effects are expected from the 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. This is considered to represent a significant adverse effect. In addition, part of the Scheme will involve the creation of hardstanding for associated infrastructure. All structures will be removed at decommissioning, and the land will be restored, but where this infrastructure is located on ALC Grade 1 or Grade 2 land, there is greater uncertainty about whether the land can be returned to its former ALC grade. Therefore, this is also considered to comprise a significant effect. Mitigation is specified within the **OSMP** (Doc Ref. 7.14), submitted with the DCO Application, which provides a comprehensive set of measures across the lifetime of the Scheme for the preservation of the soil resource within the Site.

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				Potential cumulative effects on agricultural land and food security arising from the Scheme in combination with other solar developments in Lincolnshire have also been assessed and are reported in **ES Chapter 5: Agriculture and Soils** (Doc Ref. 6.1) which concludes no significant effects are expected. It is estimated that cumulative solar schemes in Lincolnshire would account for approximately 3% of all agricultural land within Lincolnshire. This is indicative that the solar schemes represent a small proportion of agricultural and BMV land in the County. The temporary and reversible nature of the development, together with continued agricultural use and restoration following decommissioning, ensures that the Scheme would not result in a long-term loss of agricultural productivity or give rise to increased carbon emissions associated with food imports.
		Respondents argued that because the scheme consists of separate significant land parcels, it should have been dealt with as separate applications at a local, rather than national level	N	The Scheme meets the definition of a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project under the Planning Act 2008 and is therefore required to be consented by way of a Development Consent Order determined by the Secretary of State for Energy Security and Net Zero. The fact that the Scheme comprises a number of land parcels does not alter its classification, as the Planning Act regime applies to the generating station and associated infrastructure as a single project, rather than to individual parcels of land. Accordingly, it is not appropriate for the Scheme to be progressed as separate local planning applications.
		Respondents suggested the Applicant should consolidate all solar PV and accompanying infrastructure in one area rather than split across a main busy road	N	As set out in **ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution** (Doc Ref. 6.1) and **Appendix D: Site Selection** of the **Planning Statement** (Doc Ref. 7.1) a consolidated layout was not considered feasible due to the deliverability and availability of large land holdings for development. The four principal development areas where solar panels and BESS would be located comprises an area of 1,100 hectares (ha) (2,700 acres) of predominantly agricultural land. Approximately 55% of that is being considered for the solar PV panels and associated infrastructure (600 ha or 1,482 acres). We expect the remainder of the site would not contain solar panels or other infrastructure. This land will be set aside for a range of uses, including to provide leave land close to local properties and sensitive locations, to allow for planting and biodiversity enhancements, and to retain specific areas of high value agricultural land.

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
		Respondent supports the scheme, stating it is well-sited across four land parcels and has been thoughtfully designed to avoid key heritage sites and sensitive areas	N	The Applicant notes this comment.
	Indicative planting proposals, vegetation and mitigation Respondents questioned the effectiveness of proposed mitigation, noting concerns about animal grazing, the visibility of panels despite the implementation of environmental mitigation and believed that proposed biodiversity plans not genuine.	Respondents remained concerned that proposed mitigation through animal grazing is unsuitable, as the land has never been used for grazing; therefore, not representing an effective mitigation measure	N	The Applicant acknowledges that the Site consists of predominantly arable land, with some grazing. As set out in **ES Chapter 14: Socio-Economics and Land Use** (Doc Ref. 6.1) some limited agricultural use, including sheep grazing, may be possible within the Solar Development Areas during operation. The assessment undertaken in **Chapter 14: Socio-Economics and Land Use** (Doc Ref. 6.1) has assumed, on a precautionary basis, that land will not be available for agricultural use until after decommissioning of the Scheme. No significant residual effects were identified as a result of disruption to farm holdings and agricultural production, as the Scheme will provide a diversification of income for existing agricultural businesses. **ES Chapter 5: Agriculture and Soils** (Doc Ref 6.1) identifies sheep grazing as a potential mitigation option to address the long-term restriction on agricultural use. This option will be explored with landowners in areas where suitable grass species are established beneath and between solar arrays. Where grazing is not practicable in some or all areas of the Solar Development Areas, grassland will instead be managed through mechanical maintenance to ensure appropriate land management is maintained for the lifetime of the Scheme..
		Respondents were concerned that while planting may help obscure some panels, taller models and overhead lines linking parcels will remain highly visible due to the flat landscape and cannot be screened by vegetation	N	The Applicant recognises that elements of the Scheme, including taller infrastructure and overhead lines, would remain visible in parts of the landscape, particularly given the flat topography of the Site. In this context, the design and routing of overhead lines has been informed by the Holford Rules, which provide established guidance to minimise adverse landscape and visual effects through careful route selection, alignment and siting of overhead line infrastructure. 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 Assessment** (Doc Ref. 6.3), with a summary provided within Section 12.8 of **ES Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual** (Doc Ref. 6.1).
		Respondents criticised the Applicant on the basis that biodiversity meadows are limited to one area, appearing to be a token gesture rather than meaningful mitigation	N	The Applicant does not agree that the biodiversity proposals represent a token or limited form of mitigation. As part of the landscape design for the Scheme, new habitats would be provided to increase biodiversity compared to the existing baseline.

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				As part of the landscape and ecology planting proposals, large areas of land within and around the Solar Development Areas would be managed as semi-natural habitat. 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 designated habitat management areas, distributed across the Site,where no physical infrastructure is proposed. These areas are integral to the Scheme's layout and design. Of this, over 150ha have been specifically set aside for the enhancement of habitats for farmland birds, such as skylark. The creation, management, and long-term maintenance of these habitats is detailed within the **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16) which sets out clear objectives, management prescriptions and monitoring requirements to ensure that biodiversity mitigation and enhancement measures are delivered and maintained for the lifetime of the Scheme.
		Respondent suggested that some of the proposed mitigation planting appeared to be sited on their land which is adjacent to Land Parcel D. They felt that this suggestion is misleading	N	The plans submitted with the application including the **Works Plans** (Doc Ref. 2.3) and the Landscape Masterplan included within the **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16) confirm that all mitigation planting is located within the Order Limits. The Applicant acknowledges that the presentation of some figures at PEIR stage may have led to misunderstanding, however mitigation planting is not intended to extend beyond the Order Limits.

2.9. Land use and agriculture

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
Land Use and Agriculture	**Food Security** Respondents communicated their concern that by siting the Scheme on what they believed to be fertile, arable agricultural land, the Applicant was significantly undermining the UK's food security, prioritising energy security instead. Consequently, respondents linked a reduction in food security to a potential increase in reliance on foreign food imports, a phenomenon that would damage the UK's ability to be self-sustainable, a scenario that some respondents highlighted to be detrimental in light of an increasing national population. Respondents pointed to said food imports increasing the UK's carbon footprint, an act that would render any benefits from the Scheme null and void.	Respondents commented that the Applicant was damaging the UK's food security by siting the Scheme on what they labelled as fertile, agricultural land, in a region recognised for leading the production of the UK's domestic food supply	N	Agricultural Land Classification surveys have been undertaken to identify the grade of the land within the Sites and are reported in **ES Chapter 5: Agriculture and Soils** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The Applicant notes that the independent National Food Strategy Review concludes that solar farms do not present a risk to the UK's food security. Solar developments represent a reversible, time-limited use of land and can support the long-term resilience of farm businesses by enabling diversification. **ES Chapter 14: Socio-Economics and Land Use** (Doc Ref. 6.1) includes an assessment of agricultural land holdings which concludes that the Scheme results in minor beneficial effect on agricultural land holdings within the Solar Development Area, due to the diversification of income to existing agricultural businesses that the Scheme would provide.
		Respondents stated that the Applicant's use of arable land would lead to the UK relying on imports and lowering self-sustainability	N	The Applicant notes that the independent National Food Strategy Review concludes that solar farms do not in any way present a risk to the UK's food security. Solar developments represent a reversible, time-limited use of land and can support the long-term resilience of farm businesses by enabling diversification. **ES Chapter 14: Socio-Economics and Land Use** (Doc Ref. 6.1) includes an assessment of agricultural land holdings which concludes that the Scheme results in minor beneficial effect on agricultural land holdings within the Solar Development Area, due to the diversification of income to existing agricultural businesses that the Scheme would provide. . Currently solar farms occupy less than 0.1% of the UK's land. To meet the government's net zero targets, solar farms would account for approximately 0.4 - 0.6% of UK land.
		Respondents highlighted that relying on foreign imports for food would ultimately increase the UK's carbon footprint and global emissions	N	**ES Chapter 7: Climate Change** (Doc Ref. 6.1) concludes that the overall GHG impact of the Scheme is beneficial and significant, as it will play a part in achieving the rate of transition towards net zero. The carbon saving realised by the operation of the Scheme, as detailed in the GHG impact assessment within Section 7.8 of **Chapter 7: Climate Change** (Doc Ref. 6.1), is likely to significantly outweigh any increase in food transportation emissions (were a material increase to occur as a result of the Scheme, which the Applicant does not consider it will), especially with a view to the decarbonising of the transport sector.

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				While any potential increase to food transportation emissions have not specifically been quantified within the GHG impact assessment of the Scheme, it is considered the impact will be minimal and not significant. It should also be noted that combinable crops are unlikely to be marketed and consumed within a local area or even a region of England. The UK both imports and exports wheat in most years. There is therefore likely to be no discernible effect of the proposed solar farm on food miles of arable crops. For such an effect to occur grain would need to be processed at a local mill for sale in local outlets, where any tonnage concerned would be marginal.
		Respondents asserted that in the face of a growing national population, they believe it would be unwise to sacrifice arable land	N	The Applicant notes that the independent National Food Strategy Review concludes that solar farms do not in any way present a risk to the UK's food security. Solar developments represent a reversible, time-limited use of land and can support the long-term resilience of farm businesses by enabling diversification. **ES Chapter 14: Socio-Economics and Land Use** (Doc Ref. 6.1) includes an assessment of agricultural land holdings which concludes that the Scheme results in minor beneficial effect on agricultural land holdings within the Solar Development Area, due to the diversification of income to existing agricultural businesses that the Scheme would provide. Currently solar farms occupy less than 0.1% of the UK's land. To meet the government's net zero targets, solar farms would account for approximately 0.4 - 0.6% of UK land.
	Agricultural land use Respondents were highly critical of the Applicant for proposing a potential site that involved a high degree of Best and Most Valuable Land (BMV). Respondents believed that a loss of BMV land to such a degree would weaken the UK's food production capacity. Respondents were sceptical that the Applicant had considered other alternative sites, outside of BMV and productive agricultural land, as potentially suitable for the Scheme before determining on it's current siting. Respondents challenged	Respondents scrutinised the Applicant for siting the Scheme on what they believed to be prime agricultural land	N	The Applicant has undertaken a three stage approach to site selection for the solar PV development areas. These include: Stage one: Identifying the opportunity area; Stage two: Consideration of constraints and opportunities; and Stage three: solar PV development area site selection. Further details about the site selection process, including the consideration of reasonable alternatives, can be found in **ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution** (Doc Ref 6.1) and **Appendix D: Site Selection Report** of the **Planning Statement** (Doc Ref. 7.1). The results of ALC surveys are reported in **ES Chapter 5: Agriculture and Soils** (Doc Ref. 6.1). 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. The **OSMP** (Doc Ref. 7.14), outlines a comprehensive set of measures

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
	whether the siting of the Scheme on agricultural land was justified, owing to what they believed to be the inefficient nature of solar PV installations. Respondents pointed to Lincolnshire's large agricultural sector and agrarian economy as being potentially negatively impacted through sector job losses were the Applicant to receive development consent.			across the lifetime of the Scheme for the preservation of the soil resource within the Order Limits, avoiding both the loss of soil material from the Order Limits and the loss of soil functional capacity for soil retained within the Order Limits.
		Respondents stated that the Scheme would contribute to a negative effect on the UK's food production.	N	The Applicant notes that independent National Food Strategy Review concludes that solar farms do not in any way present a risk to the UK's food security. The Scheme would allow agricultural activities to continue as solar farms help farmers to diversify and improve their agricultural operations. Solar farms can still be used for grazing and support UK farmers to continue food production on other parts of their land. Currently solar farms occupy less than 0.1% of the UK's land. To meet the government's net zero targets, solar farms would account for approximately 0.4 - 0.6% of UK land.
		Respondents insisted that the installation of solar panels on farmland was an inefficient solution to climate change	N	The government has set legally binding targets to achieve net zero carbon emissions, while maintaining a secure, reliable, and affordable energy supply. Decarbonisation is a legal requirement and a matter of national importance. As established in the National Policy Statement for Energy (NPS EN-1), there is an urgent demonstrated need and critical national priority for low carbon and renewable energy infrastructure, which includes solar development at a national scale. The government's Clean Power 2030 Action Plan highlights the importance of achieving 45-47 GW of solar power by 2030 to reduce carbon emissions and the dependence on imported energy. The Scheme has the potential to accelerate the UK's transition to net zero and make a significant contribution towards achieving the government's targets, while also increasing national energy security at a time of both rising energy bills and the increasing urgency to tackle the climate emergency. **ES Chapter 7: Climate Change** (Doc Ref. 6.1) also notes that Scheme would result in a beneficial and significant greenhouse gas effect, as the renewable electricity generated would outweigh the emissions associated with construction and contribute to the displacement of fossil fuel-derived electricity. The Scheme would therefore play a meaningful role in accelerating the transition to net zero.

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
		Respondents asserted that the installation of solar on agricultural land would lead to job losses in the agricultural sector	N	The Applicant notes that a full assessment of the socio-economic impact of the Scheme is presented in **ES Chapter 14: Socio-Economics and Land Use** (Doc Ref. 6.1). There are no agricultural jobs expected to be lost as a result of the Scheme, as the land within the Solar Development Area land parcels is not cultivated by tenant farmers. Owner-occupied landholdings are expected to be able to continue in agricultural practice where they have other land still available for agricultural uses whilst also being supported by the ground rent from the solar development on land they own. As such, the Scheme will provide a diversification of income for owner-occupier landowners. Within the Grid Connection Route and the Inter-Array Connections, the Scheme would have a minimal impact on the area of land farmed and therefore is not likely to result in a loss of agricultural jobs.
		Respondents disputed whether the Applicant had considered other suitable locations other than farmland	N	The Applicant has undertaken a three stage approach to site selection for the solar PV development areas. These include: Stage one: Identifying the opportunity area; Stage two: Consideration of constraints and opportunities; and Stage three: solar PV development area site selection. In doing so, the Applicant considered a wide range of factors when identifying suitable locations, including grid connection feasibility, environmental constraints, proximity to sensitive receptors, access for construction, and policy considerations. The location of the selected land parcels are considered suitable for a number of reasons, including good access to the strategic road network, being located close to the A16; the ability to mitigate effects on nearby properties, and the absence of nationally designated landscapes, green belt land, or internationally and nationally designated biodiversity sites. National planning policy recognises that utility-scale solar development will, in many cases, be located on agricultural land due to the scale of land required and the need to be close to suitable grid infrastructure. The Applicant therefore considers that reasonable alternatives to the selected Site were appropriately assessed and that the chosen location represents a suitable and balanced option in planning and environmental terms. Further details about the site selection process, including the consideration of reasonable alternatives, can be found in **ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution** (Doc Ref 6.1) and **Appendix D: Site Selection Report** of the **Planning Statement** (Doc Ref. 7.1).

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
		Respondent claimed that the negative frequencies of the pylons and OHL technology sited on farmland would ruin the fertility of what they deemed to be prime, arable land	N	Research suggests that electric and magnetic fields from overhead lines are not considered to have significant effects on soil fertility[1].

[1] Pawełek, A., Owusu, S.A., Cecchetti, D. *et al.* What evidence exists of crop plants response to exposure to static magnetic and electromagnetic fields? A systematic map protocol. *Environ Evid* **11**, 37 (2022). https://doi.org/10.1186/s13750-022-00292-w

2.10. Landscape and visual impact

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
Landscape and Visual Impact	**Landscape and visual impact of the overhead line and pylons** Many respondents raised concerns about the visual impact of the overhead line and pylons on the character and experience of the rural landscape. Respondents expressed concerns about the height and design of the pylons and the number required. Several respondents suggested that the visual impact of the grid connection corridor would be mitigated if the route was placed underground.	Respondents felt that the proposed use of an overhead line with pylons would disrupt the visual aesthetic, character and experience of the landscape. Many suggested that these elements of the grid connection corridor would become a visual eyesore which would compromise the open skies of the Fens	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 Assessment** (Doc Ref. 6.3), with a summary provided within Section 12.8 of **ES Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual** (Doc Ref .6.1). The assessments were based on visualisations contained within **ES Figures 12-21 and 12-22 (**Doc Ref 6.2) which provide a realistic representation of the scale, form and visibility of the overhead line infrastructure within the existing landscape.
		Respondents suggested that the proposed 50 metre height for pylons was too high and would contribute to the loss of visual amenity Some respondents requested that the Applicant reviewed the needs case for 50 metre pylons, and consider alternatives, including the use of 30 metre pylons	N	The Applicant notes this comment and confirms that 50m is the standard for a suspension pylon. The height of a pylon varies based on many factors such as topography, span length, crossings and constraints beneath the span, ensuring statutory clearances are met as per ENA/43-8. Some pylons will be shorter in height and some pylons larger in height.
		Respondents criticised the length of the grid connection corridor, and noted that more overhead cabling and pylons would be required, exacerbating the visual impact. Respondents questioned why the Scheme had not been proposed at a location much closer to the Weston Marsh substation	N	The Applicant has undertaken a three stage approach to site selection for the solar PV development areas. These include: Stage one: Identifying the opportunity area; Stage two: Consideration of constraints and opportunities; and Stage three: solar PV development area site selection. This process, including the consideration of reasonable alternatives, is described in detail in **ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution** (Doc Ref 6.1) and **Appendix D: Site Selection Report** of the **Planning Statement** (Doc Ref. 7.1). The location of the selected land parcels are considered suitable for a number of reasons, including good access to the strategic road network, being located close to the A16, the ability to mitigate effects on nearby properties, the absence of nationally designated landscapes, green belt land, or internationally and nationally designated biodiversity sites, there is availability of land through willing landowners, and more. The landscape and visual effects associated with the Grid Connection Corridor, including the length of overhead line infrastructure, have been assessed in detail within **ES Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual** (Doc Ref. 6.1) and the associated technical appendices. The Environmental Statement concludes that, while some visual effects would occur, these

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				have been carefully assessed and are considered acceptable in the context of the Scheme's national need and policy support.
		Respondents paired their concerns for the visual impact of the grid connection corridor with suggestions for the route to be placed underground. Respondents felt that this would mitigate the visual impact associated with the overhead line and pylon network	N	The selection of an overhead line as the preferred technology for the grid connection is guided by national policy contained in the National Policy Statement for Electricity Networks, EN-5, which states that the Government's position that outside of nationally designated landscapes, overhead lines should be the strong starting presumption for electricity networks in general unless these would give rise to particularly significant landscape and visual effects. The potential landscape and visual effects of the proposed overhead line infrastructure have been assessed in detail within **ES Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual** (Doc Ref. 6.1) and the associated technical appendices. This assessment considers the character and sensitivity of the receiving landscape, and informs the conclusions on the significance of effects. The Applicant has therefore adopted an approach that is consistent with national policy, taking into account the balance between visual effects, technical feasibility, environmental considerations and the urgent national need to deliver new electricity network infrastructure to support decarbonisation and energy security.
		Respondent raised concerns about the cumulative visual impact of the Scheme's grid connection corridor and the proposed Grimsby to Walpole overhead line	N	A cumulative effects assessment is presented within **ES Appendix 12-7: LVIA Cumulative Effects** (Doc Ref. 6.3) and summarised within Section 12.11 of **ES Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual** (Doc Ref. 6.1) which includes consideration of the proposed Grimsby to Walpole overhead line. Photomontages reflecting views of the proposed Grid Connection Route within the context of existing infrastructure and proposed cumulative overhead lines (including the Grimsby to Walpole overhead line) have been provided within **ES Figures 12-21 and 12-22** (Doc Ref. 6.2).
		Respondent raised concerns about the potential visual impact and obstacle of any pylons placed near to Crowland Airfield	N	As stated within **ES Chapter 16: Other Environmental Topics** (Doc Ref. 6.1), the Applicant has consulted with Crowland Airfield. Following this engagement, solar panels were removed from the Scheme at the runway thresholds and the Inter-Array Connection between Land Parcels A and B was undergrounded to address aviation safety considerations. No concerns were raised by Crowland Airfield in terms of the Grid Connection Route pylons.
		Respondents raised concerns about the potential for glint and glare from the solar PV panels. Respondents felt that any glare generated by the solar PV panels would be a	N	The Applicant notes that a Glint and Glare assessment is presented in **ES Chapter 16: Other Environmental Topics** (Doc Ref. 6.1), which considers the impact of the Scheme on receptors, including residential,

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
	Landscape and visual impact of the solar PV panels and inter-array areas Respondents raised concerns about the potential landscape and visual impacts of the land parcels and inter-array areas. Many felt that these elements of the Scheme would be an eyesore on the rural landscape and a visual intrusion for residents. Some respondents felt that any glint and glare generated by the solar PV panels would exacerbate the negative visual impacts for local wildlife, residents and visitors to the area.	significant visual intrusion for both local wildlife and communities. Some raised concerns about the impact of glint and glare on the safety of aviation and air activities, road users, and pedestrians		road, bridleway, and aviation. The assessment takes into account the orientation, height and surface characteristics of the solar PV panels, which are specifically designed to absorb light rather than reflect it. The assessment concludes no significant glint and glare effects on the basis of the design parameters fixed by the **Works Plans** (Doc Ref. 2.3) and the **Design Parameters** (Doc Ref. 7.4).
		Respondents felt solar PV panels are unsightly and would become a significant and unavoidable eyesore on the rural landscape. Many felt that the installation of solar PV panels would permanently alter the visual heritage and character of the Fens Respondents noted that the raised height of the panels would further exacerbate their visual impact	N	Potential impacts and likely significant effects on landscape character and visual amenity are assessed within **ES Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual** (Doc Ref. 6.1) with mitigation embedded into the design of the Scheme. The LVIA and the landscape design presented within the **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16) have considered the character, sensitivity and distinctiveness of the local area. The proposed mitigation measures including planting, habitat management areas and careful siting of infrastructure, have been designed to reduce visual effects over time and to respond to the local landscape context. The **Design Approach Document** (Doc Ref. 7.3) demonstrates how the principles of 'good design' have been applied to the Scheme, including the layout, height and orientation of the solar PV panels with the aim of minimising visual intrusion while maintaining technical viability. The height of the panels has been considered as part of the design process and has been assessed within the landscape assessment presented in **ES Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual** (Doc Ref. 6.1). In addition, **ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution** (Doc Ref. 6.1) also provides further information on the alternative options considered and explains how alternative layouts and design options were considered and refined in response to environmental constraints and consultation feedback.
		Respondents raised concerns about the impact of solar PV panels, inter-array areas and associated infrastructure on the views and visual amenity of residential properties. The houses located along Queens Bank, Langary Gate Road, and Martins Road were referenced as a particular area of concern	N	The Scheme design has been developed to avoid significant effects on the residential visual amenity of individual properties (including along Queens Bank, Langary Gate Road and Martins Road) where practicable through layout design, separation distances and embedded mitigation. The landscape and visual impact of the Scheme has been assessed within **ES Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The Applicant notes that the assessment considers the sensitivity of residential receptors, the scale and height of the solar PV panels, inter-array areas and associated infrastructure, and the nature of existing view.

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				Mitigation planting proposals are presented within the **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16). Scattered shrub and tree planting is proposed along field boundaries to provide screening for the Solar Development Areas.
		Respondent raised concerns about the visual impact of the solar PV panels to Shepeau Stow village, which houses a school and several buildings of historical significance	N	As stated within **ES Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual** (Doc Ref. 6.1) the ZTV indicates no view of the Scheme would be possible from Shepeau Stow village with the exception of receptors on the northern edge. The impact of the Scheme on cultural heritage has been assessed within **ES Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage** (Doc Ref. 6.1). Mitigation measures to reduce visual effects set are presented within the **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16). These include offsets of solar PV panels from properties, the retention of existing vegetation where possible and scattered shrub and tree planting along field boundaries to provide screening for the Solar Development Areas over time.
		Respondents raised concerns about the impact of Land Parcel B and C on the views from Moulton Chapel and its parish. It was noted that the view has been protected from change for many decades, and is valued by local residents	N	**ES Appendix 8-4: Summary of Heritage Setting Assessment** (Doc Ref. 6.3) presents the assessment of effects on the Moulton Conservation Area, with reference to viewpoints 26 and B on **ES Figure 12-21** (Doc Ref. 6.2). The assessment concludes that there would be no significant effects due to distance and limited visibility of the Scheme.
	Landscape and visual general comments Respondents frequently raised concerns about the overall landscape and visual impact of the Scheme. Many felt that the Scheme would 'industrialise' an area valued for its open and rural expanses. It was noted that a reduction in visual amenity would have significant negative impacts on the quality of life and wellbeing of local residents, business owners and tourists. Some suggested that further evidence of assessment and mitigation was required from the Applicant.	Respondents raised general concerns about the visual impact of the Scheme on the landscape. Respondents felt that the Scheme would 'industrialise', and permanently alter the unique character and heritage of the 'open skies' Fens landscape. It was noted that local residents and communities would be the most impacted by the visual changes	N	The concerns regarding the visual impact of the Scheme on the landscape are acknowledged, however the Scheme is considered to be temporary in nature, because the operational life of the Scheme will be a maximum of 40 years after which time it will be decommissioned in accordance with the **Draft DCO** (Doc Ref. 3.1). The Scheme design has evolved to take into account the proximity of receptors and to reduce the perceived industrialisation of the area. The LVIA and landscape design presented within the **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16) have considered the character and distinctiveness of the local area. The **Design Approach Document** (Doc Ref. 7.3) demonstrates how the principles of 'good design' have been applied to the Scheme, including the layout, height and orientation of the solar PV panels with the aim of minimising visual intrusion while maintaining technical viability. The height of the panels has been considered as part of the design process and has been assessed within the landscape assessment presented in **ES Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The Applicant has sought to mitigate landscape and visual impacts through screening with bands of native scattered trees and shrubs throughout the Solar Development Area. The **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16)

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				and its accompanying Outline Landscape Masterplan set out the planting proposals for the Scheme. **ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution** (Doc Ref. 6.1) also provides further information on the alternative options considered.
		Respondents emphasised the importance of the visual landscape and amenity for local businesses, tourism, and recreational activities. Respondents felt that the Scheme would threaten the aesthetic value and enjoyment of the landscape	N	The Applicant notes that the landscape and visual impact of the Scheme has been assessed within **ES Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual** (Doc Ref. 6.1). In terms of the impact of the Scheme on tourism this has been assessed within **ES Chapter 14: Socio-economics and Land Use** (Doc Ref. 6.1) which concludes no significant effects on the tourism sector.
		Respondents noted the importance of the rural visual landscape for supporting mental health and well-being. Concern was raised about the cumulative impact visual changes may have on local quality of life	N	**ES Chapter 10: Human Health** (Doc Ref 6.1) assesses potential effects of the Scheme on the health and wellbeing of local residents. The assessment takes a holistic approach to health and considers a wide range of health determinants which are relevant to quality of life and amenity. The assessment considers elements of the Scheme which could affect mental health (for example, changes in landscape and visual amenity, noise, access to open space and employment) as well as physical health. It is acknowledged that negative impacts on landscape and visual amenity have the potential to reduce resident's enjoyment of their environment, in particular their perception of tranquillity and rurality, impacting mental health. The ES assesses potential impacts on mental health and wellbeing across all project phases, including operation. This includes consideration of the visual impacts outlined in **ES Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual** (Doc Ref 6.1) which concludes the likely effect on health arising from landscape and visual effects during the lifetime of the Scheme is assessed to be minor adverse (not significant).
		Respondent raised concerns about the potential light pollution emitted from the Scheme, including from any security infrastructure	N	It is anticipated that temporary lighting will be used during the construction and decommissioning stages, as described within **ES Chapter 2: The Scheme** (Doc Ref. 6.1). During the operational phase, no permanently turned on lighting is proposed, but security lighting would be sensor triggered, located only around critical electrical infrastructure for security. The assessment presented within Section 12.8 of **Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual** (Doc Ref. 6.1) considers effects from lighting. Good practice measures to minimise the effects of light pollution are included within the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10), **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16) and **ODEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.12). Compliance with these measures is secured through the requirements of the **Draft DCO** (Doc Ref. 3.1). The effects of light pollution on heritage and ecological receptors are

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				considered within **ES Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage** (Doc Ref. 6.1) and **ES Chapter 9: Ecology and Biodiversity** (Doc Ref. 6.1) respectively.
		Respondents felt that the landscape and visual assessments conducted as part of the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) did not acknowledge the full scale of the visual impact on the local area Respondents did not feel confident that proposed mitigation would be sufficient enough to reduce the impact on key receptors and viewpoints Further assessment and submission of evidence, particularly from a wider range of viewpoints, was encouraged	N	The assessment presented at PEIR was based on the Scheme design and information available at that stage . The Landscape and Visual assessment has since been updated and is presented in **ES Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual** (Doc Ref 6.1). The updated assessments reflect design evolution, additional assessment work and further consideration of effects on key receptors and viewpoints.

2.11. National Grid connection

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
National Grid Connection	**Western Marsh Substation** Respondents thought that the applicant prioritised the substation placement and grid connection over the quality of land. Respondents were concerned about overhead lines and pylons and thought that the applicant should use underground cabling to the substation. Respondents were concerned about the uncertainty of Weston Marsh substation.	Respondents were concerned about the distance between the Weston Marsh substation and solar PV area	N	The Applicant notes that the justification and narrative for the selection of the land parcels for the Solar Development Area is contained within **Appendix D: Site Selection Report** of the **Planning Statement** (Doc Ref. 7.1). In considering the site selection criteria, it is not considered that there are available alternative sites closer to the proposed location of Weston Marsh substation.
		One respondent suggested that the Applicant should work with National Grid to minimise the need for an additional overhead line route and instead use existing or forthcoming routes to connect the Scheme to the national grid	N	The concern regarding the development of multiple overhead line projects is acknowledged. This has been assessed within the cumulative effects section of each technical chapter of the **Environmental Statement** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The Applicant is continuing to engage with NGET regarding the Grimsby to Walpole and Weston Marsh to East Leicestershire OHLs to limit impacts where practicable.
		Respondents thought that moving the substation closer to the solar PV area would reduce the need for overhead line grid connection	N	The Applicant notes that the Weston Marsh siting area has been determined by National Grid through the development of the Grimsby to Walpole project. The justification and narrative for the selection of the land parcels for the Solar Development Area is contained within **Appendix D: Site Selection Report** of the **Planning Statement** (Doc Ref. 7.1). In considering the site selection criteria, it is not considered that there are available alternative sites closer to the proposed location of Weston Marsh substation.
		Respondent suggested that connecting at Weston Marsh substation is a driver for the Applicant's approach	N	The availability of a connection at Weston Marsh substation and the network's capacity to connect the Scheme are key drivers for its location. Further details are contained within **Appendix D: Site Selection Report** of the **Planning Statement** (Doc Ref. 7.1)
		Respondents thought that in the site selection process, the applicant prioritised connecting to Western Marsh substation over land quality	N	The availability of a connection at Weston Marsh substation and the network's capacity to connect the Scheme are key drivers for its location. Further details are contained within **Appendix D: Site Selection Report** of the **Planning Statement** (Doc Ref. 7.1). Agricultural Land

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				Classification was also a consideration through the site selection process.
		Respondents thought that in the site selection process, the applicant prioritised connecting to the National Grid over land quality	N	The availability of a connection at Weston Marsh substation and the network's capacity to connect the Scheme are key drivers for its location. Further details are contained within **Appendix D: Site Selection Report** of the **Planning Statement** (Doc Ref. 7.1). Agricultural Land Classification was also a consideration through the site selection process.
		Respondent thought that the applicant did not take consultation feedback into account and instead prioritised their grid connection	N	The Applicant held its stage one consultation between 30 May and 11 July 2024. The consultation introduced the Scheme to the local community and sought feedback on the development areas and grid connection corridors. Feedback received during stage one consultation, along with the Applicant's ongoing engagement with local authorities, parish councils and other interested parties, including statutory consultees, helped to shape the more detailed proposals presented as part of the stage two consultation. The Applicant prepared a table within the stage two consultation information booklet outlining some of the key themes raised during the stage one consultation, and how the Applicant had been working to address and incorporate the comments into the Scheme design presented at the stage two consultation. The stage two consultation information booklet can be seen in **Appendix E: Statutory Consultation Materials** (Doc Ref. 5.1).
		Respondents thought that connecting to the National Grid was central to the applicant's approach	N	The Applicant notes this and confirms that connection to the National Grid is fundamental to the delivery of the Scheme.
		Respondents were surprised that the Weston Marsh substation had not yet been confirmed, yet the Applicant was still proceeding with their development	N	National Grid is progressing the consenting of Weston Marsh substation through the Grimsby to Walpole project. Whilst the Grimsby to Walpole project is due to be submitted and consented later than the Scheme, it is critical that the Application proceeds in a timely manner. This means the consenting, procurement, and construction of the Scheme can continue within milestone dates.
		Respondents felt that the use of an overhead line Grid Connection to the Weston Marsh substation would have a negative visual impact	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 Assessment** (Doc Ref. 6.3),

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				with a summary provided within **ES Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual** (Doc Ref. 6.1).
		Respondents were specifically concerned about overhead line connections linking to the Weston Marsh substation	N	The selection of an overhead line as the preferred technology for the Grid Connection is guided by national policy contained in the NPS for Electricity Networks EN-5 which states that it is the Government's position that overhead lines should be the starting presumption for electricity networks. Further justification is provided in **ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The potential effects of the Grid Connection Route on have been considered in the **Environmental Statement** (Doc Ref. 6.1).
		Respondents were concerned about other developments in the area that are also connecting to Weston Marsh substation. Respondents highlighted the potential cumulative impacts of existing and forthcoming overhead line routes in the area	N	The Applicant notes that a cumulative assessment, which considers other developments in the area, is presented within each technical chapter of the **Environmental Statement** (Doc Ref. 6.1).
		Respondents thought that the applicant should connect to the grid through pylons near the site, rather than building a new route	N	The Applicant notes that the justification and narrative for the selection of the land parcels for the Solar Development Area is contained in **Appendix D: Site Selection Report** of the **Planning Statement** (Doc Ref. 7.1). In considering the site selection criteria, it is not considered that there are available alternative sites closer to the proposed location of Weston Marsh substation
		Respondent felt that any substation sited near an airfield should be subject to strict planning restrictions	N	As stated within **ES Chapter 16: Other Environmental Topics** (Doc Ref. 6.1), the Applicant has consulted with Crowland Airfield. Following this engagement, solar panels were removed from the Scheme at the runway thresholds and the Inter-Array Connection between Land Parcels A and B was undergrounded to address aviation safety considerations. No concerns were raised by Crowland Airfield in terms of the On-Site Substation Compounds.
		Respondents thought National Grid had not agreed on any connection proposals yet	N	The Applicant confirms that a connection agreement is in place with National Grid to connect at Weston Marsh substation. The Applicant received a Gate 1 offer for the Meridian Solar Farm. This initially indicates a connection date post 2035 (as Gate 2 offers were made up to the period ending 2035). Although an earlier connection may be possible within the 2031 to 2035 window should the Applicant be successful in reapplying through future Gate 2 application rounds. For the avoidance of doubt, the Applicant intends to submit a Gate 2 application at the earliest possibility and the Applicant is of the view

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				that Meridian Solar Farm could be a good candidate for a Gate 2 offer at the next NESO application round Further details can be found in the **Grid Connection Statement** (Doc Ref. 7.5).
		Respondents questioned what would happen if the Weston Marsh substation is not approved	N	The Scheme is reliant on a connection to the proposed Weston Marsh substation as the point of connection to the National Grid. 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.
		Respondents thought that the applicant should use underground cabling instead of overhead lines to connect to Weston Marsh substation	N	The Applicant notes that the selection of an overhead line as the preferred technology for the Grid Connection is guided by national policy contained in the NPS for Electricity Networks EN-5 which states that it is the Government's position that overhead lines should be the starting presumption for electricity networks. Further justification is provided in **ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The potential effects of the Grid Connection Route on have been considered in the **Environmental Statement** (Doc Ref. 6.1).
		Respondent stated that they do not want the connection at Weston Marsh substation to go ahead	N	The Applicant notes that the proposed Weston Marsh substation will be consented and delivered as part of National Grid's Grimsby to Walpole project. The substation forms an important part of the wider electricity transmission network required to connect new sources of low-carbon generation to the National Electricity Transmission System. Infrastructure such as the Weston Marsh substation will play a key role in supporting the UK's transition to net zero by enabling renewable energy projects, including the Scheme, to export electricity to the grid and contribute to national decarbonisation and energy security objectives.
		Respondent felt that the Weston Marsh substation should be placed elsewhere	N	The Applicant notes that the proposed Weston Marsh substation will be consented and delivered as part of National Grid's Grimsby to Walpole project, not this project. The Applicant has designed its Scheme to align with the latest public information as to siting released under that project.
		Respondent believed that the consultation of the public was premature due to the uncertainty of Weston Marsh substation	N	The Applicant notes this comment but remains confident in 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.

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
		Respondent thought that the development was too large	N	The Site is a size considered appropriate to deliver a 750MW solar farm that would make a substantial contribution to the delivery of renewable energy to the National Grid. The Scheme would also deliver environmental mitigation areas and biodiversity net gain as part of the proposals.
	Grimsby to Walpole (non-substation comments) Respondents were concerned about the combined pylon route for this development and others, such as the Grimsby to Walpole project being promoted by National Grid Electricity Transmission. Respondents highlighted the potential of a joint pylon route or underground cabling.	Respondent thought that the pylons connecting to the substation from Grimsby to Walpole, along with those in this development would harm biodiversity	N	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, with the implementation of mitigation measures established through the management plans within the DCO Application. Mitigation measures have also 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 **Design Parameters** (Doc Ref. 7.4) and **OOEMP** (Doc Ref 7.11).
		Respondents thought that the combined effect of this proposal with the Grimsby to Walpole development would be negative	N	The Applicant notes that cumulative assessment, which considers other developments in the area, is presented within each technical chapter of the **ES** (Doc Ref. 6.1).
		Respondents thought that the pylon lines of both this development and the Grimsby to Walpole development would have a negative visual impact	N	The Applicant notes that the cumulative landscape and visual impact of the overhead line and the Grimsby to Walpole development has been assessed within **ES chapter 12: Landscape and Visual** (Doc Ref. 6.1). Further information is contained within the **Inter-relationships with Other Projects Report** (Doc Ref. 7.2).
		Respondents thought underground cabling should be used in this development and the Grimsby to Walpole development	N	The Applicant notes that the selection of an overhead line as the preferred technology for the Grid Connection is guided by national policy contained in the NPS for Electricity Networks EN-5, which states that it is the Government's position that overhead lines should be the starting presumption for electricity networks. Further justification is provided in **ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The potential effects of the Grid Connection Route have been considered in the **ES** (Doc Ref 6.1). The most appropriate technology for the Grimsby to Walpole project is a consideration for National Grid.
		Respondent mentioned that National Grid had not agreed any connection proposals yet	N	The Applicant received a Gate 1 offer for the Meridian Solar Farm. This initially indicates a connection date post 2035 (as Gate 2 offers were made up to the period ending 2035). Although an earlier connection may be possible within the 2031 to 2035 window should the Applicant be successful in reapplying through future Gate 2 application rounds.

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				For the avoidance of doubt, the Applicant intends to submit a Gate 2 application at the earliest possibility and the Applicant is of the view that Meridian Solar Farm could be a good candidate for a Gate 2 offer at the next NESO application round Further details can be found within the **Grid Connection Statement** (Doc Ref. 7.5).
		Respondents were concerned about other developments in the area, like Grimsby to Walpole, also connecting to Weston Marsh substation	N	The Applicant notes that the cumulative landscape and visual impact of the overhead line and the Grimsby to Walpole development has been assessed within **ES chapter 12: Landscape and Visual** (Doc Ref. 6.1). Further information is contained within the **Inter-relationships with Other Projects Report** (Doc Ref. 7.2).
		Respondents thought that Applicant should have a joint pylon route rather than building a new route	N	The Applicant has engaged with National Grid regarding the potential to connect directly into to the Grimsby to Walpole overhead line where it would pass close to Parcel D. At this time, National Grid has not been able to confirm that this would be possible and therefore cannot form part of the Applicant's application. The Applicant has therefore continued to progress its Scheme on the basis that a connection would be to Weston Marsh substation, as per its engagement with National Grid and NESO.
		Respondent thought that the applicant should collaborate with other project promoters in the area to develop a joint approach to grid connection	N	The Applicant has engaged with National Grid regarding the potential to tee in directly to the Grimsby to Walpole overhead line where it would pass close to Parcel D. At this time, National Grid has not been able to confirm that this would be possible and therefore cannot form part of the Applicant's application. The Applicant has therefore continued to progress its Scheme on the basis that a connection would be to Weston Marsh substation, as per its engagement with National Grid and NESO.
		Respondent thought that the applicant should reconsider their point of connection to the grid	N	The Applicant has an agreement in place for a connection at Weston Marsh substation. Further details can be found in the **Grid Connection Statement** (Doc Ref. 7.5).

2.12. Needs case and trust in the developer

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
Needs Case and Trust in the Developer	**General support for solar/renewables** Respondents did support solar as a source of renewable energy, but frequently suggested that it must be designed sensitively. A small number of respondents expressed direct support for the Scheme. Others caveated their support with objections to the design of the Grid Connection corridor.	Respondents stated that they supported the development of solar as a renewable source of energy	N	National Policy Statements EN-1 and EN-3 sets out the principle need for new renewable energy infrastructure. Specifically, such as large-scale ground-mounted solar farms, which have a critical role to play in achieving the Government's aims. Solar PV generation is ascribed Critical National Priority status. Section 4 of the **Planning Statement** (Doc Ref. 7.1) further details the need for the scheme and its benefits in contributing to net zero targets and energy efficiency. Regarding the design of the Scheme, and specifically the Grid Connection Route, the **Design Approach Document** (Doc Ref. 7.3) confirms how good design has been taken into account from the inception of the Scheme. This document describes how the design has evolved in response to public and stakeholder consultation and engagement. Further information regarding the consideration of different designs can be found in **ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution** (Doc Ref. 6.1). These documents provide a reasoned argument for why an overhead grid connection has been selected rather than an underground cable connection. Regarding the Scheme's siting within the local area / landscape, **ES Chapters 5-16** (Doc Ref. 6.1) provide a comprehensive assessment of the possible environmental effects on the surrounding area, taking into account cumulative effects caused by other schemes / development. Specifically, regarding the impact to surrounding landscape, **ES Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual** (Doc Ref. 6.1) outlines the assessment undertaken regarding the local landscape and views.
		Respondents expressed support for renewable energy generation. Many also stated that a national transition away from fossil fuels, towards renewable sources of energy was essential	N	
		Respondents stated that they supported the design of the Scheme	N	
		Respondents expressed support for the Scheme on the basis that the land use was low impact compared to intensive or industrial scale farming activities	N	
		Respondents stated that they supported the placement of solar panels, but did not agree with the design of the grid connection corridor. Suggestions for undergrounding were put forward, with some stating that their support was contingent on this design change	N	
		Respondents noted that solar energy infrastructure must be sited sensitively to avoid negative impact on local communities and the landscape	N	
		Respondents noted that they had solar panels installed at their homes	N	
		Respondents stated that they supported environmental sustainability initiatives	N	
		Respondents suggested that it was self-explanatory as to why they supported solar energy	N	
	General opposition to the Scheme A majority of respondents objected to the Scheme. Reasoning was divided into several key themes: size, site selection, and the perceived level of community and	Respondents expressed opposition to the Scheme due to its proposed size and scale. Some respondents felt that the Applicant should have prioritised smaller-scale, community-led solar schemes instead	N	While community-led solar projects play an important role in local sustainability, large-scale schemes are essential for delivering the significant levels of clean energy needed to meet national net-zero targets. They offer great efficiency, lower costs per unit of energy, and the ability to power thousands of homes – making a substantial contribution to reducing carbon emissions. Solar schemes comprise one of the infrastructures deemed 'Critical National Priority' status by the

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
	environmental disruption. Some respondents directed their objections towards either the land parcel and inter-array areas or the grid connection corridor.			Government. Further information on the need for the Scheme is detailed in Section 4 of the **Planning Statement** (Doc Ref. 7.1). As set out in the **Environmental Statement** (Doc Ref. 6.1, the Scheme has been carefully designed to balance the environmental benefits with local considerations.
		Respondents opposed the Scheme due to its location. Some raised concerns about the robustness of the site selection process. Respondents raised questions about the criteria used and felt that further justification for the land proposed should be provided	N	**ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution** (Doc Ref. 6.1) and **the Site Selection Report** (Appendix D, Doc Ref 7.1) provide a description of the detailed site selection and assessment of the alternatives process undertaken by the Applicant. The assessment considers the locational criteria (being environmental, social and economic, electrical and engineering constraints) which geographically influenced the area of search. Then, following the selection of the preferred locations for the components of the Scheme, based on the application of the locational criteria and factors mentioned above, the Applicant then developed a set of core design principles which are described in the **Design Approach Document** (Doc Ref 7.3). These have then influenced the optioneering and the identification of a preferred design which then underwent further technical and feasibility assessments. **ES Chapter 5-16** (Doc Ref 6.1) have then provided a detailed assessment of the possible environmental impacts of the Scheme on the local area, taking into account the cumulative effects caused by other schemes nearby.
		Respondents opposed the Scheme due to the perceived level of disruption and destruction it could cause for the environment and local communities		In addition to the environmental assessments detailed within **ES Chapter 5-16** (Doc Ref. 6.1), appropriate mitigation measures have been determined to reduce any residual impacts on the environment and the local area as a result of the Scheme's construction, operation and decommissioning phase. The Scheme includes the adoption of an CEMP and TMP, prepared in accordance with the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10) and **OTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13) and secured by way of Requirement in the DCO, to minimise sources of environmental pollution and potential for disruption during the construction works, as well as an **Outline Skills Supply Chain and Employment Plan** (Doc Ref. 7.17) to maximise local employment and skills benefits. These documents include good design and best practice measures to ensure that adverse impacts to air quality, noise and traffic are avoided, reduced or mitigated.

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				The Scheme also incorporates the adoption of an **ODEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.12) to minimise sources of environmental pollution and potential for disruption during the decommissioning work. These documents include good design and best practice measures to ensure that adverse impacts to air quality, noise and traffic are avoided, reduced or mitigated.
		Respondents shared general objections towards the design of the land parcel and inter-array areas, citing size, location and choice of infrastructure	N	**ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution** (Doc Ref. 6.1) and the **Site Selection Report** (Appendix D, Doc Ref 7.1) provide a description of the detailed site selection and assessment of the alternatives process undertaken by the Applicant. The assessment considers the locational criteria (being environmental, social and economic, electrical and engineering constraints) which geographically influenced the area of search. Then, following the selection of the preferred locations for the components of the Scheme, based on the application of the locational criteria and factors mentioned above, the Applicant then developed a set of core design principles which are described in the **Design Approach Document (**Doc Ref 7.3). These have then influenced the optioneering and the identification of a preferred design which then underwent further technical and feasibility assessments. **ES Chapters 5-16** (Doc Ref 6.1**)** have then provided a detailed assessment of the possible environmental impacts of the Scheme on the local area, taking into account the cumulative effects caused by other schemes nearby.
		Respondents shared general objections towards the design of the grid connection corridor, citing length, location and choice of infrastructure	N	The siting and size of the Grid Connection Route is assessed within all of the environmental assessment within the **Environmental Statement** (Doc Ref 6.1). The Grid Connection Route is a vital component of the Scheme, enabling the clean energy generated to be delivered to the national network. Including the corridor within the overall application ensures that its environmental impacts are assessed comprehensively alongside the main site area, rather than two separate developments. This integrated approach allows for better planning, transparency and mitigation of potential effects, allowing for a more comprehensive EIA. As set out above, the siting of the grid connection corridor has also been through a site selection process in which reasonable alternatives have been considered. The assessment considers the locational criteria (being environmental, social and economic, electrical and engineering

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				constraints) which geographically influenced the area of search. See the **ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution (Doc Ref. 6.1)**, the **Site Selection Report (Appendix D, Doc 7.1)** and the **Design Approach Document (Doc Ref. 7.3)** for more details on the selection process.
		Respondents submitted a general (non-specific) statement of opposition towards the Scheme	N	The Applicant emphasises that the need for new renewable energy infrastructure is established in national policy. The Scheme is supported by the national policy framework for energy infrastructure, including the relevant National Policy Statements, which recognise the urgent need for new low-carbon electricity generation to support the UK's legally binding net zero targets and to maintain a secure and reliable energy system. The Scheme therefore contributes to meeting this identified national need while its environmental effects have been assessed through the Environmental Impact Assessment process and addressed through the design and proposed mitigation measures.
		Respondents stated that the Scheme should be denied development consent by the government	N	The Planning Statement and accompanying **Policy Accordance Tables at Appendix B and C (Doc Ref. 7.1)** provide a detailed analysis of the national and local planning policy. Section 5 provides a detailed planning assessment of the Scheme against relevant policy, thereby ensuring the Scheme is compliant with policy and therefore should be granted Development Consent by the Secretary of State. Section 4 also detailed the need and the national and local benefits which will come from the Scheme.
		Respondents stated that they would object to the proposal if they did not receive a reduction in their energy bills	N	As a NSIP, the Scheme is designed to contribute to the wider decarbonisation of the energy system and improve energy security across the country. While it does not offer individual bill reduction, it supports long-term environmental economic benefits, including stabilising energy prices and reducing reliance on fossil fuels. The Applicant remains committed to exploring ways the local community can benefit from the Scheme.
		Respondents objected based upon the proposition that the Scheme was too expensive	N	While cost considerations are always important, the Scheme has been carefully designed to deliver long-term value and sustainability. It reflects a strategic investment that balances upfront expenditure with anticipated benefits over time. The overall structure ensures that resources are allocated efficiently and the project outcomes justify the initial financial commitment.
	General opposition to solar/renewables (not Scheme specific)	Respondents stated that they did not support solar, in any form, as a source of renewable energy	N	It is Government's policy view that "We need a diverse mix of electricity infrastructure to come forward, so that we can deliver a secure, reliable, affordable and net zero consistent system during the transition to 2050 for a wide range of demand, decarbonisation, and technology sources";

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
	Some respondents expressed their opposition to solar and renewable energy more generally, citing concerns about efficiency, reliability, and security			and that "a secure, reliable, affordable, net zero consistent system in 2050 is likely to be composed predominantly of wind and solar" (NPS EN-1, Paragraphs 3.3.19-3.3.20). Therefore large-scale ground-mounted solar farms have a critical role to play in achieving the Government's aims. Solar PV generation is ascribed Critical National Priority status.
		Respondents did not feel that solar was a reliable or efficient source of energy, with the character of the UK's seasons frequently cited as a possible catalyst for intermittent energy production In contrast, others suggested that the energy generated current storage capacities, often leading to inactive sites	N	The Applicant notes these comments and has prepared a **Planning Statement** (Doc Ref. 7.1) which sets out the justification for the Scheme within the context of the clear and urgent national need for low-carbon, home-grown energy. This report explains that available land, available grid infrastructure and sufficient solar irradiance are essential inputs to site selection for large-scale solar schemes, and these considerations have been taken into account in the development of the proposals for the Scheme. The Applicant further recognises that the Government's policy view is that "We need a diverse mix of electricity infrastructure to come forward, so that we can deliver a secure, reliable, affordable and net zero consistent system during the transition to 2050 for a wide range of demand, decarbonisation, and technology sources"; and that "a secure, reliable, affordable, net zero consistent system in 2050 is likely to be composed predominantly of wind and solar" (NPS EN-1, Paragraphs 3.3.19-3.3.20). As the UK energy system decarbonises and becomes predominantly powered by renewables, battery systems will of course, increasingly be needed to store excess energy generated in high production periods (e.g. during the day, in the case of solar) for use during low production times (such as in the evening). Battery storage therefore helps to balance the flow of power onto the electricity grid, ensuring a stable and reliable power supply and the Applicant welcomes any increase in this vital infrastructure.
		Respondents suggested that other sources of energy should prioritised over new solar installations	N	The Applicant notes the Government's policy view that "We need a diverse mix of electricity infrastructure to come forward, so that we can deliver a secure, reliable, affordable and net zero consistent system during the transition to 2050 for a wide range of demand, decarbonisation, and technology sources"; and that "a secure, reliable, affordable, net zero consistent system in 2050 is likely to be composed predominantly of wind and solar" (NPS EN-1, Paragraphs 3.3.19-3.3.20). This explains why solar as a source of energy is being prioritised by the Applicant.

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
		Respondents specifically objected to the development of solar farms across the UK	N	The Applicant is committed to the pursuit of secure, reliable, home-grown energy generation. National Policy Statements EN-1 and EN-3 sets out the principle need for new renewable energy infrastructure. Specifically, such as large-scale ground-mounted solar farms, which have a critical role to play in achieving the Government's aims. Solar PV generation is ascribed Critical National Priority status. Section 4 of the **Planning Statement** (Doc Ref. 7.1) further details the need for the scheme and its benefits in contributing to net zero targets and energy efficiency.
		Respondents did not feel that enough research into the reliability and safety of renewable energy infrastructure had been conducted	N	The Applicant refutes the argument that not enough research into renewable energy infrastructure exists. In 2024 renewable energy sources generated more than 50% of the UK's electricity marking a major milestone in the country's transition to clean power. On safety measure, there are multiple aspects submitted as part of the DCO Application which outlines our approach to safety and management including the **Design Approach Document** (Doc Ref. 7.3), **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10)**, OOEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.11), **ODEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.12) and **OBSMP** (Doc Ref. 7.18).
		Respondents suggested that fossil fuels continue to be an important and reliable source of energy	N	The Applicant agrees that fossil fuels still play a role in meeting our national energy needs. That said, we are committed to supporting the transition away from reliance on fossil fuels and ensuring the UK has a diverse mix of electricity infrastructure. The Government's own policy recognises that "a secure, reliable, affordable, net zero consistent system in 2050 is likely to be composed predominantly of wind and solar" (NPS EN-1, Paragraphs 3.3.19-3.3.20).
	Site selection - alternatives Respondents felt that the Applicant had not sufficiently explored the use of alternative sites, including commercial, domestic and industrial rooftops. Some suggested that the Scheme should be sited closer to the point of use, in urban areas, or along railway lines.	Respondents felt that there should be government funding to improve access to domestic solar for homeowners. Some suggested a 'roof first' policy should be mandated	N	The Applicant is supportive of rooftop solar installations as part of the nation's generation mix. However, a mix of technologies will be required to meet our Net Zero targets and large-scale solar plays an important role in enabling renewable energy to be delivered at speed and at the required scale. The **Planning Statement** (Doc Ref. 7.1) further sets out the national new renewable energy infrastructure required to help achieve the UK Government's net-zero and energy security objectives. The Scheme will make a meaningful contribution to this transition while supporting local employment and supply chain opportunities during construction and operation.
		Respondents raised concerns that the Applicant had not sufficiently considered alternative sites during the selection process	N	The Applicant refers the respondents to **ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution (**Doc Ref. 6.1**)** and the **Site Selection Report (**Doc Ref 7.1) which provide a description of the detailed site selection and assessment of the alternatives process undertaken by the Applicant.

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				The assessment considers the locational criteria (being environmental, social and economic, electrical and engineering constraints) which geographically influenced the area of search. Then, following the selection of the preferred locations for the components of the Scheme, based on the application of the locational criteria and factors mentioned above.
		Respondents suggested that solar panels should be placed on rooftops instead of agricultural land Suggestions included using lower grade land, commercial, domestic and industrial rooftops, brownfield sites and carparks. Enterprise Park in Spalding was suggested as an example of a suitable local site Some respondents that these alternative sites would reduce the risk of negative impact on social, environmental and national (food and energy) security receptors	N	The Applicant is supportive of rooftop solar installations as part of the nation's generation mix. However, a mix of technologies will be required to meet our Net Zero targets and large-scale solar plays an important role in enabling renewable energy to be delivered at speed and at the required scale. The **Planning Statement** (Doc Ref. 7.1) further sets out the national new renewable energy infrastructure required to help achieve the UK Government's net-zero and energy security objectives. The Scheme will make a meaningful contribution to this transition while supporting local employment and supply chain opportunities during construction and operation. On impacts to food production the Applicant points to energy security as being another priority of this Government. The balance of the two issues needs to be appropriately weighed, and we believe that, in the context of this site representing less than 0.01% of the utilised agricultural area (UAA), it will not have a significant impact on national food production and security.
		Respondents suggested that Scheme infrastructure, including the grid connection corridor and solar panels, should be sited alongside railway lines	N	The narrative and justification for the location of the Solar Development Area is included within the **Site Selection Report** (Appendix D, Doc Ref 7.1). There is no opportunity to route the grid connection along a railway line.
		Respondents suggest solar panels should be on land suitable for grazing	N	The narrative and justification for the location of the Solar Development Area is included within the **Site Selection Report** (Appendix D, Doc Ref 7.1). Sheep grazing can be used for the management of grassland underneath the solar panels within the Solar Development Area, as set out within the **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16).
		Respondents felt that residential buildings presented a more appropriate site for solar compared to the Scheme. Many respondents suggested that all new homes should be built with solar panels	N	While the Applicant agrees that rooftop solar should be included in the mix of renewable sources helping towards the transition to clean energy generation, it is alongside utility scale solar schemes, like Meridian Solar.

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				Domestic solar is not able to meet the national urgent need for new generation on its own. Therefore, rooftop solar should come forwards as well as, rather than instead of, large-scale ground mounted schemes such as the Scheme. Further details about how and why the Scheme addresses all relevant aspects of government policy, including the current suite of National Policy Statements (NPSs), can be found in the **Planning Statement** (Doc Ref. 7.1).
		Respondents suggested that sites of renewable energy generation, including solar panels, should be sited in urban areas, where usage is perceived to be the highest. Some suggested that energy should be generated directly at the point of use, such as at the household level	N	The Applicant agrees that sites in urban areas should also come forward where appropriate to help meet the nation's electricity generating needs. However, these sites, given their constraints in dense, urban environments, will be limited in their output. It is in this context that a mix of technologies will be required to meet our Net Zero targets and large-scale solar plays an important role in enabling renewable energy is to be delivered at speed and at the required scale. Further details about how and why the Scheme addresses all relevant aspects of government policy, including the current suite of National Policy Statements (NPSs), can be found in the **Planning Statement** (Doc Ref. 7.1).
		Respondents suggested that the Applicant would find more suitable alternative sites for solar outside of Lincolnshire	N	**ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution (Doc Ref. 6.1)** and the **Site Selection Report (Appendix D, Doc Ref 7.1)** provides a description of the detailed site selection and assessment of the alternatives process undertaken by the Applicant. The assessment considers the locational criteria (being environmental, social and economic, electrical and engineering constraints) which geographically influenced the area of search. Then, following the selection of the preferred locations for the components of the Scheme, based on the application of the locational criteria and factors mentioned above, the Applicant then developed a set of core design principles which are described in the **Design Approach Document (Doc Ref 7.3)**. These have then influenced the optioneering and the identification of a preferred design which then underwent further technical and feasibility assessments. **ES Chapter 5-16 (Doc Ref 6.1)** have then provided a detailed assessment of the possible environmental impacts of the Scheme on the local area, taking into account the cumulative effects caused by other schemes nearby. Lincolnshire remains a suitable location for solar development due to its landscape, solar potential and proximity to grid infrastructure. Importantly, the proposed use of land is temporary and reversible,

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				allowing for future restoration to agricultural use. The Scheme has been designed to minimise long-term disruption while contributing to national renewable energy targets.
	Alternative generation technologies Respondents suggested that other energy generation technologies, including both fossil fuels and renewables, should be used in tandem to secure the UK's energy supply. Some suggested that other technologies, including wind, tidal, biomass and nuclear present more suitable options for development compared to solar farms.	Respondents did not believe that the United Kingdom should rely solely on renewable energy generation. Respondents felt that reducing or removing the use of fossil fuels and nuclear may impact national energy security	N	The Applicant refutes the position that a reduction in the reliance on fossil fuels and nuclear would impact national energy security. The Government's own policy recognises that "a secure, reliable, affordable, net zero consistent system in 2050 is likely to be composed predominantly of wind and solar" (NPS EN-1, Paragraphs 3.3.19-3.3.20). The **Planning Statement** (Doc Ref. 7.1) further sets out the national need for new renewable energy infrastructure, required to help achieve the UK Government's net-zero and energy security objectives. The Scheme will make a meaningful contribution to this transition while supporting local employment and supply chain opportunities during construction and operation.
		Respondents suggested that solar panels should be used in combination with wind to improve energy generation and security	N	The Applicant notes this comment and agrees that a mix of renewable technologies is needed to meet the energy generation needs of the country. That said, the assessments undertaken for this site has been focussed on a solar scheme only, with **ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution (Doc Ref. 6.1)** and the **Site Selection Report (Appendix D, Doc Ref 7.1)** providing a description of the detailed site selection and assessment of the alternatives process undertaken by the Applicant. The assessment considers the locational criteria (being environmental, social and economic, electrical and engineering constraints) which geographically influenced the area of search. Then, following the selection of the preferred locations for the components of the Scheme, based on the application of the locational criteria and factors mentioned above, the Applicant then developed a set of core design principles which are described in the **Design Approach Document (Doc Ref 7.3)**. These have then influenced the optioneering and the identification of a preferred design which then underwent further technical and feasibility assessments. This focussed on solar as the primary technology for this Scheme. **ES Chapters 5-16 (Doc Ref 6.1)** have then provided a detailed assessment of the possible environmental impacts of the Scheme on

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				the local area, taking into account the cumulative effects caused by other schemes nearby. Lincolnshire remains a suitable location for solar development due to its landscape, solar potential and proximity to grid infrastructure.
		Respondents suggested that other sources of energy, including fossil fuels, are cheaper and more reliable than solar	N	The Applicant refutes the claim that other sources are cheaper and more reliable. The Government's own policy recognises that "a secure, reliable, affordable, net zero consistent system in 2050 is likely to be composed predominantly of wind and solar" (NPS EN-1, Paragraphs 3.3.19-3.3.20). Whilst fossil fuels and other technologies play a part in the mix of energy generation, the Applicant believes solar is critical if we are to meet the energy needs of the UK.
		Respondents suggested that there are many alternative ways to generate electricity which are more space efficient and tailored to their locations	N	The Applicant disagrees with the assertion that there are many other ways to more efficiently generate electricity. Whilst a diverse mix of electricity generation is required, the Applicant believes solar is one of the more efficient and effective ways to produce reliable, affordable and secure electricity at scale.
		Respondents suggested that nuclear energy is a better and more appropriate way to generate electricity when compared to solar	N	The Applicant points to the Government's own policy recognises that "a secure, reliable, affordable, net zero consistent system in 2050 is likely to be composed predominantly of wind and solar" (NPS EN-1, Paragraphs 3.3.19-3.3.20).
		Respondents suggested that offshore renewable energy projects should be prioritised over solar farms, including the proposed Scheme	N	The Applicant reiterates that whilst offshore renewable energy is a viable component of generation to meet the nation's needs, a diverse mix of energy generation is required, including solar.
		Respondents suggested that onshore wind farms present a more suitable method of generating electricity compared to the Scheme	N	The Applicant reiterates that whilst onshore wind is also a viable component of generation to meet the nation's needs, a diverse mix of energy generation is required, including solar.
		Respondents suggested that air source heat pumps are a better alternative technology compared to solar farms	N	The Applicant recognises the place air source heat pumps have in the pursuit of our clean energy targets but reiterates that this is only one other aspect of a diverse mix of energy generation required to meet the nation's energy needs which must include solar energy generation.
		Respondents suggested that tidal technologies should be explored by the Applicant	N	The Applicant agrees tidal is another technology to be included in the mix of energy generation required to support the UK's energy security and needs.
		Respondents suggested that biomass digesters present a more suitable approach to energy generation compared to solar farms	N	The Applicant agrees biomass digesters are another technology to be included in the mix of energy generation required to support the UK's energy security and needs.

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
		Respondents suggested that there are more suitable alternative methods of energy generation which would support the government's net zero goals	N	The Government's own policy recognises that "a secure, reliable, affordable, net zero consistent system in 2050 is likely to be composed predominantly of wind and solar" (NPS EN-1, Paragraphs 3.3.19-3.3.20).
	Alternative transmission Respondents raised concerns about the current reliance on overhead lines and pylons as methods of electricity transmission to the national grid. Some suggested that alternative transmission technologies, such as undergrounding, should be prioritised. Further research was encouraged	Respondents felt that further research into alternative transmission technologies and energy storage is required. They suggested that more needed to be done to stabilise the national grid and its supply of energy	N	Applicant's consideration of alternatives for the Grid Connection Route and the Inter-Array Connections is summarised within **ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The Applicant agrees that more battery energy storage is required and it is why BESS is incorporated in the Scheme (see **ES Chapter 2: The Scheme** (Doc Ref 6.1)). That said, we believe Meridian Solar presents an opportunity to add additional generating capacity in the UK and support the Government's clean energy goals as well energy security.
		Respondents suggested that there are better ways to design grid connection corridors. Respondents did not agree with the use of overhead lines, cables, and pylons, included in the detailed designs for the Scheme. Some felt that this approach was outdated, ugly, and harmful to the environment	N	The selection of an overhead line is an appropriate technology for the grid connection. The narrative relating to the technology selection is contained within **ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution** (Doc Ref 6.1). An Environmental Impact Appraisal has been undertaken on the Scheme and the results of this is reported within the **Environmental Statement** (Doc Ref 6.1 – 6.3).
		Respondents suggested that all proposed developments, including Meridian Solar, should be utilising existing power lines to connect to the national grid	N	The Applicant has engaged with National Grid regarding the potential to tee in directly to the Grimsby to Walpole overhead line where it would pass close to Parcel D. At this time, National Grid has not been able to confirm that this would be possible and therefore cannot form part of the Applicant's application. The Applicant has therefore continued to progress its Scheme on the basis that a connection would be to Weston Marsh substation, as per its engagement with National Grid and NESO.
	Consultation length In discussions about the adequacy of consultation and community engagement, respondents raised concerns about the length of the statutory consultation period. Respondents felt that six weeks was not long enough to review the information materials in depth to formulate a response.	Respondents felt that the consultation process was being rushed to 'tick' a box	N	The Applicant remains confident that information issued for the consultation provided adequate time for community involvement and invited participation. As part of the pre-application consultation the Applicant held a number of in person events, including early engagement workshops with local stakeholders and community groups.
		Respondents felt that the six-week stage two consultation period was an insufficient amount of time to review and respond to the information materials in depth. Some noted that it had been difficult to find time due to working constraints	N	The Applicant remains confident that the information issued for the consultation was clear, provided adequate time for community involvement, and effectively invited participation. Ultimately the Applicant received 324 community responses to its consultation process alongside engagement with identified stakeholders related to the project. The timelines provided for feedback windows are in line

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				with best practice principles and were consulted on through our Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC).
		Respondents did not feel that the Applicant had adequately communicated the length of the stage two consultation period	N	The Applicant remains confident in the process undertaken for communicating the deadlines for feedback during our consultation process.
	Consultation materials Many respondents raised concerns about the accessibility and robustness of the information materials. Contrasting concerns were expressed towards the level of detail and complexity of language used. Some respondents also raised concerns about the extent to which the Applicant had considered their stage one feedback	Respondents stated that the consultation information booklet was a comprehensive and informative document	N	The Applicant notes the feedback and welcomes the acknowledgment that the information provided was comprehensive and informative. Every effort was made to ensure all of the material used for the consultation process was accessible, clear and easy to follow in order to inform the public when taking part in the feedback process.
		Respondents felt that the feedback form had been poorly designed and included leading questions. Some respondents raised concerns about how their responses would be interpreted	N	The Applicant remains confident that the information issued for the consultation was clear, provided adequate time for community involvement, and effectively invited participation. The Applicant also remains committed to ensuring all feedback received is robustly considered in line with best-practice principles and guidance.
		Respondents felt that the language used in consultation information materials was complex, technical, and difficult to understand. Respondents raised concerns that Plain English had not been used, thus reducing accessibility and sense of understanding	N	The Applicant remains confident that the information presented during the statutory consultation was sufficiently accessible. A Non-Technical Summary (NTS) of the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) was provided to summarise the key findings in an accessible format, supported by community-facing materials such as the Consultation Information Booklet and exhibition boards. Clarification and further information were also available upon request throughout the consultation period. The Applicant also notes that a **Non-Technical Summary** (Doc Ref. 6.1) of the **Environmental Statement** (Doc Ref 6.1 – 6.3) has been submitted as part of the DCO Application.
		Respondents raised concerns about the transparency and objectivity of the consultation information materials. Some felt that they were biased	N	The Applicant remains confident in the approach taken to consultation by the project team. Best practice principles have been used throughout to ensure all consultation materials have been appropriate for the project and accessible, transparent and easy to follow.
		Respondents did not feel that the feedback form had be accessed by enough local people	N	The Applicant refutes the claim that the feedback form has not been accessed by enough local people. The Applicant received 324 pieces of feedback as part of the consultation process alongside emails, phone calls and direct written correspondence from the community.
		Respondents suggested that the newsletter received in the post lacked detail and did not include information	N	The Applicant points the respondent to information published as part of stage two of the process including the consultation information booklet which outlined the key themes arising at stage one and how the project

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
		about how the Applicant had considered the feedback received during the stage one consultation		team had responded to that feedback A copy of the information booklet it provided **Appendix E: Statutory Consultation Materials (**Doc Ref. 5.1).
		Respondents felt that the output generation figures were misleading	N	The Applicant remains confident in the appropriateness of the figures referred to and the accuracy of information provided during the consultation process.
		Respondents suggested that the information materials should have included further details about the cumulative impact of multiple schemes connecting to the Weston Marsh Substation	N	The Applicant included information in the PEIR regarding Cumulative Impacts of the Scheme and the connection to Weston Marsh Substation. The Applicant's cumulative assessments identified local developments that could have the potential to cause cumulative effects with the Scheme. Where possible, the Scheme would coordinate with other developers to minimise the cumulative effects, particularly in the construction and decommissioning phases. This would include ongoing liaison with National Grid on its siting of Weston Marsh substation and Grimsby to Walpole overhead line project. The PEIR Chapter was made available during the consultation process and ahead of submission for consideration.
		Respondents did not feel that enough information had been provided during the stage two consultation Some suggested that a lack of detail in materials was a deliberate attempt to avoid public scrutiny	N	The Applicant remains confident in the level of information provided throughout the consultation process and the approach taken by the project team to ensure the community had all the information necessary to assess the Scheme and provide comments.
		Respondents felt that more details about both the construction and decommissioning phases should have been included in the consultation information materials to help inform local communities about what they could expect	N	Details of the construction and decommissioning phase were outlined within our consultation material as well as more information on construction, operation and decommissioning which could be found within PEIR, Chapter 2: The Scheme. The Applicant considers that the level of detail provided at this stage was sufficient to help inform local communities about what they could expect.
		Respondents suggested that more images in the information materials would have supported understanding It was noted that images of key infrastructure, including the proposed pylons and substations, would have been helpful to support local understanding of the Scheme and its potential visual impacts	N	The Applicant remains confident that the information presented during the consultation process was adequate and sufficiently accessible. A NTS of the PEIR was provided to summarise the key findings in an accessible format, supported by community-facing materials such as the Consultation Information Booklet and exhibition boards. Clarification and further information were also available upon request throughout the consultation period.
		Respondents felt that the consultation information materials did not adequately explain why the proposal increased in size after the stage one consultation	N	The Applicant remains confident that the information presented during the consultation process was adequate. A NTS of the PEIR was provided to summarise the key findings in an accessible format, supported by community-facing materials such as the Consultation

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				Information Booklet and exhibition boards. Clarification and further information were also available upon request throughout the consultation period. Information included the justification around Scheme size changes.
		Respondents suggested that the information materials should have provided a more detailed justification for the decision to go ahead with an overhead line as opposed to underground cables	N	The selection of an overhead line as the preferred technology for the grid connection is guided by national policy contained within the National Policy Statement for Electricity Networks Infrastructure (EN-5), which states that outside of nationally designated landscapes, overhead lines should be the strong starting presumption for electricity networks unless they would give rise to particularly significant landscape and visual effects. The narrative relating to the technology selection and the consideration of alternatives is set out in **ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution** (Doc Ref. 6.1). This approach was also explained within the consultation information booklet, which is provided in Appendix E: Statutory Consultation Materials (Doc Ref. 5.1). Consultees who wished to seek clarification during the consultation period were able to contact the project team through the available communication channels.
		Respondents suggested that the information materials inadequately explained what an Inter-array area was and what sort of infrastructure would be included	N	The Applicant refers respondents to the PEIR Glossary and Abbreviations List which provided a definition for what Inter Array areas are as "The land option required for the Inter-Array Connection in the area between the land parcels of the PV Area". The Inter-Array Connection between Land Parcels A and B would comprise an underground cable, whilst the Inter-Array Connection between Land Parcels C and D would comprise an overhead line, supported by wooden poles. The updated descriptions of development with parameters for the Inter-Array Connections are provided within **ES Chapter 2: The Scheme** (Doc Ref. 6.1).
		Respondents suggested that the information materials did not adequately explain what a Scheduled Monument is	N	The Applicant refers respondents to the PEIR Glossary and Abbreviations List which provided a definition for what Scheduled Monuments are as "An ancient monument or archaeological deposits designated by the Secretary of State as a 'Scheduled Ancient Monument' and protected under the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979".
		Respondents did not feel that the Applicant had adequately explained the site selection process for the land parcels. Respondents felt that a justification for the	N	**ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution** (Doc Ref. 6.1) and the **Site Selection Report** (Appendix D, Doc Ref 7.1) provides a description of the detailed site selection and assessment of the alternatives process

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
		use of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) land was required as a minimum		undertaken by the Applicant. This includes details of the BMV considerations. The assessment considers the locational criteria (being environmental, social and economic, electrical and engineering constraints) which geographically influenced the area of search. During the consultation period, the site selection process was also explained within the consultation information booklet (provided in **Appendix E: Statutory Consultation Materials** (Doc Ref. 5.1)), including the staged approach to identifying the opportunity area based on the grid connection at Weston Marsh, followed by the consideration of environmental and technical constraints to identify suitable land parcels. The booklet also noted that ALC surveys indicate a mix of BMV land across the area, and that the Applicant has adopted a sequential approach to locating infrastructure on lower grades of agricultural land where practical. Consultees who wished to seek clarification during the consultation period were able to contact the project team through the available communication channels.
		Respondents felt that the consultation information materials did not adequately explain the layout refinement and design process	N	**ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution** (Doc Ref. 6.1) and the **Site Selection Report** (Appendix D, Doc Ref 7.1) provide a description of the detailed site selection and assessment of the alternatives process undertaken by the Applicant. The assessment considers the locational criteria (being environmental, social and economic, electrical and engineering constraints) which geographically influenced the area of search. Then, following the selection of the preferred locations for the components of the Scheme, based on the application of the locational criteria and factors mentioned above, the Applicant then developed a set of core design principles which are described in the **Design Approach Document** (Doc Ref 7.3). These have then influenced the optioneering and the identification of a preferred design which then underwent further technical and feasibility assessments. The stage two consultation information booklet (provided in **Appendix E: Statutory Consultation Materials** (Doc Ref. 5.1)) explained the evolution of the Scheme design, including the refinements made since the stage one consultation. The booklet also detailed how

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				environmental and technical constraints were considered to inform and improve the Scheme design. Consultees wishing to seek further information during the consultation period were able to contact the project team through the available communication channels.
		Respondents did not feel that the Applicant had adequately communicated how feedback from the stage one consultation had been considered A clear response to the feedback received during stage one was requested	N	The Applicant points to information published as part of the stage two consultation including the consultation information booklet which outlined the key themes arising at stage one and how the project team had responded to that feedback.
		Respondents suggested that the information materials inferred that the Scheme would go ahead regardless of local feedback It was not clear as to how feedback would be considered	N	The Applicant disputes any inference suggested. The consultation responses have been carefully considered and informed the decision making through the DCO Application process.
		Respondents suggested that 3D models of the proposed infrastructure, such as the substations, at the in-person events would have supported local understanding of the Scheme	N	The Applicant remains confident in the level of information provided throughout the consultation process was adequate to inform the community and enable the level of feedback requested on the proposals.
		Respondents stated that an audio of typical sounds emitted from the different Scheme elements would have boosted local understanding of the impacts of the Scheme	N	The Applicant refers to **ES Chapter 13: Noise and Vibration [Doc Ref. 6.1),** which outlines the proposed embedded and additional mitigation measures to reduce/manage noise impacts to not significant effects. These measures will be implemented in the relevant management plans for construction, operation, and decommissioning, and will be secured through a requirement of the DCO.
		Respondents did not feel confident that the PEIR was a reliable source of information Some respondents suggested that there had not been sufficient time to conduct assessments. Others stated that the report lacked detail, with significant gaps across the assessments	N	The Applicant remains confident in the level of information provided throughout the consultation process was adequate to inform the community and enable the level of feedback requested on the proposals. Similarly, the amount of time provided to take part in the consultation process followed best practice principles and guidance.
		Respondents stated that the technical language used in the PEIR was difficult to understand. Some respondents suggested that the consultation period should have been extended to allow sufficient time to review the PEIR in depth	N	The Applicant remains confident in the level of information provided throughout the consultation process was adequate to inform the community and enable the level of feedback requested on the proposals. Similarly, the amount of time provided to take part in the consultation process followed best practice principles and guidance. An NTS of the PEIR was provided to summarise the key findings in an accessible format, supported by community-facing materials such as the

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				Consultation Information Booklet and exhibition boards. Clarification and further information were also available upon request throughout the consultation period.
	Consultation maps Respondents raised concerns about the detail and visual clarity of the stage two consultation maps. Some suggested that further details should have been marked on the map to support local understanding.	Respondents suggested that the consultation maps were vague and did not provide enough information for users. Some noted that the maps were inconsistent in style	N	The Applicant remains confident in the level of information provided throughout the consultation process. Some maps were produced by various project team members meaning some inconsistency in style may exist, but every effort was made to ensure all material was accessible and easy to read.
		Respondents suggested that additional maps, such as the transport and access maps, should have been included in the Information Booklet	N	The Applicant remains confident in the level of information provided throughout the consultation process. More detailed maps were included within the complete PEIR documentation and made available to the public to scrutinise – it would have been onerous on the public for us to include all relevant maps and images in one information booklet.
		Respondents suggested that transport and access routes should have been included on the maps. It was noted that it would have been useful to see where access routes started and finished	N	The Applicant remains confident in the level of information provided throughout the consultation process. Access points and transport routes were published with the documentation produced for the PEIR. Updated access points and traffic routes have been published with the DCO Application. The Applicant points to measures associated with transport and access summarised in the **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref. 6.1) and the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13). Heavy Goods Vehicles routes and accesses are shown on **ES Figure 2-5 and ES Figure 15-3** (Doc Ref. 6.2).
		Respondents noted that members of the project team had been unable to answer specific questions about the layout of proposed infrastructure detailed on the maps at events	N	The Applicant has confidence in the expertise and guidance of the professional project team present at the consultation events. Where questions could not be answered at the event, attendees were encouraged to submit them in writing and provide their contact details so that the Applicant could respond directly.
	Consultation events Respondents suggested that the in-person consultation events had helped to answer their questions about the Scheme. Some suggested that the project team did not understand the local area, and that the events were a 'tick box' element of the stage two consultation. Respondents also felt	Respondents felt that members of the project team were not able to provide detailed answers to the questions raised during the in-person consultation events and briefings Respondents suggested that they had received conflicting and/ or contradictory responses from members of the project team. Some respondents attributed this to a lack of local knowledge across the project team Some felt that the project team were biased in favour of the Scheme	N	The Applicant has confidence in the expertise and guidance of the professional project team present at the consultation events, and in the wider team instructed to provide the information for the assessments and reports undertaken for this DCO Application. Where questions could not be answered at the event, attendees were encouraged to submit them in writing and provide their contact details so that the Applicant could respond directly.

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
	that the Applicant should have focused on directly engaging the most impacted communities.	Respondents raised concerns about the competency of the project team they had spoken to	N	The Applicant has confidence in the expertise and guidance of the professional project team present at the consultation events.
		Respondents felt that members of the project team should have written down all questions and comments received during conversations at events	N	It is not always practicable to record all questions and comments raised during conversations at consultation events. However, where matters could not be addressed or recorded at the time, attendees were encouraged to submit their questions or comments in writing and provide their contact details so that the Applicant could respond directly.
		Respondents suggested that there should have been more than three in-person consultation events. It was also suggested that the in-person consultation events should have been held in the most impacted communities It was noted that some members of the local community cannot access the internet, increasing their reliance on being able to attend an event to access	N	The Applicant remains confident that the number and locations of consultation events, positioned around the Scheme boundary and with reference to the Primary Consultation Zone, were appropriate. The approach was also agreed with South Holland District Council and Lincolnshire County Council as part of the preparation of the Statement of Community Consultation. Every effort was made to ensure that the consultation was as accessible as reasonably practicable.
		Respondents did not feel that the stage two consultation events had provided the sufficient detail that was promised during conversations at the stage one consultation events	N	The Applicant remains confident in the level of information provided throughout the consultation programme. Technical detail and assessments were presented within the PEIR, while the community-facing consultation materials were designed to present information in an accessible and proportionate format for a non-technical audience.
		Respondents did not feel that an adequate level of consultation had been undertaken for the grid connection corridor One respondent suggested that the Applicant should have spent more time surveying landowners closer to the Weston Marsh Substation to reduce the length of the grid connection corridor	N	The Applicant remains confident in the level of consultation undertaken in relation to the grid connection corridor. Relevant landowners were consulted throughout the pre-application process, as detailed in the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 5.1) and its appendices. Technical information and assessments relating to the grid connection corridor were presented within the PEIR, while community-facing consultation materials were designed to present information in an accessible and proportionate format for a non-technical audience.
		Respondents noted that the postcode for the Crowland Pavilion had been incorrectly printed on information materials	N	The postcode used in the consultation materials to advertise the in-person consultation event at the Crowland Pavilion was the same postcode used on other online sources at the time, including the South Holland District Council website and Google maps. There were no issues raised about the ability of consultees to locate or access the consultation events.
	Consultation website	Respondents stated that they were not able to access the Interactive Scheme Map on the website	N	The Applicant understands that the Interactive Scheme Map was functioning as intended throughout the consultation period. Should consultees have experienced any difficulties accessing the map, they

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
	Respondents raised various concerns about the accessibility of the Scheme website.			were encouraged to contact the project team via the Community Relations Team through the available communication channels so that assistance could be provided.
		Respondents questioned why the stage two consultation information materials, such as the PEIR had not been available on the website ahead of the launch of consultation. A few respondents noted that the documents had been uploaded after the official launch time	N	The PEIR was uploaded to the Scheme website on the day of the consultation launch: 24 April 2025. The first day of the 45-day consultation period was counted from the day after the launch, so it did not effect people's ability to respond to the consultation within the full consultation period provided.
		Respondents could not find the online feedback form on the Scheme website	N	The online feedback form was made available on the Scheme website throughout the consultation period. Consultees who experienced difficulty locating the form were encouraged to contact the Community Relations Team through the available communication channels for assistance.
		Respondents noted that they could not download the online feedback form	N	The feedback form was available on the Scheme website during the consultation period. Where consultees experienced difficulty accessing or downloading the form, they were encouraged to contact the Community Relations Team through the available communication channels so that alternative arrangements could be provided.
		Respondents found the website difficult to navigate	N	The Scheme website was designed to provide accessible information about the proposals and consultation materials. Where consultees experienced difficulty navigating the website, they were encouraged to contact the Community Relations Team through the available communication channels for assistance.
		Respondents suggested that had been an overreliance on online consultation participation. It was suggested that more information should have been posted to members of the local community to ensure those who could not access the internet were included	N	The Applicant remains confident that the consultation approach was proportionate and provided a range of opportunities for participation. In addition to online materials, in-person consultation events were held to ensure that those who preferred to engage face-to-face were able to do so. The consultation approach, including the balance of online and in-person engagement, was agreed with South Holland District Council and Lincolnshire County Council as part of the preparation of the Statement of Community Consultation.
	Consultation briefings Some respondents reflected on the quality and number of consultation briefings. It was suggested that the Applicant should have held	Respondents suggested that the Applicant should have held more briefings with parish councils and affected communities. Some expressed disappointment in the cancellation of a meeting	N	The Applicant remains confident that the consultation approach was proportionate and provided a range of opportunities for participation. In addition to online materials, in-person consultation events were held to ensure that those who preferred to engage face-to-face were able to do so. The consultation approach, including the balance of online and in-person engagement, was agreed with South Holland District Council

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
	additional meetings with members of the local community, to help them to ask questions and understand the proposals.			and Lincolnshire County Council as part of the preparation of the Statement of Community Consultation.
		Respondents suggested that the Applicant had deliberately conducted the minimum level of consultation with local communities and that it had been poorly managed	N	The Applicant notes that the statutory consultation went above and beyond the minimum requirements set out in the PA 2008.
		Respondents felt that there should have been more public meetings to allow local people to ask questions. It was suggested that a meeting should have been held in Whaplode Drove	N	The Applicant remains confident that the number and distribution of consultation events were appropriate. The consultation approach and locations of events were agreed with South Holland District Council and Lincolnshire County Council as part of the preparation of the Statement of Community Consultation.
	Trust and confidence in the Applicant	Respondents felt that the Applicant's motivation for bringing the Scheme forward was driven by the opportunity to make a profit Some noted that the decision to use overhead lines rather than underground cabling was financially motivated. Due to this reasoning, respondents did not feel that they could trust the Applicant as a responsible developer	N	The selection of an overhead line as the preferred technology for the grid connection is guided by national policy contained in the National Policy Statement for Electricity Networks, EN-5, which states that the Government's position that outside of nationally designated landscapes, overhead lines should be the strong starting presumption for electricity networks in general unless these would give rise to particularly significant landscape and visual effects.
		Respondents did not feel confident that the Applicant understood or cared about the local area Respondents did not feel that the Applicant was working in partnership with local communities, or that their feedback would be listened to and considered	N	The Applicant has sought to work with local communities throughout the consultation process to understand local views and concerns. Feedback received during consultation has been carefully considered and has informed the development of the Scheme, as detailed within the Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 5.1) and its appendices.
		Respondents did not trust the Applicant as a reliable or objective source of information about the Scheme Several reasons were given for this lack of confidence in the Applicant: • Some suggested the Applicant had presented biased data from ongoing surveys and assessments. Several respondents suggested that the environmental assessments should have been undertaken by an independent organisation. • Other respondents felt that the Applicant had insufficiently explored alternative sites during the selection process. • Respondents also stated that they could not trust that the Applicant had experience of managing	N	The surveys, assessments and reporting that support this DCO Application have been undertaken by a team of suitably qualified and experienced specialists in accordance with relevant legislation, policy and recognised good practice, as reported within the **Environmental Statement** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The Environmental Impact Assessment has been carried out in line with the relevant regulatory requirements and includes independent review through the examination process. The consideration of reasonable alternatives, including site selection and design evolution, is described in **ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The Applicant also notes that measures relating to the construction, operation and decommissioning of the Scheme are set out within the relevant management plans submitted with the application, including

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
		the construction, operation and decommissioning phases of a similar Scheme.		the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10), **OOEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.11) and the **ODEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.12).
		Respondents questioned whether the Applicant would own the Scheme for the duration of the construction, operation and decommissioning phases Respondents also suggested that further information on the Scheme's ownership and investors should be shared. Some concern was expressed towards the potential for foreign ownership or investment	N	Downing LLP is the ultimate beneficial owner of the Applicant. Downing LLP's approach is to own, develop and manage projects throughout their full lifecycle, rather than selling them to a third-party operator once development consent has been granted. The decommissioning of the Scheme will be secured through the DCO, which is a legally binding consent. Measures to manage the environmental effects associated with decommissioning are set out in the **ODEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.12), which will be secured by way of a Requirement in the DCO. In the highly unlikely scenario that the Applicant ceased business during the operational phase, funds would be set aside specifically to cover the cost of decommissioning. These dedicated reserves ensure that the Scheme could still be safely and responsibly decommissioned without financial risk to stakeholders or the environment.
		Respondents noted that the Applicant would have a duty of care for the environment and local communities if the Scheme received development consent	N	The Applicant recognises its responsibility to manage the environmental effects of the Scheme and to consider the interests of local communities. Measures to manage environmental effects during construction, operation and decommissioning are set out within the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10), the **OOEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.11) and the **ODEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.12), which will be secured by way of Requirements in the DCO.
		Respondents did not feel confident that the Scheme would be decommissioned by the Applicant. Some suggested that the chances of decommissioning may be reduced if ownership of the Scheme is transferred to a third party, or the land is repurposed for further development	N	Measures to manage and mitigate the environmental effects associated with the decommissioning of the Scheme are set out in the **ODEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.12), secured by way of a Requirement in the DCO. As a result of this obligation the Applicant would be setting aside funds during the operation of the Scheme to meet the cost of decommissioning. The requirements of the DCO are enforceable and it is a criminal offence to fail to comply with a DCO. The Proceeds of Crime Act 2002 also acts as a further deterrent, and elements of the installed solar PV represent a valuable asset meaning it would be in Applicant's interest financially to decommission the site in order to sell or recycle the panels and other components. If the undertaker went into liquidation or receivership, its assets would be sold off to fund the decommissioning of the Scheme that is required pursuant to the legal requirement of the DCO (in this context, it is relevant that the DCO is a piece of legislation, and therefore different to a planning permission).

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
		Respondents questioned what would happen to the Scheme if Meridian Solar Farm Limited went bankrupt during construction, operation or decommissioning phases	N	Measures to manage and mitigate the environmental effects associated with the decommissioning of the Scheme are set out in the **ODEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.12), secured by way of a Requirement in the DCO. As a result of this obligation the Applicant would be setting aside funds during the operation of the Scheme to meet the cost of decommissioning. The requirements of the DCO are enforceable and it is a criminal offence to fail to comply with a DCO. The Proceeds of Crime Act 2002 also acts as a further deterrent, and elements of the installed solar PV represent a valuable asset meaning it would be in Applicant's interest financially to decommission the site in order to sell or recycle the panels and other components. If the undertaker went into liquidation or receivership, its assets would be sold off to fund the decommissioning of the Scheme that is required pursuant to the legal requirement of the DCO (in this context, it is relevant that the DCO is a piece of legislation, and therefore different to a planning permission).
		Respondents suggested that there had been a lack of transparency from the Applicant regarding costs associated with the Scheme	N	The Applicant remains confident in the level of information provided throughout the consultation process was adequate.
		Respondents did not trust that the size of the indicative layout for the land parcels and inter-array areas was final; with some suggesting that a larger area might be consented later down the line	N	The Applicant reiterates that the scale and size of the Scheme being applied for has been transparently communicated throughout the pre-application process. **ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution** (Doc Ref. 6.1) describes the consideration of reasonable alternatives carried out by the Applicant in relation to the Site for the Scheme, layouts and choice of technology. It is supported by the **Planning Statement** (Doc Ref. 7.1), which provides an appraisal of alternative sites and demonstrates con, which provides an appraisal of alternative sites and demonstrates consideration of relevant policy and its applicability to the site evaluation process undertaken by the Applicant. The site being brought forward as part of this DCO Application has therefore undergone robust consideration so any change to something larger would need to go through a whole separate application process.
		Respondents stated that the Applicant should publish a commitment to consistent and ongoing communication with local residents during each phase of the Scheme	N	The Applicant remains committed to ongoing dialogue with the local community throughout all stages. The Community Relations channels will remain open throughout the consenting process. The Applicant further notes that a Community Liaison Manager will be appointed as a temporary facilitator of communications between communities and the Scheme's operators. During long-term general operation and maintenance activities, a member of the Scheme's operation and

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				maintenance team would also be in a dedicated 'community contact' position whereby they are responsible for monitoring community interaction to ensure community concerns are heard, responded to and suitably addressed throughout the duration of the Scheme's operation and maintenance phase. Further details of this are set out in the **OOEMP (Doc Ref. 7.11)** which forms part of the DCO Application.
	DCO Submission A small number of respondents raised concerns about the details included in the DCO submission for Meridian Solar. Some questioned how the Applicant would communicate any changes between the stage two consultation and the DCO submission.	Respondents suggested that the inter-array area poses a physical danger to aircrafts. They felt that if the grid connection infrastructure was not placed underground, the DCO application would be rejected by the Secretary of State	N	Following the consideration of feedback from the stage two consultation, the Scheme design has been refined to include an underground cable between land parcels A and B of the Solar Development Area. The key justification for this decision was to reduce potential effects on the nearby airfield.
		Respondents suggested that a justification for the height of the proposed pylons will need to be included in the DCO Application	N	The proposed Grid Connection overhead line is designed to industry standards, requirements and guidance. The pylon heights proposed are sufficient to maintain the relevant electrical clearances required from the conductors to the ground. This differs for the type of land use below the overhead line crossing i.e., road crossing, railway crossing, agricultural land and third party overhead assets. The pylons are designed to avoid unnecessary height increases as it is time, cost and resource efficient to keep the height as low as feasible from a technical perspective.
		Respondents noted that the traffic and access plans shown during the statutory consultation were indicative and subject to refinement. They queried how any changes would be communicated ahead of submission	N	The changes that have been made to the Scheme since statutory consultation are summarised within **ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution** (Doc Ref. 6.1). In terms of the access strategy, the main construction access points presented in the PEIR have been refined as summarised below. Further detail can be found in **ES Chapter 2: The Scheme (Doc Ref. 6.1)** and **ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution (Doc Ref. 6.1)**: • Land Parcel A and the Inter-Array Connection between Parcels A and B will be accessed via a temporary construction haul route which heads west from Barrier Bank. This will avoid construction vehicles using Cloot Drove and passing through Crowland. • Land Parcel B will be accessed via a temporary construction haul route going west from Martin's Road via the B1166. The HGV routeing has been revised, so that no HGV access will be allowed via Queen's Bank, where significant construction traffic noise effects were identified within the PEIR. The access via Queen's Bank will be for AILs and operational use only. In addition, within the PEIR, the access point from Martin's Road was identified directly to the north of Martin's Farm, with

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				construction vehicles routeing past the residential properties. A new access point has now been identified to the south of Martin's Farm, so that construction vehicles would turn off the Martin's Road before passing the residential properties. • Land Parcel C will be accessed via a new access route going east from Martin's Road via the B1166. Similarly to the Parcel B access, the new access point has been located south of the residential properties at Martin's Farm. • Land Parcel D (Langary Gate Road) will be accessed from the A16 via B1166, and Langary Gate Road. To reduce the number of new watercourse crossings required, 14 existing field accesses will be upgraded to provide access to each of the individual fields that make up Parcel D. • The Inter-Array Connection between Parcels C and D will be accessed from B1166 via Back Bank and B1168 Holbeach Drove Gate. This will reduce the number of new watercourse crossings required and make use of existing field accesses. • The accesses to the north and central areas of the Grid Connection Route have been maintained via A151 High Road and B1165 Austendike Road, with the latter only proposed as a secondary access to reduce the amount of traffic travelling through Weston Hills. • Instead of an access off Moulton Chapel Road, a new access directly off the A16 has been proposed, which will avoid traffic impacts on residential properties on Moulton Chapel Road. An alternative access route would also be provided via the Queens Bank crossing point from Parcel B.
		Respondents requested that the Applicant truthfully represented the opinions and feedback of local residents in the DCO submission	N	The Applicant wishes to assure all respondents that their feedback and comments have been considered throughout the consultation process.
		Respondents questioned why the Applicant was submitting their application for Meridian Solar ahead of the application for the Weston Marsh Substation. It was noted that Meridian Solar is reliant on Weston Marsh for a connection to the national grid	N	The Applicant is required to make timely progress with the application to allow sufficient time for the consent process, procurement and construction of the Scheme. It is correct that the Scheme is reliant on the Grimsby to Walpole project to develop and build a substation at Weston Marsh as this will be our point of connection. The Applicant is engaging with National Grid Electricity Transmission (NGET) to ensure that the Scheme is connected in line with the dates of the Connection Agreement.

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
	DCO Process Respondents raised general concerns about the consultation process for DCO projects.	Respondents felt that the consultation process during the pre-application phase of the DCO process for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIPs) was flawed due to a lack of finalised documentation	N	The Applicant notes these comments but remains confident in the level of information provided throughout the pre-application consultation process and ultimately within the DCO as applied for.
	Financial Compensation Respondents raised concerns about the potential impact of the Scheme on property values. Some suggested that affected persons should receive financial compensation.	Respondents stated that residential properties and local businesses directly impacted by the Scheme should receive financial compensation Respondents suggested that any properties devalued as a result of the Scheme should receive compensation	N	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.
		Respondents stated that they would take legal action if damage and structural issues to their property were incurred from Scheme construction traffic	N	The Applicant will work with those involved in the construction of the Scheme to ensure that the contractor operates within the parameters of the DCO as applied for. During construction, efforts will be made to minimise any potential damage, as set out in the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10), **OOEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.11) and **ODEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.12). The measures outlined within these plans will be secured by way of Requirements in the DCO. The final CEMP, OEMP and DEMP will be submitted for approval by the relevant planning authority prior to the relevant phase of the Scheme commencing.
		Respondents raised concerns at the lack of funding to support landowners with surveys and ownership questionnaires. It was suggested that the surveys were complex and time-consuming, which may result in inaccurate results	N	The information requested from landowners forms part of the statutory processes associated with preparing the DCO and is required to ensure that land interests are accurately identified. The Applicant sought to make the process as clear and straightforward as possible and provided contact details for the project team so that landowners could seek clarification or assistance where required.
	Compulsory Purchase Orders A few respondents raised concerns about the potential use of Compulsory Purchase Orders by the Applicant, and the consequences for owners and prospective owners of impacted land and property	Respondents raised concerns about the possibility of their properties and land being acquired by a compulsory purchase order by the Applicant	N	The Applicant is aware the DCO, if successful would give the Applicant the powers to acquire land and rights compulsorily but the intention if for the Applicant to obtain land voluntarily. The Applicant is not intending to acquire any private residence or farmsteads for the DCO application.
		Respondents suggested that the use of compulsory purchase orders by private developers was unethical	N	Whilst compulsory purchase is a method of land resort, ultimately government sanctions the compulsory acquisition for infrastructure schemes by way of compulsory purchase orders or a DCO as the Scheme is an NSIP and a CNP.

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
		Respondents raised concerns about the impact that compulsory purchases may have on the ability to access a mortgage for other properties close to the boundary	N	The inclusion of land within the Order Limits does not prevent landowners from continuing to use or deal with their property. Compulsory acquisition powers, if granted, would only be exercised in accordance with the powers and procedures set out in the DCO and the relevant statutory framework. The Applicant will continue to engage with affected landowners and will seek to secure the necessary land rights by agreement wherever possible.
		Respondents questioned what would happen to any compulsory purchased land and/or properties in the event of bankruptcy	N	The Applicant acknowledges this comment and can confirm this a highly unlikely scenario. However, if this was the case once the land is compulsory acquired, the land would have to be offered back to the landowner or their successors in title under the Critchel Down Rules.
	Supply Chain (General) Respondents expressed a sense of uncertainty and concern towards the Scheme's supply chain. Respondents expressed concerns about how the Applicant would ensure any sub-contracted and outsourced work complied with UK ethical and environmental standards.	Respondents expressed concerns about the security, environmental accountability, and transparency of a global Scheme infrastructure supply chain	N	The Applicant will be undertaking a comprehensive procurement process should the Scheme gain consent. The Applicant is committed to building sites with only manufacturers and contractors who have pledged to prevent modern slavery in the supply chain. The balance of system components are generally sourced from the UK and EU. The Applicant is a member of the Solar Energy UK and subscribe to their Responsible Sourcing Guidance and best practices.
		Respondents suggested that solar PV panels produced in China may be unreliable and pose a security risk. Some suggested that the panels would be installed with "kill switches"	N	The Applicant refutes the claim that any solar panels produced in China pose a security risk or are unreliable in any capacity.
		Respondents raised significant concern about the risk that contractors involved in the supply chain would be complicit in modern slavery, child and forced labour. Concern was also expressed toward the lack of transparency over working conditions and worker's rights in the countries involved in the supply chain. Many suggested that outsourcing labour was unethical	N	The Applicant will be undertaking a comprehensive procurement process should the Scheme gain consent. The Applicant is committed to building sites with only manufacturers and contractors who have pledged to prevent modern slavery in the supply chain. The balance of system components are generally sourced from the UK and EU. The Applicant is a member of the Solar Energy UK and subscribe to their Responsible Sourcing Guidance and best practices
	Waste and recycling Respondents raised a variety of concerns about how the Applicant would process waste generated by the Scheme. Concerns were raised	Respondents raised concerns about whether the Applicant would recycle the solar PV panels Respondents suggested that the solar PV panels were made of mainly non-recyclable elements, which would	N	As stated in **ES Chapter 2: The Scheme (Doc Ref. 6.1)** all infrastructure removed from the Site would be recycled or disposed of in accordance with good practice and taking lessons learnt from schemes of a similar size and nature. The Scheme would apply the waste hierarchy and, where possible, look to prevent, re-use or recycle waste.

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
	about whether materials would be recycled, and the potential environmental impact of processing the waste.	harm the environment and generate high levels of waste upon replacement and disposal		The impact of the Scheme in terms of waste is assessed within **Section 16.6** of **ES Chapter 16: Other Environmental Topics (Doc Ref. 6.1)**. The assessment concludes no significant effects are expected.
		Respondents raised questions about how the Applicant would recycle the ground-mounts which secure the solar PV panels in place	N	As stated **in ES Chapter 2: The Scheme (Doc Ref. 6.1)** all infrastructure removed from the Site (including ground-mounts) would be recycled or disposed of in accordance with good practice and taking lessons learnt from schemes of a similar size and nature. The Scheme would apply the waste hierarchy and, where possible, look to prevent, re-use or recycle waste.
		Respondents suggested that the solar PV panels would be sent to landfill due to the costs of recycling	N	As stated in **ES Chapter 2: The Scheme (Doc Ref. 6.1)** all infrastructure removed from the Site (including solar PV panels) would be recycled or disposed of in accordance with good practice and taking lessons learnt from schemes of a similar size and nature. The Scheme would apply the waste hierarchy and, where possible, look to prevent, re-use or recycle waste.
		Respondents raised concerns about the lifespan of the BESS components and whether they could be disposed of without negatively impacting the environment. Some respondents raised questions about whether these elements would be recycled by the Applicant	N	The Waste Electrical and Electronic Equipment (WEEE) Regulations[2] and The Waste Batteries and Accumulators Regulations[3]**Error! Bookmark not defined.** place obligations on those who place batteries on the market to finance the costs of collection, treatment, recovery and environmentally sound disposal; and the landfill tax strongly incentivise reuse, recycling and recovery. The UK market for lithium-ion battery recycling is under development, as the fleet of electric vehicles and other lithium-ion battery users rapidly increases. A number of new investments have been announced, and an 80% recovery rate is reported[4]. The **OOEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.11) and **ODEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.12), submitted with the DCO Application, sets out the commitment of the Applicant to maximise recycling and reuse of the Scheme components at the end of their life.
		Respondents raised concerns about how any plastic used in the construction, operation and decommissioning phases of the Scheme would be recycled	N	As stated within **ES Chapter 16: Other Environmental Topics (Doc Ref. 6.1)** plastics would be recycled or recovered by other means e.g. energy recovery.
		Respondents raised concerns about the long-term human and environmental impacts of any toxic or non-recyclable waste generated by the Scheme	N	As stated within **ES Chapter 16: Other Environmental Topics (Doc Ref. 6.1)** minimal hazardous waste is expected to be generated by the Scheme. Any hazardous waste will be disposed in line with industry guidance.

[2] Waste Electrical and Electronic Equipment (WEEE) Regulations 2013. Available at: https://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2013/3113/contents [Accessed 29 September 2025]
[3] The Waste Batteries and Accumulators Regulations 2009. Available at: https://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2009/890/contents [Accessed 29 September 2025]
[4] RS Bruce Metals and Machinery Ltd (2023). Battery Recycling. Available at: https://www.rsbruce.com/battery-recycling

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
		Respondents did not feel confident that any packaging used to in the transportation of Scheme infrastructure, including solar PV panels, would be recycled	N	As stated within **ES Chapter 16: Other Environmental Topics (Doc Ref. 6.1)** packaging would be recycled or recovered by other means e.g. energy recovery.
		Respondents did not feel that the Applicant had adequately detailed their recycling plan as part of the decommissioning process	N	Further detail regarding recycling is provided within **Section 16.6** of **ES Chapter 16: Other Environmental Topics (Doc Ref. 6.1)**. The **ODEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.12), submitted with the DCO Application, sets out the commitment of the Applicant to maximise recycling and reuse of the Scheme components at the end of their life.
	Carbon Footprint Respondents raised concerns about the carbon footprint of the Scheme. It was noted that key activities involved across the construction, operation and decommissioning phases would generate carbon emissions, thus impacting the carbon payback of the Scheme. Some respondents felt that the involvement of fossil fuels and finite resources to build Scheme infrastructure undermines the Scheme's ability to be environmentally sustainable.	Respondents raised concerns about the carbon footprint of the Scheme Respondents stated that activities, such as outsourcing and importing materials to construct and maintain the Scheme, would contribute to global carbon emissions and contradict the objectives of the Scheme as a driver of net zero	N	The impact of the Scheme on carbon emissions has been assessed within the GHG assessment presented in **ES Chapter 7: Climate Change (Doc Ref. 6.1)**. The chapter concludes that the Scheme demonstrates significant carbon savings, which considered to have a significant beneficial impact on the climate. The assessment takes into account the embedded carbon associated with the manufacture of the BESS and Solar PV components as well as emissions associated with water, energy and fuel use for construction activities, transportation of materials and workers to the Site and the transportation and disposal of construction waste.
		Respondents did not feel that the Applicant had provided adequate information on the carbon footprint of the Scheme	N	The impact of the Scheme on carbon emissions has been assessed within the GHG assessment presented in **ES Chapter 7: Climate Change (Doc Ref. 6.1)**. The chapter concludes that the Scheme demonstrates significant carbon savings, which considered to have a significant beneficial impact on the climate. The assessment takes into account the embedded carbon associated with the manufacture of the BESS and Solar PV components as well as emissions associated with water, energy and fuel use for construction activities, transportation of materials and workers to the Site and the transportation and disposal of construction waste.
		Respondents questioned the carbon payback of the Scheme. It was noted that the carbon payback should be calculated by considering the full life cycle impacts of the Scheme, including material extraction, transportation, and disposal methods	N	The impact of the Scheme on carbon emissions has been assessed within the GHG assessment presented in **ES Chapter 7: Climate Change (Doc Ref. 6.1)**. The chapter concludes that the Scheme demonstrates significant carbon savings, which considered to have a significant beneficial impact on the climate. The assessment takes into account the embedded carbon associated with full lifecycle of the Scheme (construction, maintenance and decommissioning) which includes embedded carbon associated with the Scheme components, transportation and disposal methods.

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
		Respondents raised concerns about the use of fossil fuels in the creation of solar PV panels It was noted that this carbon intensive process would significantly increase the carbon footprint of the Scheme. Respondents frequently referred to China as the potential primary source of Scheme infrastructure	N	The impact of the Scheme on carbon emissions (including the embedded carbon within solar PV panels) has been assessed within the GHG assessment presented in **ES Chapter 7: Climate Change (Doc Ref. 6.1)**. The chapter concludes that the Scheme demonstrates significant carbon savings, which considered to have a significant beneficial impact on the climate.
		Respondents raised concerns about the use of finite resources for BESS and the carbon footprint generated from mining the raw materials	N	The impact of the Scheme on carbon emissions (including the embedded carbon within the BESS) has been assessed within the GHG assessment presented in **ES Chapter 7: Climate Change (Doc Ref. 6.1)**. The chapter concludes that the Scheme demonstrates significant carbon savings, which considered to have a significant beneficial impact on the climate.
		Respondents raised concerns about the emissions generated during the construction phase, particularly from the transportation and construction vehicles A respondent also suggested that the emissions generated from any road upgrades to accommodate construction vehicle access should be included in any carbon emission assessments	N	The impact of the Scheme on carbon emissions has been assessed within the GHG assessment presented in **ES Chapter 7: Climate Change (Doc Ref. 6.1)**. The chapter concludes that the Scheme demonstrates significant carbon savings, which considered to have a significant beneficial impact on the climate. The assessment takes into account the embedded carbon associated with full lifecycle of the Scheme (construction, maintenance and decommissioning) which includes embedded carbon associated with the Scheme components, transportation and disposal methods.
		Respondents suggested that the carbon emissions generated by the importing of goods from should be considered in national carbon emission figures and targets	N	The impact of the Scheme on carbon emissions has been assessed within the GHG assessment presented in **ES Chapter 7: Climate Change** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The chapter concludes that the Scheme demonstrates significant carbon savings, which considered to have a significant beneficial impact on the climate. The assessment takes into account the embedded carbon associated with full lifecycle of the Scheme (construction, maintenance and decommissioning) which includes embedded carbon associated with the Scheme components, transportation and disposal methods. As stated within **ES Chapter 7: Climate Change** (Doc Ref. 6.1) the transport of materials to Site is based on industry standard Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors (RICS) assumptions (**Table 7-13**) in the absence of specific data.
		Respondents did not feel confident that UK solar farms would have a tangible impact in reducing the global carbon footprint	N	The impact of the Scheme on carbon emissions has been assessed within the GHG assessment presented in **ES Chapter 7: Climate Change** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The chapter concludes that the Scheme demonstrates

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				significant carbon savings, which considered to have a significant beneficial impact on the climate.
		Respondents suggested that the Scheme would contribute to an increase in the national reliance on imported food, thus increasing the UK's global carbon footprint It was felt that this would undermine the objectives of the Scheme	N	The utilised agricultural area (UAA) in the UK was 16.8 million hectares (ha) in 2024. The agricultural land taken for the Scheme represents less than 0.01% of the UAA and is not expected to have a significant impact on national food production and security or the carbon footprint that already exists in the importation of food. The **Planning Statement** (Doc Ref. 7.1) has been prepared, which sets out the critical benefits of the Scheme, including supplying low-cost, secure energy to the nation.
		Respondents emphasised the importance of reducing the UK's carbon footprint, and the importance of taking a holistic approach	N	The Applicant notes this response and agrees. Meridian Solar provides the opportunity to ensure a mix of renewable energy technologies are utilised in the UK's pursuit of clean power.

2.13. Operational phase

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
Operational Phase	**Access to Grid Connection, specifically tower locations** Concerns about access to the towers when the Project is operational included the noise pollution, impact on active farmland and damage to this land.	Respondent expressed concern about noise pollution from workers accessing the tower	N	During the operational phase, it is anticipated that annual inspections of the Grid Connection Route would be completed from the ground or by air (e.g. by drone or helicopter) to identify any visible faults or signs of wear. Inspections would include the identification of vegetation growth or development that has occurred that may either risk infringing clearances or could compromise the integrity of the assets. Operational maintenance would be infrequent and completed in compliance with the environmental management measures set out within the **OOEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.11). No significant noise effects from operational maintenance are considered likely.
		Respondent expressed concern that access to the towers will cut across active farmland. Access to manage the land will be difficult as result and cause damage to the soil	N	The Applicant notes that future operational and maintenance accesses have been carefully considered to utilise existing access points from the highway via gates, gaps in vegetation and existing agricultural access points. These accesses have also been drawn to use existing tracks where possible, follow field boundaries in the absence of the track and make use of existing tram-lines. Operational access would be taken from the access locations listed within Table 2-2 of **ES Chapter 2: The Scheme** (Doc Ref. 6.1) and shown on **ES Figure 2-5: Construction, Operational and Decommissioning Accesses** (Doc Ref. 6.2). Existing farm accesses may also be used infrequently for the purposes of completing annual inspections of the Grid Connection and minor maintenance works. For future access, the Applicant will notify the landowner of their intended access and ensure the most efficient and least impactful path is taken to the Scheme in accordance with landowner agreements with the impacted landowners. Measures are included within the **OOEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.11) to limit impacts which includes a complaints procedure in the unlikely event an issue arises.
	Access to Grid Connection, specifically oversail Concerns about access to the oversail when the Project is operational included the change in	Respondents expressed concern regarding access to grid connection and this would change the peaceful, rural character of the area. These are believed to not be easily screened or softened	N	The Applicant notes that, as set out in the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13), there are 6 construction accesses from public roads or 8 public road crossings with the internal haul route within the Grid Connection Route. It is anticipated that there will be a maximum of 205 construction staff, 75 HGVs and 75 LGVs associated with the Grid Connection Route during the peak construction period of Q1 2030. To manage traffic in

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
	the landscape and cross into active farmland.			local areas, the contractor will implement a shuttle bus strategy, with details to be determined closer to the start of the construction phase, when more information on staff locations is available. Shuttle bus pick-up and drop-off locations will be planned around staff accommodation centres to maximise uptake. These details are secured by requirement in the **Draft DCO** (Doc Ref. 3.1) to produce a detailed CTMP. For accesses, existing hedgerow gaps have been used wherever possible in the design and layout of the construction and maintenance accesses. Whilst some hedgerow loss will occur, such as at visibility splays, this will be fully compensated for by new planting and the enhancement of existing hedgerows. 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 Assessment** (Doc Ref. 6.3), with a summary provided within Section 12.8 **of ES Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual** (Doc Ref. 6.1).
	OHL and Tower Maintenance Concerns about the overhead line and tower maintenance during the operational phase related to birds, use of old technology and road use.	Respondent expressed concern about the migration corridor for birds, such as swans, geese and swallows	N	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 with the implementation of mitigation measures committed to in the management plans submitted with the DCO Application. Mitigation measures have been included to minimise 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 **Design Parameters** (Doc Ref. 7.4) and **Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan** (Doc Ref 7.11).
		Respondent expressed concern that old technology is being used. Therefore, maintenance such as helicopter surveys and regular replacement will be required	N	As stated in **ES Chapter 2: The Scheme** (Doc Ref. 6.1) it is anticipated that annual inspections of the Inter-Array Connections and Grid Connection Route would be completed from the ground or by air (e.g. by drone or helicopter) to identify any visible faults or signs of wear. Measures to minimise disturbance from operational maintenance are set out within the **Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan** (Doc Ref 7.11).
		Respondent would prefer internal farm access rather than using local roads for maintenance vehicles. Concerns include the noise and dust	N	As stated within **ES Chapter 2: The Scheme** (Doc Ref. 6.1) operational access would be taken from the access locations listed in Table 2-2 and shown on **ES Figure 2-5: Construction, Operational and Decommissioning Accesses** (Doc Ref. 6.2). Existing farm accesses along the Grid Connection Route would only be used infrequently for the purposes of completing annual inspections and minor maintenance

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				works. Measures are included within the **OOEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.11) to limit impacts associated with dust and noise. This includes a complaints procedure in the unlikely event an issue arises.
	Other Operational Concerns Other concerns during the operational phase relating to the grid connection was the ownership and security of the Project and the upholding of decommissioning plans.	Respondent expressed concern about the security of the project if the ownership is held and controlled by a foreign country	N	Matters relating to the nationality of ownership or control of a development are not material planning considerations for the purposes of determining an application for development consent under the PA 2008. The Scheme would be constructed, operated and decommissioned in accordance with UK planning law, the requirements of the DCO, and all relevant regulatory and statutory controls, regardless of ownership structure.
		Respondents expressed concerns about whether the decommissioning phase will be upheld at the end of the Scheme	N	The Scheme is proposed as a time-limited development, with an operational period of up to 40 years, which is secured through the **Draft DCO** (Doc Ref. 3.1). The DCO requires the approval and implementation of a Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP) which will be largely consistent with the **ODEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.12) and secured by way of requirement in the **Draft DCO** (Doc Ref. 3.1). The DEMP will set out the approach to decommissioning having regard to best practice, relevant government guidance and policy in force at the time, and the landowner agreements. The Environmental Statement assesses the likely effects of decommissioning on this basis. Accordingly, while the detailed method of decommissioning will reflect the standards and circumstances applicable at the end of the operational life, the DCO provides the legal mechanism to ensure that decommissioning is properly planned and carried out, and that the land is appropriately restored.
	Access to land parcels A, B, C and D Concerns about accessing these land parcels during the operational phase are all related to traffic.	Respondents expressed concern that traffic from access to land parcels A, B and C will increase noise and air pollution. Suggestions included routing traffic straight off the A16 between Cowbit and Crowland directly to the Site	N	During the operational phase, it is anticipated that the Scheme would be manned by a nominal number of staff across the Solar Development Area (10 full time equivalent (FTE) staff), predominantly undertaking maintenance tasks. In addition, there is expected to be approximately 5 visitors per week (equating to 1 per day) for deliveries. As a worst-case scenario, this would generate up to 11 vehicles (22 two-way movements) per day. These may be four-wheel drive vehicles, HGVs or transit vans for maintenance. Replacement of infrastructure is expected to generate up to a maximum of 40 HGVs (or 80 two-way HGV movements) per day, and up to 75 staff car trips (150 two-way movements) per day. This is considerably

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				lower than the level of vehicle trips generated during the peak construction phase, equating to approximately 20% of both the HGV and LGV/car movements generated during peak construction of the Solar Development Area and Grid Connection Route. As set out within **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref. 6.1), due to the low level of operational traffic to be generated by the Scheme, no significant effects are likely to occur.
		Respondents expressed concern regarding access to land parcel D. Concerns included the proximity to properties, a local school in Dowsdale Bank, the increase in congestion, risks of accidents and damage to road infrastructure. Suggestions include using the B1166 instead of Dowsdale Bank and Cox's Drove	N	Since the PEIR, the Traffic and Access assessment has been finalised and is contained within **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref. 6.1). Traffic management measures are detailed within the **Outline CTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13). In terms of traffic management routes these are shown in **ES Figure 15-3 Heavy Goods Vehicle (HGV Routing)** (Doc Ref. 6.2), and **ES Figure 15-4 Abnormal Indivisible Load (AIL) Routing** (Doc Ref. 6.2)). For the Solar Development Area, construction vehicles would utilise points of access from Barrier Bank/ Spalding Road, Martins Road and Langary Gate Road for Land Parcels A, B & C and D respectively. Dowsdale Bank and Cox's drove will not be used for construction traffic, which will prevent construction traffic routing past Shepeau Stow Primary School on Dowsdale Bank. The Applicant further notes that details on how construction traffic will be managed to mitigate impacts, including potential congestion, accidents and damage to roads, are set out in the **OCTMP** (Doc. Ref. 7.13). This includes a commitment to undertake road condition surveys during pre-construction, construction, and post-construction. Any defects that arise to highways assets/vergers during the construction phase of the Scheme would be identified and reinstated, this includes Langary Gate Road.

2.14. Other non-grid infrastructure

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
Other non-grid infrastructure	**BESS/on-site substation compound locations** Respondents felt that BESS/on-site substation compounds should be moved further away from communities and closer to the connection point. Respondents commented that further information on the location and design of BESS/on-site substation compounds would be useful.	Respondents thought that the solar PV land parcels should be sited closer to the proposed connection point	N	The Applicant notes that the justification and narrative for the selection of the land parcels for the Solar Development Area is contained within **Appendix D: Site Selection Report** of the **Planning Statement** (Doc Ref. 7.1). In considering the site selection criteria, it is not considered that there are available alternative sites closer to the proposed location of Weston Marsh substation.
		Respondents felt that the development should be moved further away from communities	N	D The location and layout of the Scheme have been informed by a site selection process which considered environmental constraints, technical feasibility and land availability. Further details of the site selection process and design evolution are set out in **ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution** (Doc Ref. 6.1), **Appendix D: Site Selection Report** (Doc Ref. 7.1) and **Design Approach Document** (Doc Ref 7.3).
		Respondents felt that the development's BESS/on-site substation compound could have been better designed	N	All BESS has been relocated to the On-Site 400kV Substation Compound. Centralising the BESS in one location 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. The BESS and Sub Stations have been designed to comply with industry standards, relevant legislation and safety considerations, including Horlock Rules. Further information is set out within the **Design Approach Document** (Doc Ref. 7.3).
		Respondent expressed concern about placement of substations near roads	N	The location of the Sub Stations was chosen to comply with industry standards, relevant legislation and safety considerations, including Horlock Rules. Further information is set out within the **Design Approach Document** (Doc Ref. 7.3). The location was optimised as much as practicable whilst still considering the external factors that determined the possible locations of the sub station. **ES Chapter 2: The**

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				Scheme (Doc Ref. 6.1) confirms details of the BESS design and substation compounds including their location within the Scheme.
		Respondents felt that the applicant has not provided enough information about the location and design of BESS/on-site substation compounds	N	The Applicant remains confident that the level of information provided was adequate for the purpose of the pre-application consultation and engagement. The Scheme layout has been optimised to locate the BESS and On-Site Substations as far as practicable from sensitive receptors. **ES Chapter 2: The Scheme** (Doc Ref. 6.1) confirms details of the BESS design and substation compounds including their location within the Scheme.
		Respondent felt that the BESS should be located closer to emergency services	N	The Applicant notes the comment. The location of the BESS has been informed by technical, environmental and safety considerations as part of the Scheme design process, as set out in **ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The Applicant has engaged with relevant stakeholders, including emergency services, during the preparation of the application. Battery safety and emergency response arrangements are set out in the **O BSMP** (Doc Ref. 7.18), which will be subject to approval by the relevant planning authority in consultation with relevant emergency services and secured by way of a Requirement in the **Draft DCO** (Doc Ref. 3.1).
		Respondents felt that the BESS/on-site substation compounds should not be located on farmland	N	The Scheme layout has been designed to locate the BESS and On-Site Substations as far as practicable from sensitive receptors. **ES Chapter 2: The Scheme** (Doc Ref. 6.1) confirms details of the BESS design and substation compounds, including their location within the Scheme. The location of this infrastructure has been informed by environmental, technical and land availability considerations, with the Scheme designed to minimise the permanent loss of agricultural land where practicable. Further details of the site selection process and design evolution are set out in **ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution** (Doc Ref. 6.1) and **Appendix D: Site Selection Report** (Doc Ref. 7.1).
		Respondent felt that BESS/on-site substation compounds would bring noise issues	N	The Scheme layout has been optimised to locate the BESS and On-Site Substations as far as practicable from sensitive receptors. The BESS and On-Site Substation Compound locations are fixed via the **Works Plans** (Doc Ref. 2.3) and are all proposed over 350m from residential properties. As confirmed in **ES Chapter 13: Noise and Vibration** (Doc Ref. 6.1), the BESS compound and On-Site Substations, operational plant noise levels are predicted to be no greater than minor adverse and not significant following the implementation of proposed mitigation via detailed

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				design. Whilst there is a requirement for flexibility in the design of the Scheme going forward, the Applicant has committed to operational noise levels that are no greater than those assessed in the ES.
		Respondent felt that the placement of BESS/on-site substation compounds near housing would reduce property value	N	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.
		Respondent felt that substations should be built on site	N	The Scheme includes the necessary electrical infrastructure required for its operation, including on-site substations, as described in **ES Chapter 2: The Scheme** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The location and design of these components have been informed by environmental, technical and engineering considerations as part of the Scheme design process.
		Respondent thought that the BESS/on-site substations could face flood risks due to their location	N	The Applicant acknowledges that areas of the Scheme are located within flood zones. **ES Appendix 11-3: Flood Risk Assessment (FRA)** (Doc Ref. 6.3) has therefore been produced for the Scheme and considers risk both to, and arising from, the Scheme. As part of this, mitigation is proposed to manage the potential impacts of flood risk so that the Scheme does not increase or exacerbate flood risk to others and can continue to safely operate at times of flood. This includes elements being sequentially located to avoid areas of greatest flood risk, such the BESS Compound, 400 kV Substation, and 132 kV Substations being located outside Flood Zone 3 associated with the Postland Catchment and South Holland Main Drain. Whilst these are still located within the Flood Zone associated with the River Welland, this is in the undefended scenario, whilst in practice the risk of flooding from the River Welland is mitigated by the existing flood defences that provide protection up to a 1 in 1,000 year flood event. In addition, design measures have been specified to minimise flood risk in the event of a breach of the River Welland flood defences. This includes bunding

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				and/or flood defence walls surrounding the BESS Compound and 400 kV Substation, and 132 kV Substations. **ES Appendix 11-4: Outline Drainage Strategy** (Doc Ref. 6.3) has been prepared to support the DCO Application. This considers runoff from the Scheme and proposes sustainable drainage techniques that will be implemented to manage this. This will be developed into a detailed Drainage Strategy post consent, following the detailed design of the BESS and On-Site Substations Compounds. With proposed mitigation measures in place, **ES Appendix 11-3: FRA** (Doc Ref. 6.3) concludes that there would be no significant effect to flood risk levels within and surrounding the BESS Compound and On-Site Substations as a result of the Scheme.
	BESS/on-site substation compound locations – mitigation Respondents think that they need further information on BESS/on-site substation compound mitigation measures in reference to fire risk and water contamination.	Respondents felt that BESS compounds should be smaller	N	Throughout the pre-application design process the Applicant has endeavoured to minimise the installed area by utilising best design practice and undertaking regular iterations of the design process. Early engagement with industry has enabled the Applicant to produce an optimised layout taking into account potential new innovations with future BESS Technologies.
		Respondent suggested that the proposed fencing surrounding BESS and substation compounds would vary in height and design, which would exacerbate the visual impact of the infrastructure.	N	As described within **ES Chapter 2: The Scheme** (Doc Ref. 6.1), metal palisade type fencing up to 2.5m in height would be used around the On-Site Substation and BESS Compounds. Further fencing up to 3m in height may be required to enclose electrical equipment within each compound. The landscape and visual effects of the On-Site Substation and BESS 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). 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.
		Respondent thought that glare would be a problem	N	**ES Appendix 16-2: Glint and Glare Assessment** (Doc Ref. 6.3) confirms that all glint and glare impacts from the Scheme are anticipated to be Low or None with proposed mitigation in place. No glint and glare impacts are anticipated from BESS Enclosures and On-Site Substations.
		Respondent felt that fences would be stand out from a distance	N	**ES Chapter 2: The Scheme** (Doc Ref. 6.1) confirms that the BESS and On-Site Substations compounds would be enclosed by metal palisade type fencing up to approximately 2.5m in height with further fencing,

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				up to approximately 3m in height, potentially required to enclose electrical equipment within each compound. The landscape and visual impact of the Scheme have been assessed in **ES Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual** (Doc Ref. 6.1). 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 BESS / on-site substation compound.
		Respondent questioned the applicant's proposed mitigation to fire risk	N	Fire risk is considered within Section 16.5 of **ES Chapter 16: Other Environmental Topics** (Doc Ref. 6.1). Though considered unlikely, the BESS and substations associated with the Scheme present a risk of fire or explosions. Mitigation measures are discussed in the chapter and summarised below. The BSMP, which will be prepared in accordance with the **OBSMP** (Doc Ref. 7.18) and secured by way of Requirement in the DCO, ensures that the final BESS compound will be designed in accordance with prevailing industry standards and good practice at the time of detailed design and implementation. As set out within the **OBSMP** (Doc Ref. 7.18), the BESS units proposed for the Scheme will have built in safety features including cooling systems, fire resistant construction, fire detection, suppression systems, emergency stop functions and isolation monitoring, which are designed to regulate temperatures to within safe conditions to minimise the risk of fire. The broader BESS compound will include further measures, including ensuring adequate provision of land for water storage, and adequate separation between battery enclosures to ensure an isolated fire would not become widespread and lead to a major incident. The **OBSMP** (Doc Ref. 7.18) has been prepared in consultation with the local Fire and Rescue Service (FRS). The Final Battery Safety Management Plan, to be developed at the detailed design stage, would be subject to approval by the local FRS. Fire risks associated with substations will be controlled through compliance with Construction (Design and Management) Regulations 2015 and Regulatory Reform (Fire Safety) Order 2005 , which will ensure that the risks are mitigated through design in accordance with a fire risk assessment. Section 16.5 of **ES Chapter 16: Other Environmental Topics** (Doc Ref. 6.1) concludes that with the implementation of the above measures,

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				risks associated with fire and explosion are as low as reasonably practicable and not significant.
		Respondents felt that mitigation provisions were required to prevent contamination in the event of a fire	N	The BSMP, which will be prepared in accordance with the **OBSMP** (Doc Ref. 7.18) and secured by way of Requirement in the DCO, sets out the controls in place to ensure that, in the unlikely event a fire did occur, any impacts arising from the fire and/or the actions implemented to control it (such as contaminated fumes and/or water run off) are managed appropriately so there are minimal impacts from contamination on the surrounding communities and environment. The BESS Enclosures would have automatic fire detection systems in place along with fire suppression systems. Water storage tanks and hydrants would be provided to have a storage volume up to approximately 360,000 litres to allow a discharge rate of approximately 1,500 litres per minute over a 4-hour period. In the case of an incident, fire water would be contained within the attenuated subbase of the gravel compound by a penstock valve to be pumped out and disposed of off-site by a specialist contractor to ensure the surrounding area is not polluted. An Unplanned Emissions Assessment has been provided within **ES Appendix 16-4** (Doc Ref. 6.3) to consider potential impacts from toxic emissions released in the unlikely event of a BESS fire. This document demonstrates that after a distance of approximately 200m from the fire, any toxic emissions (hydrogen fluoride used as a proxy) would reduce to below the acute exposure guideline levels published by Public Health England. Given that the BESS Compound would be sited a minimum of 350m from residential receptors, concentrations will be below relevant health thresholds at any existing residential receptor location.
		Respondents felt that the applicant should provide further information on BESS/substation fire mitigation measures	N	The BSMP, which will be prepared in accordance with the **OBSMP** (Doc Ref. 7.18) and secured by way of Requirement in the DCO, ensures that the final BESS compound will be designed in accordance with prevailing industry standards and good practice at the time of detailed design and implementation. As set out within the **OBSMP** (Doc Ref. 7.18), the BESS units proposed for the Scheme will have built in safety features including cooling systems, fire resistant construction, fire detection, suppression systems, emergency stop functions and isolation monitoring, which are designed to regulate temperatures to within safe conditions to minimise the risk of fire. The broader BESS compound will include further measures,

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				including ensuring adequate provision of land for water storage, and adequate separation between battery enclosures to ensure an isolated fire would not become widespread and lead to a major incident. The **OBSMP** (Doc Ref. 7.18) has been prepared in consultation with the local Fire and Rescue Service (FRS). The Final Battery Safety Management Plan, to be developed at the detailed design stage, would be subject to approval by the local FRS.
		Respondents felt that water contamination would be an issue	N	The BSMP, which will be prepared in accordance with the **OBSMP** (Doc Ref. 7.18) and secured by way of Requirement in the DCO sets out the controls in place to ensure that, in the unlikely event a fire did occur, any impacts arising from the fire and/or the actions implemented to control it (such as contaminated water run off) are managed appropriately so there are minimal impacts from contamination on the surrounding communities and environment, including watercourses and waterbodies. The BESS Enclosures would have automatic fire detection systems in place along with fire suppression systems. Water storage tanks and hydrants would be provided to have a storage volume up to approximately 360,000 litres to allow a discharge rate of approximately 1,500 litres per minute over a 4-hour period. In the case of an incident, fire water would be contained within the attenuated subbase of the gravel compound by a penstock valve to be pumped out and disposed of off-site by a specialist contractor to ensure the surrounding area is not polluted. Further details are provided within **ES Appendix 11-4: Outline Drainage Strategy** (Doc Ref. 6.3).
		Respondent felt that the applicant should work with communities to understand the best BESS mitigation measures such as landscaping	N	The Applicant acknowledges this as a concern for neighbouring residents. 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 **ES** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The landscape and visual impact of the Scheme have been assessed in **ES Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual** (Doc Ref. 6.1). Boundary planting is proposed along the field boundaries containing the On-Site 400kV Substation and BESS Compound to provide screening of the electrical infrastructure. This is illustrated within the **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16). In terms of BESS mitigation, an **OBSMP** (Doc Ref. 7.18) has been prepared to support the DCO Application. This sets out the controls in place to ensure that, any impacts arising from a safety challenge are

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				managed appropriately so there are minimal impacts from contamination on the surrounding community.
	BESS safety (inc. fire risk) Respondents felt that BESS is unsafe and a fire risk. Respondents also expressed concerned about the toxicity of BESS fires and the impact this will have on residents, land, biodiversity and the environment. Residents questioned whether the local fire service would be able to adequately manage a BESS fire at the site due to issues with accessibility and capacity. Respondents thought that the applicant should put in place further fire prevention measures.	Respondents felt that the BESS infrastructure and potential fires would have a negative impact on the environment.	N	The BESS Compound has been located as far as reasonably practicable from sensitive receptors to ensure impacts to the surrounding communities and environment is minimised in the unlikely event that BESS Container failure should occur. The **OBSMP** (Doc Ref. 7.18) confirms that the final BESS Compound would be designed to address prevailing industry standards and good practice at a time of detailed design and implementation. It sets out the controls in place to ensure that, in the unlikely event a fire did occur, any impacts arising from the fire (such as contaminated fumes and/or water run off) will be managed so there are minimal impacts on the surrounding communities and environment. It should also be noted that any emissions associated with a fire would be limited to a relatively short period whilst it is appropriately managed by the fire service. The **OBSMP** (Doc Ref. 7.18) has been prepared in consultation with the local Fire and Rescue Service (FRS). The Final BSMP, to be developed at the detailed design stage, would be subject to approval by the local FRS.
		Respondents felt that BESS is unsafe	N	An **OBSMP** (Doc Ref. 7.18) has been prepared to support the DCO Application. The **OBSMP** ensures that the final BESS compound will be designed in accordance with prevailing industry standards and good practice at the time of detailed design and implementation. The **OBSMP** (Doc Ref. 7.18) sets out the measures that would be in place to manage the unlikely event of a fire, ensuring that potential impacts — such as contaminated fumes and/or water run-off — are appropriately controlled so as to minimise effects on surrounding communities and the environment. The **OBSMP** (Doc Ref. 7.18) has been prepared in consultation with the local Fire and Rescue Service (FRS). The Final BSMP, to be developed at the detailed design stage, would be subject to approval by the local FRS.
		Respondents highlighted a perceived fire risk associated with BESS facilities	N	An **OBSMP** (Doc Ref. 7.18) has been prepared to support the DCO Application. The **OBSMP** (Doc Ref. 7.18) ensures that the final BESS compound will be designed in accordance with prevailing industry standards and good practice at the time of detailed design and implementation.

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				The **OBSMP** (Doc Ref. 7.18) sets out the measures that would be in place to manage the unlikely event of a fire, ensuring that potential impacts — such as contaminated fumes and/or water run-off — are appropriately controlled so as to minimise effects on surrounding communities and the environment. The **OBSMP** (Doc Ref. 7.18) has been prepared in consultation with the local Fire and Rescue Service (FRS). The Final BSMP, to be developed at the detailed design stage, would be subject to approval by the local FRS.
		Respondents expressed concern about toxic fumes from potential BESS related fires	N	The Applicant notes that the BESS Compound has been located as far as reasonably practicable from sensitive receptors which will ensure impacts to the surrounding communities and environment is minimised in the unlikely event that BESS Container failure should occur. The **OBSMP** (Doc Ref. 7.18) confirms that the final BESS Compound would be designed to address prevailing industry standards and good practice at a time of detailed design and implementation. It sets out the controls in place to ensure that, in the unlikely event a fire did occur, any impacts arising from the fire (such as contaminated fumes and/or water run off) will be managed so there are minimal impacts on the surrounding communities and environment. It should also be noted that any emissions associated with a fire would be limited to a relatively short period whilst it is appropriately managed by the fire service. An Unplanned Emissions Assessment has been provided within **ES Appendix 16-4** (Doc Ref. 6.3) to consider potential impacts from toxic emissions released in the unlikely event of a BESS fire. This document demonstrates that after a distance of approximately 200m from the fire, any toxic emissions (hydrogen fluoride used as a proxy) would reduce to below the acute exposure guideline levels published by Public Health England. Given that the BESS Compound would be sited a minimum of 350m from residential receptors, concentrations will be below relevant health thresholds at any existing residential receptor location.
		Respondents felt that the fallout from BESS fires could contaminate the surrounding area	N	The **OBSMP** (Doc Ref. 7.18) confirms that the final BESS Compound would be designed to address prevailing industry standards and good practice at a time of detailed design and implementation. It sets out the controls in place to ensure that, in the unlikely event a fire did occur, any impacts arising from the fire (such as contaminated fumes and/or water run off) will be managed so there are minimal impacts on the surrounding communities and environment. It should also be noted that

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				any emissions associated with a fire would be limited to a relatively short period whilst it is appropriately managed by the fire service.
		Respondents expressed concern that the BESS was inaccessible for emergency services	N	The Applicant notes that emergency access routes to the BESS Compound within and outside of the Order limits have been selected and designed to ensure they are able to accommodate emergency response vehicles. The Applicant further confirms that an **OBSMP** (Doc Ref. 7.18) has been prepared to support the DCO Application. This includes details of an Emergency Response Plan (ERP) which would be developed post consent to facilitate effective and safe emergency response following UK National Fire Chiefs Council (NFCC) and NFPA 855 guidelines at the time. The **OBSMP** (Doc Ref. 7.18) has been prepared in consultation with the local Fire and Rescue Service (FRS). The Final BSMP, to be developed at the detailed design stage, would be subject to approval by the local FRS.
		Respondent was concerned about the actions of protestors causing safety concerns at the BESS site	N	The Applicant reiterates the measures outlined within the application around site security and safety. Whilst the actions of determined saboteurs, are challenging to plan for an **OBSMP** (Doc Ref. 7.18) has been prepared to support the DCO Application. This includes details of an Emergency Response Plan (ERP) which would be developed post consent to facilitate effective and safe emergency response following UK National Fire Chiefs Council (NFCC) and NFPA 855 guidelines at the time. Furthermore, Emergency access routes to the BESS Compound within and outside of the Order limits have been selected and designed to ensure they are able to accommodate response vehicles in any emergency event.
		Respondents expressed concern about the risk of flooding in the vicinity of the proposed BESS infrastructure	N	**ES Appendix 11-3: Flood Risk Assessment** (FRA) (Doc Ref. 6.3) has been produced for the Scheme and considers risk both to, and arising from, the Scheme. As part of this, mitigation is proposed to manage the potential impacts of flood risk so that the Scheme does not increase or exacerbate flood risk to others and can continue to safely operate at times of flood. This includes elements being sequentially located to avoid areas of greatest flood risk, such the BESS Compound, 400 kV Substation, and 132 kV Substations being located outside Flood Zone 3 associated with the Postland Catchment and South Holland Main Drain. Whilst these are still located within the Flood Zone associated with the River Welland, this is in the undefended scenario, whilst in practice the

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				risk of flooding from the River Welland is mitigated by the existing flood defences that provide protection up to a 1 in 1,000 year flood event. In addition, design measures have been specified to minimise flood risk in the event of a breach of the River Welland flood defences. This includes bunding and/or flood defence walls surrounding the BESS Compound and 400 kV Substation, and 132 kV Substations. **ES Appendix 11-4: Outline Drainage Strategy** (Doc Ref. 6.3) has been prepared to support the DCO Application. This considers runoff from the Scheme and proposes sustainable drainage techniques that will be implemented to manage this. This will be developed into a detailed Drainage Strategy post consent, following the detailed design of the BESS and On-Site Substations Compounds. With proposed mitigation measures in place, **ES Appendix 11-3: FRA** (Doc Ref. 6.3) concludes that there would be no significant effect to flood risk levels within and surrounding the BESS Compound and On-Site Substations as a result of the Scheme.
		Respondents felt that the applicant has not provided adequate documentation regarding BESS safety	N	The Applicant remains confident in the level of information made available at the pre-application stage was appropriate to the consultation being undertaken. An **OBSMP** (Doc Ref. 7.18) has been prepared to support the DCO Application. This sets out the controls in place to ensure that, in the unlikely event a fire did occur, any impacts arising from the fire and/or the actions implemented to control it (such as contaminated fumes and/or water run off) are managed appropriately so there are minimal impacts from contamination on the surrounding communities and environment.
		Respondents thought that BESS fires would negatively impact the health of local people	N	An Unplanned Emissions Assessment has been provided within **ES Appendix 16-4** (Doc Ref. 6.3) to consider potential impacts from toxic emissions released in the unlikely event of a BESS fire. This document demonstrates that after a distance of approximately 200m from the fire, any toxic emissions (hydrogen fluoride used as a proxy) would reduce to below the acute exposure guideline levels published by Public Health England. Given that the BESS Compound would be sited a minimum of 350m from residential receptors, concentrations will be below relevant health thresholds at any existing residential receptor location. The **OBSMP** (Doc Ref. 7.18) also confirms that the final BESS Compound would be designed to address prevailing industry standards and good practice at a time of detailed design and implementation. It sets out the controls in place to ensure that, in the unlikely event a fire

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				did occur, any impacts arising from the fire (such as contaminated fumes and/or water run off) will be managed so there are minimal impacts on the surrounding communities and environment. It should also be noted that any emissions associated with a fire would be limited to a relatively short period whilst it is appropriately managed by the fire service.
		Respondents thought that the applicant should put measures in place to warn local people of BESS fires should they take place	N	An **OBSMP** (Doc Ref. 7.18) has been prepared to support the DCO Application. The **OBSMP** (Doc Ref. 7.18) ensures that the final BESS compound would be designed in accordance with prevailing industry standards and good practice at the time of detailed design and implementation. The **OBSMP** (Doc Ref. 7.18) sets out the measures that would be in place to manage the unlikely event of a fire, ensuring that potential impacts — such as contaminated fumes and/or water run-off — are appropriately controlled so as to minimise effects on surrounding communities and the environment. The **OBSMP** (Doc Ref. 7.18) also includes details of an Emergency Response Plan (ERP) which would be developed post consent to facilitate effective and safe emergency response and communications following UK National Fire Chiefs Council (NFCC) and NFPA 855 guidelines at the time. The **OBSMP** (Doc Ref. 7.18) has been prepared in consultation with the local Fire and Rescue Service (FRS). The Final BSMP, to be developed at the detailed design stage, would be subject to approval by the local FRS.
		Respondents felt that the applicant should provide further detail about provisions for wild fire prevention	N	If a wildfire were to occur, it would be managed and responded to by Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue Service, which is the statutory authority responsible for fire and rescue operations within the county. The service routinely responds to outdoor fires, including grass, heathland, woodland, and agricultural fires, and has the personnel, equipment, and operational procedures necessary to control and extinguish such incidents. Where required, it can also coordinate with neighbouring fire and rescue services and other relevant agencies to ensure that larger or more complex fires are effectively managed. The Applicant also points the respondents to our **OBSMP** (Doc Ref. 7.18) which has been prepared to support the DCO Application. This includes details of an Emergency Response Plan (ERP) which would be developed post consent to facilitate effective and safe emergency response following UK National Fire Chiefs Council (NFCC) and NFPA 855 guidelines at the time.

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
		Respondents noted that the local fire service is already under pressure	N	The Scheme design and operational procedures have been developed with regard to relevant fire safety guidance and best practice, and appropriate measures will be implemented to manage fire risk. Ongoing engagement with relevant authorities will continue to ensure that appropriate safety and response arrangements are in place. The Applicant further confirms that an **OBSMP** (Doc Ref. 7.18) has been prepared to support the DCO Application. This includes details of an Emergency Response Plan (ERP) which would be developed post consent to facilitate effective and safe emergency response following UK National Fire Chiefs Council (NFCC) and NFPA 855 guidelines at the time. The **OBSMP** (Doc Ref. 7.18) has been prepared in consultation with the local Fire and Rescue Service (FRS). The Final BSMP, to be developed at the detailed design stage, would be subject to approval by the local FRS.
		Respondent felt that BESS would generally create toxins negatively affecting the health of residents	N	There are no planned emissions from the BESS Compound to the environment. Operation and maintenance of the BESS Compound would be managed in accordance with the OEMP, which would be secured by way of Requirement in the DCO and prepared in accordance with the **OOEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.11). The Applicant notes that impacts to human health as a result of the Scheme have been considered in **ES Chapter 10: Human Health** (Doc Ref. 6.1) which concludes no significant effects are expected. The Applicant further notes that the BESS Compound has been located as far as reasonably practicable from sensitive receptors which will ensure impacts to the surrounding communities and environment is minimised in the unlikely event that BESS enclosure failure should occur. The **OBSMP** (Doc Ref. 7.18) also sets out how final BESS Compound would be designed to address prevailing industry standards and good practice at a time of detailed design and implementation. It sets out the controls in place to ensure that, in the unlikely event a fire did occur, any impacts arising from the fire (such as contaminated fumes and/or water run off) will be managed so there are minimal impacts on the surrounding communities and environment. It should also be noted that any emissions associated with a fire would be limited to a relatively short period whilst it is appropriately managed by the fire service.

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
		Respondents felt that fire prevention measures were required	N	An **OBSMP** (Doc Ref. 7.18) has been prepared to support the DCO Application. The **OBSMP** (Doc Ref. 7.18) sets out how the final BESS compound will be designed in accordance with prevailing industry standards and good practice at the time of detailed design and implementation. The **OBSMP** (Doc Ref. 7.18) sets out the measures that would be in place to manage the unlikely event of a fire, ensuring that potential impacts — such as contaminated fumes and/or water run-off — are appropriately controlled so as to minimise effects on surrounding communities and the environment. The **OBSMP** (Doc Ref. 7.18) has been prepared in consultation with the local Fire and Rescue Service (FRS). The Final BSMP, to be developed at the detailed design stage, would be subject to approval by the local FRS.
		Respondents felt that BESS fires would negatively impact wildlife	N	The **OBSMP** (Doc Ref. 7.18) sets out how the final BESS Compound would be designed to address prevailing industry standards and good practice at a time of detailed design and implementation. It sets out the controls in place to ensure that, in the unlikely event a fire did occur, any impacts arising from the fire (such as contaminated fumes and/or water run off) will be managed so there are minimal impacts on the surrounding communities and environment, including wildlife. It should also be noted that any emissions associated with a fire would be limited to a relatively short period whilst it is appropriately managed by the fire service.
		Respondents felt that the applicant should put measures in place to control contaminated water from BESS fires	N	An **OBSMP** (Doc Ref. 7.18) has been prepared to support the DCO Application. This sets out the controls in place to ensure that, in the unlikely event a fire did occur, any impacts arising from the fire and/or the actions implemented to control it (such as contaminated fumes and/or water run off) are managed appropriately so there are minimal impacts from contamination on the surrounding communities and environment. The BESS Enclosures would have automatic fire detection systems in place along with fire suppression systems. Water storage tanks and hydrants would be provided to have a storage volume up to approximately 360,000 litres to allow a discharge rate of approximately 1,500 litres per minute over a 4-hour period. In the case of an incident, fire water would be contained within the attenuated subbase of the gravel compound by a penstock valve to be pumped out and disposed of off-site by a specialist contractor to ensure the surrounding area is

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				not polluted. Further details are provided within **ES Appendix 11-4: Outline Drainage Strategy** (Doc Ref. 6.3).
		Respondents felt that the applicant must provide provisions for increased water supply for use in the event of a fire	N	As set out within the **OBSMP** (Doc Ref. 7.18), the BESS Enclosures would have automatic fire detection systems in place along with fire suppression systems. Water storage tanks and hydrants would be provided to have a storage volume up to approximately 360,000 litres to allow a discharge rate of approximately 1,500 litres per minute over a 4-hour period. In the case of an incident, fire water would be contained within the attenuated subbase of the gravel compound by a penstock valve to be pumped out and disposed of off-site by a specialist contractor to ensure the surrounding area is not polluted. The capacity of the water storage tanks and hydrants is considered to be appropriate for the BESS Compound proposed as part of the Scheme.
		Respondents questioned the applicants expertise on fire safety	N	The Applicant notes these comments but remains confident in the expertise and guidance of the professional project team and relevant specialists who have informed the design and safety considerations for the Scheme. Fire safety considerations, including prevention, monitoring and response measures, are set out in the **OBSMP** (Doc Ref. 7.18), which has been prepared with input from relevant experts and in accordance with current guidance and best practice.
		Respondents felt that the applicants proposals for fire safety were and thermal propagation not adequate	N	An **OBSMP** (Doc Ref. 7.18) has been prepared to support the DCO Application. The **OBSMP** (Doc Ref. 7.18) ensures that the final BESS compound would be designed in accordance with prevailing industry standards and good practice at the time of detailed design and implementation. The **OBSMP** (Doc Ref. 7.18) sets out the measures that would be in place to manage the unlikely event of a fire, ensuring that potential impacts — such as contaminated fumes and/or water run-off — are appropriately controlled so as to minimise effects on surrounding communities and the environment. The **OBSMP** (Doc Ref. 7.18) has been prepared in consultation with the local Fire and Rescue Service (FRS). The Final BSMP, to be developed at the detailed design stage, would be subject to approval by the local FRS.
		Respondent was concerned that fires would have to burn out themselves	N	An **OBSMP** (Doc Ref. 7.18) has been prepared to support the DCO Application. The **OBSMP** (Doc Ref. 7.18) ensures that the final BESS compound will be designed in accordance with prevailing industry

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				standards and good practice at the time of detailed design and implementation. BESS systems are designed so that they can safely burn out, with boundary cooling provided by the Local Fire & Rescue Service. The **OBSMP** (Doc Ref. 7.18) sets out the measures that would be in place to manage the unlikely event of a fire, ensuring that potential impacts — such as contaminated fumes and/or water run-off — are appropriately controlled so as to minimise effects on surrounding communities and the environment. The **OBSMP** (Doc Ref. 7.18) has been prepared in consultation with the local Fire and Rescue Service (FRS). The Final BSMP, to be developed at the detailed design stage, would be subject to approval by the local FRS.
		Respondent questioned whether local emergency services have been consulted on this proposal	N	The **OBSMP** (Doc Ref. 7.18) has been prepared in consultation with the local Fire and Rescue Service (FRS). The Final BSMP, to be developed at the detailed design stage, would be subject to approval by the local FRS.
	Inter-array areas – location and design Respondents felt that the inter-array areas could be better designed and located elsewhere, with reference to locations further away from communities and farmland. Respondents felt that inter-array areas would bring disruption and negatively impact the environment, while providing a negative visual impact.	Respondent felt that the solar PV and inter-array areas are sited too far away from the substation	N	The Applicant notes that the justification and narrative for the selection of the land parcels for the Solar Development Area is contained within **Appendix D: Site Selection Report** of the **Planning Statement** (Doc Ref. 7.1). In considering the site selection criteria, it is not considered that there are available alternative sites closer to the proposed location of Weston Marsh B substation.
		Respondents thought that the applicant could adopt a different design of the inter-array areas	N	The Applicant considered overhead line and underground cable options for designing the Inter-Array Connections, using an iterative process. Further information is provided within **ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution** (Doc Ref. 6.1).
		Respondents felt that the development's inter-array areas could be better located elsewhere	N	The Applicant notes that the justification and narrative for the selection of the land parcels for the Solar Development Area is contained within **Appendix D: Site Selection Report** of the **Planning Statement** (Doc Ref. 7.1). In considering the site selection criteria, it is not considered that there are available alternative sites for the Inter-Array Connections.
		Respondents expressed concern that the inter-array areas are sited too close to local communities	Y	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.

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				6.1). At statutory consultation stage, the Applicant consulted on two options for the route of the Inter-Array Connection between Land Parcels C and D. Subsequently, the Applicant has adopted the northern corridor within the DCO Application which is located further away from residential properties, compared to the southern corridor.
		Respondents felt that the inter-array areas were too close to farmland	N	The Applicant notes that the justification and narrative for the selection of the land parcels for the Solar Development Area is contained within **Appendix D: Site Selection Report** (Doc Ref. 7.1). In considering the site selection criteria, it is not considered that there are available alternative sites for the Inter-Array Connections.
		Respondents felt that the location of the inter-array areas would negatively impact residents' health	N	The Applicant confirms that it has undertaken a comprehensive and detailed approach to consultation and Scheme design, and that the EIA process has allowed any adverse effects to be identified early and mitigated, where practicable. The Applicant further confirms that this includes an assessment of human health, which is presented in **ES Chapter 10: Human Health** (Doc Ref. 6.1) and has considered related environmental topics, such as air quality, noise and vibration, electric and magnetic fields, traffic and access, and landscape and visual, presented in the ES (**ES Chapter 5 to Chapter 16** (Doc Ref. 6.1)). This does not identify any significant effects to human health as a result of the Inter-Array Connections throughout the Construction, Operational, and Decommissioning phases of the Scheme.
		Respondents felt that the location of the inter-array areas would negatively impact resident biodiversity and wildlife	N	The Applicant confirms that comprehensive assessment of the impacts of the Scheme, including the Inter-Array Connections, on biodiversity and wildlife is presented in **ES Chapter 9: Ecology and Biodiversity** (Doc Ref. 6.1) which concludes no significant effects with the implementation of mitigation measures established through management plans submitted with the DCO Application.
		Respondents felt that the location and design of the inter-array areas would bring disruption	N	As detailed in **ES Chapter 2: The Scheme** (Doc Ref. 6.1), the Scheme has been designed to minimise disturbance to local communities as far as practicable during the construction, operational, and decommissioning phases. The management of these activities is secured through the CEMP, OEMP and DEMP, which will be prepared in accordance with the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10), **OOEMP** (Doc Ref 7.11) and **ODEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.12) and secure by way of Requirement in the DCO.

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				The Applicant also confirms that disruption to local communities as a result of the Scheme has been considered throughout the ES (**ES Chapter 5 to Chapter 16** (Doc Ref. 6.1)) but has concluded that no significant disruption is expected to be caused by the Construction, Operational, and Decommissioning phases of Inter-Array Connections, considering the small scale of works proposed and the measures specified within the management plans.
		Respondents felt that the applicant has not given enough information on the inter-array area design	N	The **Design Parameters** (Doc Ref. 7.4) document, submitted as part of the DCO Application, sets out the design parameters for the including the inter-array connections to be incorporated into the detailed plans should the Scheme be granted consent.
		Respondents felt that the placement of the inter-array areas would negatively impact house value	N	The Applicant acknowledges this as a concern for neighbouring residents. 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.
		Respondents felt that the inter-array areas would have a negative visual impact	N	The Applicant confirms that a comprehensive assessment of the impacts of the Scheme, including the Inter-Array Connections, on the landscape and visual amenity is presented in **ES Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual** (Doc Ref. 6.1).
		Respondent felt that the inter-array areas are too close to major roads	N	The Applicant notes that the Inter-Array Connections have been designed to limit interactions with surrounding major road networks. The Inter-Array Connection between Land Parcel A and B crosses beneath Spalding Road and Crowland Bypass (A16) and between Parcels C and D crosses above Back Bank, Chapel Gate, Dog Drove, and Holbeach Drove Gate (B1168). Disruption to these roads is only expected during the construction and decommissioning phase when the overhead line is being installed/ uninstalled across these roads. The works would be limited in duration and disruption mitigated through the traffic management measures

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				detailed in the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13) which control access and ensure safety for road users. As detailed in **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref. 6.1), impacts to the local road network are anticipated to be negligible to minor (not significant) during the construction and decommissioning phase. Limited traffic is expected to be required to Inter-Array Connections (likely only requiring occasional inspection and maintenance) during the Operational phase of the Scheme. Therefore, impacts are expected to be lower than during the Construction phase.
		Respondents thought that the applicant should use underground cabling in the inter-array areas	Y	The selection of an overhead line as the preferred technology is guided by national policy contained in the NPS for Electricity Networks EN-5 which states that it is the Government's position that overhead lines should be the starting presumption for electricity networks. Further justification is provided in **ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution** (Doc Ref. 6.1). However, due to the vicinity of Crowland Airfield to Land Parcels A and B, the Inter-Array Connection between these parcels is proposed to be underground to minimise aviation safety risks.
		Respondent felt that the inter-array areas could face flooding issues	N	**ES Appendix 11-3: FRA** (Doc Ref. 6.3) has been produced for the Scheme and considers risk both to, and arising from, the Scheme. The Inter-Array Connection between Land Parcels A and B is underground and therefore, would not be impacted by flood risk. The H poles to be used for the Inter-Array Connection between Land Parcels C and D are typically smaller in diameter than the steel lattice pylon legs, and are located approximately 120m apart. There is very little land take per pole and the detailed hydraulic model of the South Holland Main Drain and the Postland Catchment confirms flood risk is very low between Land Parcel C and D with majority of flood risk extents present only during the 0.1% AEP plus climate change events in this area. It is therefore considered that flood risk would be not significant both to, and arising from, the Scheme with no mitigation required.
		Respondent felt that the design of the inter-array areas, and the general development, was too large	N	The Applicant notes this comment. The scale of the Scheme reflects the Government's policy position that solar generation is a Critical National Priority (CNP) under the relevant National Policy Statements, recognising the important role that large-scale renewable energy infrastructure plays in delivering legally binding net zero targets and supporting energy security.

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
		Respondent felt that the design and scale of the inter-array areas would make land recovery unlikely	N	The Applicant notes that, as confirmed in **ES Chapter 2: The Scheme** (Doc Ref. 6.1), a 15m working width and 50m buffer have been applied to the proposed cabling alignment within the Inter-Array Connections to allow for micro-siting during detailed design. In reality, when Construction phase commences only the area required to install the cabling and 15m working width would be required for the Scheme. The length of the Inter-Array Connections is required to connect each of the land parcels comprising the Solar Development Area. The areas of working widths within the Inter-Array Connections will be reinstated following the Construction phase. An **OSMP**(Doc Ref. 7.14) has been prepared as part of the DCO Application which provides details of measures that would be implemented as part of the Scheme to ensure soils within the Order limits are not degraded and farming activities can re-commence following completion of the Construction phase within the Inter-Array Connections. Prior to the start of construction, a detailed SMP will be prepared, submitted to and approved by the local authority and is secured by the **Draft DCO** (Doc Ref. 3.1). This will be in substantial accordance with the **OSMP** (Doc Ref. 7.14).
		Respondent felt that the location of the inter-array areas would cause safety concerns with aircrafts	N	The Applicant notes that details regarding the Inter-Array Connections are provided in Section 2.7 of **ES Chapter 2: The Scheme** (Doc Ref. 6.1). Whilst Crowland airfield is located between Land Parcel A and B, the cabling within the Inter-Array Connection between these Land Parcels would be situated underground. The Inter-Array Connection between Parcels C and D would comprise an overhead line configuration, however, the height of poles would be between 6.7m and 15m depending on the topography and is located approximately 4km east at its closest point. Therefore, the Inter-Array Connections are not considered to pose a safety concern to aircrafts.
	Inter-array areas – mitigation Residents were not satisfied with the applicant's inter-array mitigation measures and felt that fences or tree planting would not prevent a negative visual impact.	Respondent felt that the applicant has not carried adequate surveys or outlined the impact and mitigation measures of the development	N	The Applicant has undertaken a detailed assessment of the potential impacts of the Scheme which has been informed by comprehensive surveys and publicly available datasets, where required, to establish the baseline conditions within and surrounding the Order limits. Each chapter of the ES (**ES Chapter 5 to Chapter 16** (Doc Ref. 6.1)) clearly sets out the methodology and embedded and additional mitigation proposed as part of the Scheme to reduce and/or avoid impacts to the surrounding communities and environment.
		Respondent thought that fences would have a negative impact on wildlife	N	The Applicant notes that fencing would only be provided for temporary work areas during the Construction and Decommissioning phases within the Inter-Array Connections whilst works are completed. No

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				fencing is required within the Inter-Array Connection areas during the Operational phase which will only comprise underground cabling between Land Parcels A and B, and an overhead line between Land Parcels C and D. A comprehensive assessment of the impacts of the Scheme, including the Inter-Array Connections, on biodiversity and wildlife is presented in **ES Chapter 9: Ecology and Biodiversity** (Doc Ref. 6.1), which concludes that there are no adverse significant effects as a result of the Scheme following implementation of mitigation.
		Respondents were not satisfied with the applicant's mitigation proposals	N	The Applicant has undertaken a detailed assessment of the potential impacts of the Scheme which has informed the requirement for any specific mitigation measures required to mitigate potential effects of the Inter-Array Connections as far as practicable. The Applicant has clearly set out the processes followed in undertaking the assessments of the Scheme and has provided detailed rationale as to what and where specific mitigation measures are provided in each ES chapter (**ES Chapter 5 to Chapter 16** (Doc Ref. 6.1)). As such, the Applicant considers that any mitigation measures incorporated into the Scheme design are proportionate to the magnitude of impact identified.
		Respondent felt that tree planting would not mitigate the visual impact of the inter-array areas	N	The Applicant confirms that a comprehensive assessment of the impacts of the Scheme, including the Inter-Array Connections , on the landscape and visual amenity is presented in **ES Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The Applicant acknowledges that tree planting would not be able to fully screen all views of the Overhead Inter-Array Connection, however, it would not be uncharacteristic considering nearby existing similar overhead lines.

2.15. People

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
zPeople	**National government policy** Respondents do not feel that solar farm developments, including the proposed Scheme, are an appropriate strategy to unlock renewable energy in the UK. There is a sense that the Scheme undermines national policies on the use of agricultural land, and pulls government resource from other societal needs. Respondents noted that the growing sense of disconnect national decision-making processes and the priorities of local authorities, is contributing to a lack of confidence in national net zero strategies.	Respondents felt that the Scheme would likely be granted development consent due to the net zero goals of the Labour government	N	Whilst the Applicant agrees that the Scheme represents the right approach to ensuring this site makes a meaningful contribution towards supporting the transition to net zero, it is not an inevitability that it is granted consent. The hard work in ensuring the right proposals are submitted and all relevant policy requirements are met, impacts mitigated and design robustly scrutinised will be the reason why any solar scheme of this nature is granted consent.
		Respondent noted that they would not support any government in favour of solar farm developments	N	The need for renewable energy infrastructure, including solar developments, is established in national energy policy and reflected in the National Policy Statements, which recognise the role such schemes play in meeting legally binding carbon reduction targets and supporting energy security.
		Respondents felt that the government has overfocused on net zero targets, at the expense of food security, national security and other perceived societal needs	N	The Scheme will make a meaningful contribution to the UK government's net-zero and energy security objectives, while supporting local employment and supply chain opportunities during construction and operation. On impacts to food production the Applicant points to energy security as being another priority of this government. The balance of the two issues needs to be appropriately weighed, and we believe that, in the context of this site representing less than 0.01% of the utilised agricultural area (UAA), it will not have a significant impact on national food production and security.
		Respondents expressed a lack of confidence in the government's net zero strategy. They did not believe that it will adequately contribute to long term national energy security. Some considered net zero to be a flawed government policy	N	The Applicant refutes the claim that net zero is a flawed policy. The transition towards more affordable, reliable and clean energy generation is critical to ensuring we meet the electricity needs of the UK and energy security.
		Respondents considered net zero and climate change to be part of a deliberate political narrative which generates fear and distraction from other societal issues	N	The Applicant disagrees with the sentiments expressed. Climate change is a real and urgent issue that must be addressed.
		Respondents suggested that the Applicant is contributing to government "greenwashing" by bringing the Scheme forward	N	The Applicant disagrees. There is a clear and urgent national need for low-carbon, home-grown energy. The available land, available grid infrastructure and sufficient solar irradiance are essential inputs to site

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				selection for large-scale solar schemes, and these considerations have been taken into account in the development of the proposals for the Scheme.
		Respondents suggested that they did not believe that the UK's transition to net zero would have a significant impact on global carbon dioxide emissions	N	The Applicant contests the principle that the Scheme will make no different to the climate emergency. If approved, The Scheme would contribute a significant amount of energy generated through a clean energy source, which may otherwise have been delivered through more climate-harming means of generation. The Applicant's Climate Change assessment, including Lifecycle Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Impact Assessment, In-Combination Climate Impacts (ICCI) Assessment, and Climate Change Resilience, is set out in **ES Chapter 7: Climate Change** (Doc Ref. 6.1).
		Respondents felt that the final decision made by the government when determining the application for development consent for Scheme would be driven by financial gain	N	Whilst the Applicant contends that the Scheme represents the right approach to ensuring this site makes a meaningful contribution towards supporting the transition to net zero, it is not an inevitability that it is granted consent. The hard work in ensuring the right proposals are submitted and all relevant policy requirements are met, impacts mitigated and design robustly scrutinised will be the reason why any solar scheme of this nature is granted consent.
		Respondents questioned how the Scheme would operate if the government continued to research "sun dimming"	N	This is a potentially exciting experiment, but at this stage that is all it is. The technology is a long way away from commercial deployment. Even if it were, it would not diminish the need for a balanced energy mix, including solar, which can ensure the UK can access clean, affordable and self-sufficient electricity. In addition, it is radiation from the sun, rather than temperature, heat or direct sunlight, that enables solar PV panels to generate electricity. In the middle of a sunny day solar panels can produce over a quarter of the UK's power, but they do not need direct sunlight to operate and produce power all year round.
		Respondents felt that there is a growing sense of disconnect between the ambitions of the national government, and the priorities and policies of local authorities and their communities	N	The Applicant won't comment on any perceived divergence between local and national priorities. Ultimately, the government's policy view is that "we need a diverse mix of electricity infrastructure to come forward, so that we can deliver a secure, reliable, affordable and net zero consistent system during the transition to 2050 for a wide range of demand, decarbonisation, and technology sources"; and that "a secure, reliable, affordable, net zero consistent system in 2050 is likely to be composed predominantly of wind and solar" (NPS EN-1, Paragraphs 3.3.19-3.3.20).

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
		Respondents felt that the consenting process for the Scheme overrides the authority of local authorities	N	The Applicant disagrees with these comments. Local authorities have been consulted throughout the application process as appropriate, including on the approach to consultation through the production of the Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC) document (see **Consultation Report** (Doc Ref. 5.1) for more details). Whilst the nature of the Scheme means it meets the requirements for a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP) and therefore will be determined by PINs the local authorities still have a critical role in the planning process.
		Respondents referenced National Policy Statements for Energy in their responses. They noted that Best and Most Versatile (BMV) agricultural land and soils should be safeguarded and that impacts from development should be minimised The Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs consultation on Land use in England (January to April 2025), was also used as further evidence against the use of BMV agricultural land Respondents suggested that the Secretary of State for Energy Security and Net Zero should be required to provide a justification for granting consent to Schemes proposed for BMV agricultural land	N	The Applicant is aware that NPS EN-1 seeks for schemes not to be sited on the best and most versatile agricultural land (defined as land in grades 1, 2 and 3a) and preferably use land in areas of poorer quality (grades 3b, 4 and 5). However, as stated within NPS EN-1 5.11.34, where schemes are to be sited on the best and most versatile agricultural land, the Secretary of State should take into account the economic and other benefits of that land. **ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution** (Doc Ref. 6.1) and **Appendix D: Site Selection Report** (Doc Ref. 7.1) provide a description of the detailed process and assessment of the alternatives process undertaken by the Applicant. The assessment has considered the locational criteria (environmental, social and economic, electrical and engineering constraints) that geographically influenced the areas of search. **ES Chapter 5: Agriculture and Soils** (Doc Ref. 6.1) provides a detailed assessment of the impact of the Scheme on the land. Ensuring that any necessary mitigation requirements are secured and confirmed within the **Environmental Mitigation and Commitments Register** (Doc Ref. 7.7).
		Respondents felt that there should be a greater focus in government policy on rooftop, domestic and commercial solar development, as opposed to Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects	N	Whilst the Applicant agrees rooftop solar should be included in the mix of renewable sources helping towards the transition to clean energy generation, it needs to be alongside utility scale solar schemes, like Meridian Solar. Domestic solar is not able to meet the national urgent need for new generation on its own. Therefore, rooftop solar should come forwards as well as, rather than instead of, large-scale ground mounted schemes such as the Scheme.
		Respondent suggested that the mandatory framework proposed in the Department of Energy Security and Net Zero's Community benefits and shared ownership for low	N	The Applicant notes the publication of the Department of Energy Security and Net Zero's May 2025 working paper on community benefits and shared ownership for low carbon energy infrastructure.

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
		carbon energy infrastructure working paper (May 2025), should be applied to the Scheme, should it be granted consent		Should the Scheme be granted development consent, the Applicant will remain open to engaging with emerging policy developments and will continue to monitor any further guidance or requirements that may be relevant to the Scheme.
		Respondent suggested that there is a lack of understanding within Policy about Electro-Magnetic Radiation	N	Electric and Magnetic Fields (EMF) are assessed in **ES Chapter 16: Other Environmental Topics** (Doc Ref. 6.1) and within the **EMF Compliance Assessment** (Doc Ref. 7.8). The **EMF Compliance Assessment** includes an assessment of the potential EMFs from the Scheme against the exposure limits developed by ICNIRP and includes evidence on potential impacts from exposure to radiation. The approach has been agreed with UKHSA following the inclusion of DECC (2012) 'Power Lines: Demonstrating compliance with EMF public exposure guidelines A voluntary Code of Practice' guidance. As set out in Section 16.3 of **ES Chapter 16: Other Environmental Topics**, the UK policy on public exposure limits to EMF radiation is designed to comply with the 1998 International Commission on the Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) guidelines. No significant effects were identified in the EMF assessment, and levels of electromagnetic radiation from the Scheme are predicted to be well below 1998 ICNIRP reference levels at all surrounding locations where public exposure levels are relevant.
		Respondents raised concerns about taxpayer's money being used to fund the operation and decommissioning of the Scheme	N	The Applicant is privately funding the Scheme. It is not being paid for by the taxpayer.
		Respondent suggested that the government should manage national energy supplies more efficiently and reduce the exporting of energy	N	The Applicant agrees that national energy supply does need efficient management; however notes that this responsibility lies with NGET and the Government.
		Respondent suggested that the UK needs to minimise importing fossil fuels for energy	N	The Applicant notes this comment and agrees.
		Respondents stated that the Secretary of State for Energy Security and Net Zero intended to export green energy	N	The Applicant is unable to comment on the intentions of the Secretary of State.
		Respondent argued that changing relations with the European Union would support the national move away from fossil fuels	N	The Applicant reserves comment on the UK's relationship with the European Union.
		Respondent stated that they recognised the significance of the Scheme in contributing to the government's net zero targets	N	The Applicant notes this comment.

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
	Local policy – general comments Respondents referred to their local authorities as an important mechanism for democracy and local decision making.	Respondent felt that local councils are under pressure to meet national renewable energy targets, and as a result, are more likely to override community opposition to new projects	N	Whilst the Applicant agrees that the Scheme represents the right approach to ensuring this site makes a meaningful contribution towards supporting the transition to net zero, it is not an inevitability that it is granted consent. The hard work in ensuring the right proposals are submitted and all relevant policy requirements are met, impacts mitigated and design robustly scrutinised will be the reason why any solar scheme of this nature is granted consent. This will be done in consultation with the democratically elected Council, while those in the community will also have the opportunity to give their views as relevant representations and at the open floor hearing to the examining authority. The Consultation Report (Doc Ref. 5.1) provides an account of the pre-application consultation activities undertaken to support the Scheme.
		Respondent stated that they hoped that the relevant local and county councils would object to the Scheme	N	The scale of the Scheme reflects the Government's policy position that solar generation is a Critical National Priority under the relevant National Policy Statements, recognising the important role that large-scale renewable energy infrastructure plays in delivering legally binding net zero targets and supporting energy security.
		Respondent noted that they would lobby their local MP to oppose the Scheme	N	The scale of the Scheme reflects the Government's policy position that solar generation is a Critical National Priority under the relevant National Policy Statements, recognising the important role that large-scale renewable energy infrastructure plays in delivering legally binding net zero targets and supporting energy security.
		Respondent referenced a motion titled, "Preservation of Fenland Landscape and Recognition of South Holland as a Critical Food Producing Area", which was proposed to South Holland District Councillors in October 2024 The motion was passed and aims to safeguard the Fenland landscape and its food production The respondents suggested that the motion emphasises the importance of protecting agricultural land from development	N	The UK Government has identified through its energy policy, most recently in the National Policy Statement (NPS) EN-1 and NPS EN-3 , that there is a critical national priority (CNP) for the provision of nationally significant low carbon infrastructure in the UK, including solar technology. Developing the Scheme at its proposed size will be an important contribution to meeting this need. The LVIA has considered the landscape and visual effects of the industrialisation of a predominantly rural area and change of use of agricultural land, as set out within **ES Appendix 12-4: Landscape Assessment** (Doc Ref 6.3) and summarised within Section 12.8 of **ES Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual** (Doc Ref. 6.1).
	Local policy – land parcels and inter-array areas	Respondent suggested that the proposed location of the solar PV panels breaches local environmental policies	N	The Applicant confirms that local planning policies have been considered within the **Planning Statement** (Doc Ref. 7.1) and specifically within Appendix 3: Local Planning Policy Tables, which assesses the Scheme's compliance with local policy. These documents

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
	Respondents raised concerns about the congruence between local planning policy and the proposed layout for the land parcels.			provide an assessment of the Scheme with local policy, as well as national policy, ensuring that the Scheme is compliant with all.
		Respondent noted that local authorities recommend a minimum distance of 2km from Site to local residential properties	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 Masterplan of the **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16) illustrates the landscape mitigation proposals, including buffers around Site boundaries, shrub and tree planting on field boundaries and areas adjacent to residential properties, which have been left undeveloped. However, the Applicant considers that it is not feasible or required to maintain a 2km buffer from all residential properties for the construction of a solar scheme.
	Climate change / Net zero – general comments Respondents expressed mixed sentiments towards the definition of climate change. Some respondents did not feel that climate change was an issue requiring a response. Others recognised climate change as a phenomenon, but did not believe that the Scheme would have a tangible impact on global greenhouse gas emissions and the rate of global warming. However, some respondents did express broad support for the use of renewable energy to reduce emissions, but emphasised the importance of balancing energy security with other national priorities.	Respondents stated that they did not believe that climate change was a reliable, or real, phenomenon	N	The Applicant disagrees with this response.
		Respondents considered climate change an inevitable element of nature. Some felt that national climate change narratives deliberately generate fear amongst the population. Others argued further scientific research needs to be conducted	N	The Applicant disagrees with the sentiments expressed. Climate change is a real and urgent issue that must be addressed.
		Respondents emphasised the importance of tackling climate change and expressed support for an increase in national renewable energy infrastructure projects	N	The Applicant notes these comments and welcomes the support for these types of schemes.
		Respondents suggested that there were more appropriate ways to use renewable energy to tackle climate change than the development of solar farms	N	National Policy Statements EN-1 and EN-3 sets out the principle need for new renewable energy infrastructure. Specifically, such as large-scale ground-mounted solar farms, which have a critical role to play in achieving the government's aims. Solar PV generation is ascribed Critical National Priority status. Section 4 of the **Planning Statement** (Doc Ref. 7.1) further details the need for the Scheme and its benefits in contributing to net zero targets and energy efficiency.
		Respondents supported the use of renewable energy to tackle climate change, but felt that the pace of infrastructure growth should be slowed in the UK	N	The Applicant disagrees with these comments. The government's policy view is that "We need a diverse mix of electricity infrastructure to come forward, so that we can deliver a secure, reliable, affordable and net zero consistent system during the transition to 2050 for a wide range of demand, decarbonisation, and technology sources"; and that "a secure, reliable, affordable, net zero consistent system in 2050 is likely to be

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				composed predominantly of wind and solar" (NPS EN-1, Paragraphs 3.3.19-3.3.20).
		Respondents recognised the national need to tackle climate change, but emphasised the importance of a balanced approach to energy and food security ambitions	N	The Applicant agrees a balance must be struck. That said, the Applicant believes that, in the context of the Site representing less than 0.01% of the utilised agricultural area (UAA), it will not have a significant impact on national food production and security.
		Respondents suggested that global climate change is not an important issue for the UK	N	The Applicant disagrees with the suggestion that climate change is not important for the UK.
		Respondents did not feel that tackling global climate change was the responsibility of local communities in the UK	N	The Applicant disagrees with these comments. Every community across the UK that must share the responsibility for supporting the UK's transition to clean energy in whichever way appropriate.
		Respondents considered global climate change an important issue, but did not believe that the Scheme would significantly reduce global carbon dioxide emissions	N	The Applicant disagrees with these comments . The Scheme will make a much-needed contribution to generating clean energy and help support the UK's transition away from over reliance on harmful sources of power. Without low-carbon energy generation projects such as the Scheme, the average grid GHG intensity will not decrease as is projected, which would adversely affect the UK's ability to meet its carbon reduction targets. The carbon intensity of UK grid electricity is expected to decarbonise in line with Government projections, with a goal of net-zero by 2050. A detailed overview of the methodology and assessment of likely impacts and effects is presented in **ES Chapter 7: Climate Change** (Doc Ref 6.1).
		Respondent suggested that the UK should consider their outsourced global emissions in net zero targets	N	The Applicant notes this comments and agrees this should be part of the consideration.
		Respondents considered population growth a greater threat to climate change than carbon emissions	N	The need for renewable energy infrastructure, including solar developments, is established in national energy policy and reflected in the National Policy Statements, which recognise the role such schemes play in meeting legally binding carbon reduction targets and supporting energy security.
		Respondents raised general concerns about the national financial cost of net zero activities	N	The Applicant notes these concerns. The delivery of renewable energy infrastructure by the private sector plays an important role in achieving the UK's net zero objectives, supporting the transition to a low-carbon energy system while contributing to national energy security. The Applicant is appropriately resourced to deliver the Scheme and considers that it represents a meaningful contribution towards these objectives.

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
		Respondents suggested that the Fenland landscape and ecosystem already operates as a national carbon sink	N	The Applicant acknowledges that the Fenland ecosystem acts as a natural carbon sink. As set out in **ES Chapter 7: Climate Change** (Doc Ref. 6.1), the Scheme is assessed in the context of its contribution to the UK's carbon budgets and the possible impact of the Scheme on meeting the net zero targets. This approach aligns with industry best practice, and the assessment framework is structured to provide a comprehensive evaluation of the Scheme's contribution to GHG emissions while recognising that the ultimate receptor of these emissions is the global climate system rather than a specific geographic area.
		Respondents felt that the potential environmental damage and disruption caused by the Scheme would outweigh its contribution to national net zero targets	N	The Applicant notes that Section 5 of the **Planning Statement** (Doc Ref. 7.1) provides a comprehensive assessment of the Scheme's impacts (including the results found within the **Environmental Statement** (Doc Ref. 6.1) and weighs these impacts against the relevant mitigation measures proposed, the national and local policy, and the benefits that the Scheme can offer. Therefore, ensuring that the Scheme provides an appropriate planning balance for the Secretary of State to give deemed consent.
		Respondents questioned the greenhouse gas emissions created by the supply chain and any importing activities associated with the Scheme. Respondents did not feel confident that this process aligned with the Applicant's net zero objectives	N	As set out in **ES Chapter 7: Climate Change**, the lifecycle Greenhouse Gas (GHG) assessment covers all direct emissions from activities during the construction, operation, and decommissioning stages of the Scheme, this includes emissions embedded within the production of construction materials, as well as emissions arising from the transportation of materials, waste and construction workers. This approach aligns with industry best practice and follows methodologies used in comparable solar ESs. The significance of a Scheme's emissions is based on its net impact over its lifetime. Without low-carbon energy generation projects such as the Scheme, the average grid GHG intensity will not decrease as is projected, which would adversely affect the UK's ability to meet its carbon reduction targets. The carbon intensity of UK grid electricity is expected to decarbonise in line with Government projections, with a goal of net-zero by 2050. A detailed overview of the methodology and assessment of likely impacts and effects is presented in **ES Chapter 7: Climate Change** (Doc Ref 6.1).
		Respondent could not find a reference in consultation documentation to efficiency at the point of use when	N	Large-scale solar schemes in the UK are efficient compared to other technologies in terms of energy generation over their operational lifespan. The Applicant disagrees with the suggestion that the Scheme

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
		considering the lifetime impact of the Scheme's greenhouse gas emissions		will make no different to the climate emergency. If approved, the Scheme would contribute a significant amount of energy generated through a clean energy source, which may otherwise have been delivered through more climate-harming means of generation. The Applicant's Climate Change assessment, including Lifecycle Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Impact Assessment, In-Combination Climate Impacts (ICCI) Assessment, and Climate Change Resilience, is set out in **ES Chapter 7: Climate Change** (Doc Ref. 6.1). These assessments conclude that the construction and decommissioning of the Scheme will not result in a significant effect on the global climate, while the operation of the Scheme will result in a significant beneficial effect on the global climate, due to the clean energy it produces. Therefore the Scheme will provide a net reduction in GHG emissions, compared to a scenario without the Scheme based on forecast UK grid average energy emissions available from the Department for Energy Security and Net Zero for the year 2033.
	Climate change / Net zero – land parcels and inter-array areas Respondents raised concerns about the potential for the solar PV panels to generate a localised heat island effect.	Respondents raised concerns about the potential the solar PV panels to raise local temperatures	N	There is limited evidence to support this statement. While there may be a microclimate generated above the panels, it is not anticipated this will have an impact on any receptor. Studies that suggest this are from hot arid climates and the conclusions are not comparable with the UK climate. Therefore, there is limited research confirming that this is the case or where local temperature rises are suggested, that these are harmful.
	Climate change / Net zero – Grid connection corridor Respondents expressed concerns about the impact extreme weather events may have on the overhead line and pylons.	Respondent attributed changing local weather patterns to climate change. They raised concerns about the impact of frequent high wind events on the overhead line and pylons	N	Pylons and conductors (overhead lines) are designed to withstand extreme weather conditions that are likely to occur in England and will be designed to meet industry standards. The Applicant notes that, as set out in **ES Chapter 7: Climate Change** (Doc Ref. 6.1), storms and wind patterns are difficult to predict and there is high variation and uncertainty in projections. However, there is a general trend of an expected increase in near surface wind speeds and wind gusts for the second half of the 21st century for the winter season. This is accompanied by a possible increase in frequency of winter storms over the UK. This has been included within the future baseline assessment.
	Planning regulations / Planning Inspectorate Respondents expressed a sense of discontent with the planning and	Respondents suggested that the current Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project planning and consultation process disempowers local voices and concerns	N	The Applicant disagrees with the principle outlined in this statement. Every effort has been made to involve the local community and relevant stakeholders throughout the pre-application process and the **Consultation Report** (Doc Ref. 5.1) outlines how the Applicant has complied with the requirements for consultation. The feedback

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
	consenting process associated with Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects.			received through our pre-application consultation process has been invaluable in helping shape the Scheme as submitted.
		Respondent felt that the configuration of the Scheme as a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project purposefully bypasses local planning mechanisms	N	The Applicant reaffirms the right to apply through the DCO process given the status of the scheme proposed as a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project. It should also be noted that local planning authorities still play a critical role in the planning process as statutory consultees and have been consulted throughout the planning process for Scheme.
		Respondent suggested that the Applicant should be doing more, as a developer, to change planning regulations and lobby the government to mandate domestic and small scale solar installations	N	The Applicant is supportive of small scale solar options such as rooftop solar installations as part of the nation's generation mix. However, a mix of technologies will be required to meet our Net Zero targets and large-scale solar plays an important role in enabling renewable energy to be delivered at speed and at the required scale.
		Respondent expressed frustration at the lack of funding and compensation provided by the Applicant to support local landowner questionnaires and land surveys	N	The information requested from landowners forms part of the statutory processes associated with preparing the DCO application and is required to ensure that land interests are accurately identified. The Applicant sought to make the process as clear and straightforward as possible and provided contact details for the project team so that landowners could seek clarification or assistance where required.
		Respondents raised concerns about the ownership and security over the Scheme's lifespan	N	The Applicant notes the comment. Downing LLP's approach is to own, develop and manage projects throughout their full lifecycle. The construction, operation and decommissioning of the Scheme will be secured through the DCO, which is a legally binding consent. Measures relating to the decommissioning of the Scheme will be secured by the DEMP, which will prepared in accordance with the **ODEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.12), secured by way of a Requirement in the **Draft DCO** (Doc Ref. 3.1). A change in ownership would not alter this requirement.
		Respondent noted that Community Benefit commitments are not included in the DCO submission It was suggested that the outcomes of the DESNZ Community Benefits and Shared Ownership for Low Carbon Energy Infrastructure Working Paper, may impact the Scheme. The respondent suggested that a commitment to community benefits should be a mandatory part of the DCO process	N	Whilst community benefit funds do not form part of the DCO application and cannot be taken into account in the determination of the application, the Applicant believes communities living closest to the Scheme should benefit from it and is committed to making a positive contribution to South Holland and beyond through opportunities for community benefit.
	Impact on local business (including farming) – general comments	Respondents highlighted Lincolnshire as a leading region for food production in the UK	N	The Applicant notes that the likely economic effects on agricultural land holdings are assessed in **ES Chapter 14: Socio-Economics and Land Use** (Doc Ref. 6.1).

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
	Respondents consistently emphasised the national importance of Lincolnshire as a leading food producing region in the UK. At the local level, farming and other agricultural practices are closely tied to the cultural, historical, social, and economic fabric of the area. Respondents feel that the Scheme will negatively impact farming activities, including harvesting and transporting crops. Others felt that the Scheme will directly reduce the security of the sector, and reduce the opportunities for future generations of agricultural workers.	Respondents raised high levels of concern towards the potential impact of the Scheme on the rural economy Respondents felt that the Scheme would directly reduce the opportunities for local farm workers and farming businesses tied to this sector		Within the Solar Development Areas, there are a total of five landowners, with an additional 42 and 16 landowners located within the Grid Connection Route and the Inter-Array Connections, respectively. There are no workers who are reliant on the farmland in the Solar Development Area for full time employment. The Scheme would occupy agricultural land within the Solar Development Areas with the prior agreement of relevant landowners. Hosting the Scheme will provide a diversified source of income for landowners of agricultural landholdings, and their voluntary co-operation with the Scheme indicates that this proposed change in land use would not compromise the financial viability of the farm holding for landowners. Within the Inter-Array Connections and the Grid Connection Route, disruption to farming activities would largely be temporary and short term only, so no operational loss of employment in this part of the Scheme is expected. No significant effects are anticipated in relation to agricultural employment and income.
		Respondents noted that 22% of businesses in the South Holland District are directly engaged in the agriculture sector It was also noted that food manufacturing is 13 times more significant as an employer in the region than the national average Concern was expressed about the long-term security of local jobs tied to the agricultural sector	N	The Applicant notes that, as set out in **Chapter 14: Socio-Economics and Land Use** (Doc Ref. 6.1), 5% of the working population work within the agriculture, forestry and fishing industry. This is based on the 2023 Business Register and Employment Survey which classifies industries by their Standard Industrial Classification (SIC). The Applicant further confirms that there are no workers who are reliant on the farmland for full time employment. The fields within the Solar Development Areas that are currently used to grow arable crops would cease to be part of a working farm during construction. However, the Applicant has reached voluntary land agreements with all landowners in the Solar Development Areas reflecting their consent to this land use change. For landowners within the Solar Development Areas, the Scheme is an opportunity to diversify their operations and generate income from their land.
		Respondent raised concerns about the changing land use implications for tenant farmers	N	The Applicant confirms that the likely economic effects to agricultural land holdings are assessed in **ES Chapter 14: Socio-Economics and Land Use** (Doc Ref. 6.1). No significant effects are anticipated during any phase of the Scheme. Within the Solar Development Areas there are a total of five landowners, with a further 42 and 16 landowners located within the

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				Grid Connection Route and Inter-Array Connections respectively. There are no workers who are reliant on the farmland in the Solar Development Area for full time employment. The fields within the Solar Development Areas that are currently used to grow arable crops would cease to be part of a working farm during construction. However, the Applicant has reached voluntary land agreements with all landowners in the Solar Development Areas reflecting their consent to this land use change, while there are no tenant farmers. For landowners within the Solar Development Areas, the Scheme is an opportunity to diversify their operations and generate income from their land. Within the Inter-Array Connections and the Grid Connection Route, disruption to farming activities would largely be temporary and short term only, so no operational loss of employment in this part of the Scheme is expected.
		Respondents raised concerns about the cumulative impact that reduced farming and agricultural opportunities would have on local food processing, packaging, haulage and transport sectors	N	The likely economic effects to agricultural land holdings are assessed in **ES Chapter 14: Socio-Economics and Land Use** (Doc Ref. 6.1). No significant effects are anticipated during any phase of the Scheme. The Scheme is anticipated to provide an increase in local employment arising from indirect and induced effects of the construction activity. Employment growth would arise locally through manufacturing services and suppliers to the construction process (indirect or supply linkage multipliers). Further, the ES sets out an employment gain of 11 jobs supported by operational activities on the Site.
		Respondents suggested that reduced local employment rates, as a result of the Scheme, would deter investment in local agriculture, further narrowing opportunity	N	The Applicant notes that, as set out in **ES Chapter 14: Socio-Economics and Land Use** (Doc Ref. 6.1), the employment effects of the Scheme during the construction phase are expected to represent a positive economic effect. It is expected that 40% of the construction staff can be sourced from within a 60-minute travel area, with 60% of staff likely to reside outside this area. Whilst it is not a specific consideration of the assessment, it is noted that a larger proportion of the jobs taken up by people living outside the area would likely be in more specialised solar PV professions owing to the scarcity of such resources within localised areas compared with less skilled professions. It is estimated that during construction, the Scheme would create 74full time equivalent (FTE) jobs per annum for residents within the 60-minute travel area, and 110 FTE jobs outside of this travel area (184 FTE overall on average over the construction period).

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				In addition to the direct employment generated by the construction of the Scheme, there would be an increase in local employment arising from indirect and induced effects of the construction activity. Employment growth would arise locally through manufacturing services and suppliers to the construction process (indirect or supply linkage multipliers). Additionally, it is assumed that part of the income of the construction workers and suppliers would be spent in the Study Area, generating further employment (in terms of induced or income multipliers). It is estimated that the Scheme would result in net indirect and induced employment of 69 jobs per annum during the construction phase. For the operational phase, the Applicant has estimates that 11 FTE jobs would be supported by activities on the Site as a result of the Scheme. The **Outline Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan** (Doc Ref. 7.17) sets out a variety of interventions which the Applicant would pursue post-consent to maximise the economic benefits of the Scheme, for example promoting local employment, apprenticeships and education.
		Respondent raised concerns about the impact large construction vehicles would have on their local horse riding business	N	Equestrian routes (Bridleways) have been considered in **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref. 6.1), with no likely significant effects identified with the implementation of measures set out within the **OCTMP** and the **Outline PRoW-MP**(Doc Ref. 7.15).
		Respondents questioned how farming activities would be impacted by road closures and diversions during the construction phase	N	The Applicant acknowledges that temporary partial or full road closures may be required in some locations to complete the highway works. Any partial or full road closures are expected to be for a short duration to minimise impacts on the local highway network. Advance warning will be provided in line with local highway authority guidance and diversion routes will be put in place. No permanent road closures will be required. Management measures will be set out in the Detailed Construction Traffic Management Plans (CTMPs), to be agreed with the Local Planning Authority, in substantial accordance with the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13). Where a full closure is required, the works will be carefully planned to ensure that the durations of any closures are minimised, and any full closure will include consideration of the continued access of any local residents or commercial businesses that fall within the area of the closure. The exact duration of any partial or full closure would be secured as part of the Detailed CTMP.

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				A summary of the anticipated type of closures and durations by location is provided in **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref. 6.1).
		Respondents raised concerns about local harvesting activities, which are set to coincide with the construction phase of the Scheme. Particular concern was expressed towards the impact on rural road networks	N	An **Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan** (Doc Ref. 7.13) has been produced to set out measures that will be undertaken to measure traffic during the construction phase. A Delivery Management System (DMS) will be implemented to control bookings of HGV deliveries from the start of the construction period. This will be used to regulate the arrival times of HGVs via timed delivery slots, as well as to monitor compliance of HGV routing which will be communicated to all suppliers. In addition, measures will be in place to ensure no queuing back from accesses onto the surrounding road network occurs. Temporary full closures are only anticipated to be required on minor unclassified roads with relatively low traffic flows, and it is not expected that there would be multiple closures at the same time or in close proximity to each other.
		Respondent suggested that direct compensation should be given to any local businesses impacted by the Scheme	N	Impacts on local businesses are assessed within **ES Chapter 14: Socio-Economics and Land Use** (Doc Ref. 6.1). No significant effects on businesses are considered likely with the implementation of the mitigation measures set out within the management plans submitted with the DCO Application.
		Respondents did not feel confident that the land parcels included in the Scheme would be returned to agricultural practices upon decommissioning	N	Land within the Order Limits would be returned to the relevant landowners once the decommissioning phase has been completed. This would include the areas of land where the agricultural resource has been maintained during operation, alongside any established habitats. Post-decommissioning, the landowner will decide upon the use of the land.
	Impact on local business (including farming) – land parcels and inter-array areas Respondents tended to reference the impact of the Scheme on local business at a general level. However, concern was expressed about the impact that the construction, operation and decommissioning of Land Parcel D	Respondent raised concerns about the impact of Land Parcel D on local bees. Respondent was concerned the forage for bees will be negatively impacted and suggested the solar PV areas would have to be sensitively planned to accommodate local wildlife	N	The impact of the Scheme on wildlife (including invertebrates) is assessed within **ES Chapter 9: Ecology and Biodiversity** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The chapter concludes no significant effects are expected. As part of the landscape design for the Scheme, new habitats would be provided to increase biodiversity compared to the existing baseline. 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. The creation and subsequent

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
	may have on local beekeepers and their bees.			management of habitats is detailed within the **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16), included as part of the DCO Application.
	Impact on local business (including farming) – grid connection corridor Respondents suggested that the construction and operation of the indicative overhead line would disrupt a range of local businesses, across the agricultural, tourism, and security sectors.	Respondent requested that land is removed from consideration for the pylon route. The respondent has an agroforestry and agrotourism business that would be impacted by the indicative overhead line route	Y	The Applicant confirms that the land referenced by the respondent has been removed from the Scheme and that no pylons will be placed there. Further, the potential impacts of the Scheme on tourism and existing businesses are assessed within **ES Chapter 14: Socio-Economics and Land Use** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The Applicant also notes that overhead line route has been developed through an iterative design process, informed by surveys and ongoing environmental and technical assessments. Further information is provided within **ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution** (Doc Ref. 6.1), the **Design Approach Document** (Doc Ref. 7.3) and **Appendix D: Site Selection Report** (Doc Ref. 7.1).
		Respondent requested for P30 and P31 to be moved as close to the dykes as possible to ensure the longevity of farming activities, including crop cultivation and spraying	Y	Both 4SV8 (P31) and 4SV9 (P30) have been moved southwest along the alignment, closer to the adjacent field drains as requested. 10m was maintained from the pylon leg to the edge of the drain for the installation of foundations.
		Respondents raised concerns about the impact of the indicative overhead line on local gliding club businesses and small airfields in the area	N	The Applicant confirms that aircraft disasters have been assessed in the Major Accidents and Disasters section of **ES Chapter 16: Other Environmental Topics** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The closest pylon is approximately 1.65km from Crowland airfield, which is the closest airfield. In the case of all Scheme infrastructure, it is expected to be outside of a theoretical Obstacle Limitation Surface of the airfields and, therefore, not impact on the operation of the airfield due to the Scheme's height, assuming an approach path of 365m and a worst-case approach angle of 2 degrees. As a result, major accident and disaster risks associated with aircraft are considered to be not significant.
		Respondents suggest that erecting new pylons would render impacted fields uneconomical to farm	N	The Applicant acknowledges that there would be land use impact associated with the bases of pylons. In these instances, impacts would be localised to the bases. The overhead line construction as part of the Grid Connection Route would require excavation, operation of heavy machinery, and scaffolding. Sections with these overhead lines would be subject to temporary loss of land to facilitate the construction and stringing works, temporary access tracks will also be constructed. Once the overhead lines are constructed, land would be returned to its original state, except for the pylon bases.

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
		Respondent raised concerns about the impact of the indicative overhead line and pylons on the use of a sensitive satellite system located on their property. The respondent requested the pylons be rerouted away from the property to ensure they could continue to use the equipment as part of their job	N	The design of the Scheme has been developed in accordance with UK electromagnetic compatibility (EMC) regulations and relevant British Standards to limit electromagnetic interference with third-party equipment, including radio and telecommunications apparatus. The risk of interference to existing equipment under normal operating conditions is extremely low. Any potential interference is mitigated through good engineering practice and adherence to EMC design standards. In the event that a complaint is received during the operational phase of the Scheme with regards to interference, it would be investigated in accordance with the **OOEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.11) and addressed through maintenance or remedial action to ensure continued safe and effective operation of all affected equipment.
	Impact on tourism – general comments Respondents raised concerns about how the Scheme may impact the local and regional tourism industry. Tourism in the area is closely tied to heritage sites, the natural landscape, and sport and outdoor recreational activities. It was noted that many local businesses rely on tourism to operate.	Respondents felt that the construction, operation and decommissioning of the Scheme would significantly harm the local tourist industry, including campsites, hotels and cafes	N	The Applicant confirms that **ES Chapter 14: Socio-Economics and Land Use** (Doc Ref. 6.1) has assessed tourism and recreation receptors most likely to be impacted by the Scheme. The Applicant acknowledges that tourism and visitor spending plays a notable role in the economy of the local area. Whilst there are no major tourism attractions within the Site or within 500m, a number of local visitor attractions have been included within the baseline assessment. Details of these are set out in Table 14-15 and 14-16 of **ES Chapter 14: Socio-Economics and Land Use** (Doc Ref. 6.1). There are expected to be no direct land use impacts, no effect on the local accommodation capacity, and minor and temporary indirect effects via severance. Throughout the design process, the Applicant has sought to reduce the potential for effects on views experienced by tourists, and visual amenity has been considered, where possible, on balance with other environmental constraints.
	Impact on tourism – land parcels and inter-array areas Respondents expressed concern about the impact of solar PV panels and associated land parcel infrastructure on local tourism. It was noted that changes to the natural landscape may reduce the aesthetic value which operates as a key 'pull' to the area.	Respondents raised concerns about the impact of the solar PV panels on tourism. It was felt that the potential glint and glare would reduce the aesthetic value of the visual landscape	N	The **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16), provides details on landscaping, which while not specifically required to mitigate glint and glare impacts from the Scheme, will further reduce glint and glare. As set out in **ES Chapter 16: Other Environmental Topics** (Doc Ref. 6.1) **Section 16.4 Glint and Glare**, Solar PV panels are designed to absorb, not reflect, irradiation. Additionally, the reflection intensity of solar panels is similar to common outdoor sources of reflection such as still water. As such, the glare intensity is likely to be comparable to that experienced on a regular basis in the natural world. The Applicant therefore notes that it is unlikely that adverse effects will be experienced from glint and glare due to the nature of the solar PV panels, and no significant effects are anticipated.

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
	Impact on tourism – grid connection corridor Respondents expressed concern about the impact of the overhead line on local tourism. It was noted that the construction of new pylons may reduce the aesthetic value which operates as a key 'pull' to the area.	Respondent noted that their local business, which operates as a horticultural tourist attraction in Cowbit, is within 500m of the proposed overhead line route, and had not been identified in consultation documents	N	The Applicant confirms that **ES Chapter 14: Socio-Economics and Land Use** (Doc Ref. 6.1) has assessed tourism and recreation receptors most likely to be impacted by the Scheme. The Applicant acknowledges that tourism and visitor spending plays a notable role in the economy of the local area. Whilst there are no major tourism attractions within the Site or within 500m, a number of local visitor attractions have been included within the baseline assessment. Details of these are set out in Table 14-15 and 14-16 of **ES Chapter 14: Socio-Economics and Land Use** (Doc Ref. 6.1). There are expected to be no direct land use impacts, no effect on the local accommodation capacity, and minor and temporary indirect effects via severance. Throughout the design process, the Applicant has sought to reduce the potential for effects on views experienced by tourists, and visual amenity has been considered, where possible, on balance with other environmental constraints.
		Respondents raised concerns about the impact of the overhead line on tourism. It was felt that the overhead line and pylons would reduce the aesthetic value of the visual landscape	N	During the design process, the Applicant has considered the visual impacts of the overhead lines and how these can be reduced through careful routing and siting, for example seeking to avoid important designations and proximity to towns and villages, and potential for effects to be mitigated. The Applicant is committed to, and has been following, the guidance set out in the Holford Rules and associated notes of clarification for routing overhead lines. As set out in **ES Chapter 14: Socio-Economics and Land Use** (Doc Ref. 6.1), no significant impacts on tourism are anticipated during any phase of the Scheme.
	Scheduled monuments, Heritage Sites, and Archaeology – general comments Respondents did not feel that the Scheme integrated well into the historical rural character of the local landscape, despite owing its name to the local Meridian Stone. Further details about how sites of historical significance and value would be protected, were requested as a minimum.	Respondents raised concerns about the potential impact of the Scheme on local heritage sites and areas. It was noted that the historical rural character of the area is integral to its identity and sense of place	N	The Applicant notes that potential direct and indirect effects on the historic environment have been considered in **ES Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage** (Doc Ref. 6.1). It is anticipated that construction activities, plant, compounds, solar PV modules, BESS units, towers and other infrastructure from the Scheme would have an adverse impact on the setting of some heritage assets located. Mitigation measures, such as buffers and removal of infrastructure from certain locations, has been incorporated into the Scheme design to reduce these effects, where practicable.
		Respondent stated that they did not feel that the Applicant had formally recognised the local and national importance of the Meridian Stone, despite using the name	N	The Meridian Stone was noted and recorded during the initial site visit and potential impacts to its historic significance and location have been considered in **ES Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage** (Doc Ref. 6.1), which

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				concludes that no significant effects are expected as a result of the Scheme.
		Respondents noted the Roman history and infrastructure in the area, including at Queen's Bank and surrounding Moulton Chapel. There is concern that the Scheme will permanently disrupt these elements of the historic landscape	N	Impacts on potential Iron Age or Roman settlement activity on higher ground / roddons within the Order Limits would be mitigated through the implementation of an archaeological programme of works, comprising archaeological investigation, recording, reporting and public engagement prior to construction. Whilst the archaeological programme of works would not minimise the physical impact to archaeological deposits, it would partially compensate for the loss by creating a record of the assets and advancing professional and public understanding of the local archaeology. As such the effects on archaeological deposits related to potential Iron Age and Roman settlement activity are not considered to be significant. Impacts on the setting of the heritage assets near Queen's Bank and the village of Moulton Chapel have also been considered in **ES Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage** (Doc Ref. 6.1). Mitigation planting proposals are presented within the **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16). Scattered shrub and tree planting is proposed along field boundaries to provide screening for the Solar Development Areas, in order to minimise impacts to the setting of heritage assets. Furthermore, buffers from Scheduled Monuments have been incorporated as part of the Scheme design. A significant adverse, reversible effect has been identified as a result of the change to the setting of the 'Medieval boundary earthworks at Queen's Bank, 100m south east of Providence House' Scheduled Monument. However, no significant effects are considered likely on the historic environment assets at Moulton Chapel, due to distance from the Scheme.
		Respondents stated that archaeological sites should be protected at all stages of the Scheme. It was noted that potential trenching activities posed a risk to the sites	N	The Applicant acknowledges that there will be likely significant residual effects on buried archaeological remains either through complete loss or disturbance during the construction of the Scheme. A geophysical survey and intrusive archaeological evaluation (trial trenching) of the Solar Development Area was undertaken which identified extensive archaeological activity across the Scheme. This has comprised trenches measuring 50m x 2m, with several broader but shorter trenches (e.g 7m x 7m) excavation to investigate possible features. Following receipt of the final fieldwork report for the evaluation trenching, the scope and type of mitigation to be applied to the Solar Development Area will be set out in the Outline Archaeological Mitigation and Management Strategy (OAMMS), which will be agreed

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				with the Archaeological Advisor to LCC (anticipated to be post-DCO submission and prior to the end of examination), and its implementation will be secured by a DCO requirement. This would likely involve recording, sampling and monitoring in advance of and during the construction phase. Details of potential enhancement and community engagement measures will also be included.
		Respondent stated that they did not feel confident that the Applicant would commit to the protection of local heritage assets	N	The embedded and additional mitigation set out in **ES Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage** (Doc Ref. 6.1) will be secured via the requirements in the Draft **DCO** (Doc Ref. 3.1). For example, The Applicant has ensured that prior to the commencement of any phase of development a detailed Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) will be submitted and approved by the relevant planning authority.
		Respondent noted that the Nene Wash is being considered for UNESCO World Heritage status and should be protected	N	No response required.
		Respondent suggested that the Applicant should outline provisions to protect St Polycarp Church in Gedney Hill and the Meridian Stone present along Langary Gate Road, particularly during the construction phase	N	The impacts of the Scheme on Holy Trinity with St Polycarp Church and the Meridian Stone have been assessed within **ES Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage** (Doc Ref. 6.1). Mitigation measures are included within the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10) and **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13) to reduce impacts related to the construction phase where practicable.
		Respondent expressed concern about the protection of non-designated sites	N	**ES Appendix 8-2: Historic Environment Desk-Based Assessment** (Doc Ref. 6.3) details the heritage assets considered in the Cultural Heritage assessment, included designated and non-designated assets.
		Respondent stated that no further information about the impact of the Scheme on the Medieval boundary earthworks at Queens Bank has been shared beyond the Preliminary Environmental Information Report and its Non-Technical Summary	N	S42 and S47 of the Planning Act 2008 require applications for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects to carry out formal pre-application consultation. Stage two consultation, including the sharing of information in the Preliminary Environmental Information Report, was held between 24 April and 8 June 2025. The **Consultation Report** (Doc Ref. 5.1) demonstrates how the Applicant has complied with the Planning Act 2008, Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, and, Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedures) Regulations 2009 (as amended) (the APFP Regulations). Further information gathered since the PEIR relating to the Scheduled Monument 'Medieval boundary earthworks at Queen's Bank' has been included in **ES Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage** (Doc Ref. 6.1). There are no direct effects on the Scheduled Monument, however, the assessment

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				acknowledges that a significant, reversible effect will occur due to the change in setting.
		Respondent stated that no further details about the nature of impacts on the Iron Age or Roman-British field boundaries and potential trackways had been shared beyond the Preliminary Environmental Information Report and its Non-Technical Summary	N	S42 and S47 of the Planning Act 2008 require applications for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects to carry out formal pre-application consultation. Stage two consultation, including the sharing of information in the Preliminary Environmental Information Report, was held between 24 April and 8 June 2025. The **Consultation Report** (Doc Ref. 5.1) demonstrates how the Applicant has complied with the Planning Act 2008, Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, and, Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedures) Regulations 2009 (as amended) (the APFP Regulations). Further information gathered since the PEIR relating to the Iron Age or Roman-British field boundaries and potential trackways is presented in **ES Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage** (Doc Ref. 6.1). Impacts on potential Iron Age or Roman settlement activity on higher ground / roddons within the Order Limits would be mitigated through the implementation of an archaeological programme of works, comprising archaeological investigation, recording, reporting and public engagement prior to construction. Whilst the archaeological programme of works would not minimise the physical impact to archaeological deposits, it would partially compensate for the loss by creating a record of the assets and advancing professional and public understanding of the local archaeology. As such the effects on archaeological deposits related to potential Iron Age and Roman settlement activity are not considered to be significant.
		Respondent stated that no further details about the nature of the effects to the historic setting of Schedules and Grade II listed St Guthlac's Cross had been shared beyond the Preliminary Environmental Information Report and its Non-Technical Summary	N	Section 42 and Section 47 of the PA2008 require applications for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects to carry out formal pre-application consultation. Stage two consultation, including the sharing of information in the Preliminary Environmental Information Report, was held between 24 April and 8 June 2025. The **Consultation Report** (Doc Ref. 5.1) demonstrates how the Applicant has complied with the Planning Act 2008, Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, and, Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedures) Regulations 2009 (as amended) (the APFP Regulations). Further information gathered since the PEIR relating to the historic setting of Scheduled Monuments and Grade II listed St Guthlac's Cross is presented in **ES Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage** (Doc Ref. 6.1). Whilst there would be no direct effects on these designated heritage assets,

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				the Applicant acknowledges that a significant, reversible effect will occur due to the change in setting.
		Respondent noted the historical significance of the area of land southwest of Moulton Chapel as a battle ground during the English Civil War	N	The village of Moulton Chapel and historical elements around it has been considered in **ES Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage** (Doc Ref. 6.1). No significant effects are considered likely on the historic environment assets at Moulton Chapel, due to distance from the Scheme.
	Heritage Sites, and Archaeology – land parcels and inter-array areas Parcel B, C and D were identified as parts of the Scheme located within areas of local historical importance. Whilst the removal of land in Land Parcel C to avoid direct impacts on two Scheduled Monuments was acknowledged, respondents felt more could be done to mitigate and protect the local historical landscape.	Respondents stated that recent archaeological investigations within areas of the proposed land parcels have identified areas with uncovered ancient artifacts. A full archaeological assessment has been requested	N	A geophysical survey and intrusive archaeological evaluation (trial trenching) of the Solar Development Area was undertaken which identified extensive archaeological activity across the Scheme. This has comprised trenches measuring 50m x 2m, with several broader but shorter trenches (e.g 7m x 7m) excavation to investigate possible features. Following receipt of the final fieldwork report for the evaluation trenching, the scope and type of mitigation to be applied to the Solar Development Area will be set out in the Outline Archaeological Mitigation and Management Strategy (OAMMS), which will be agreed with the Archaeological Advisor to LCC (anticipated to be post-DCO submission and prior to the end of examination), and its implementation will be secured by a DCO requirement. This would likely involve recording, sampling and monitoring in advance of and during the construction phase. Details of potential enhancement and community engagement measures will also be included.
		Respondent raised concerns that Land Parcel D would disrupt the cultural heritage of the Meridian Stone on Langary Gate Road. It was noted that the Stone is located along a potential transport route, placing it at a greater risk of disturbance. Protective measures have been requested	N	The Meridian Stone was noted and recorded during the initial site visit and potential impacts to its historic significance and location have been considered in **ES Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage** (Doc Ref. 6.1) which concludes that no significant effects are expected as a result of the Scheme. Mitigation measures relevant to Cultural Heritage have been included in the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10), which include ensuring Scheduled Monuments are protected from accidental damage, and the siting of access routes away from sensitive receptors.
		Respondents suggested that the historical visual landscape from Moulton Chapel would be permanently disrupted by Land Parcel B and C	N	Historic environment assets at the village of Moulton Chapel have been considered in **ES Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage** (Doc Ref. 6.1). No significant effects are considered likely on the historic environment assets at Moulton Chapel, due to distance from the Scheme.
		Respondent expressed concern about the proximity of the Land Parcels to Shepeau Stow. It was noted that the	N	The impact of the Scheme on historic buildings within Shepeau Stow has been assessed within **ES Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage** (Doc Ref. 6.1). Measures are included in the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10) and **OCTMP**

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
		village contains historically significant buildings, which may be vulnerable to disturbance		(Doc Ref. 7.13) to minimise the impacts of construction activity where practicable. No significant effects from a change in the setting of heritage assets are considered likely.
		Respondents welcomed the removal of land in Land Parcel C to avoid direct impacts on two scheduled monuments	N	The Applicant notes this comment.
		Respondent suggested that additional wildflower planting close to the scheduled monuments in Land Parcel C would significantly contribute to local biodiversity	N	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. The Scheduled Monuments in Land Parcel C have been set aside as habitat management areas for farmland birds. This would involve maintaining the existing arable use of these areas, however, providing skylark plots and habitat margins along the fields. 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.
		Respondent felt that the term "Scheduled Monument" required additional explanation and clarity in consultation materials	N	The Applicant acknowledges the comment and points to the PEIR Glossary and Abbreviations List made available to the public which defines "Scheduled Monuments" as - *An ancient monument or archaeological deposits designated by the Secretary of State as a 'Scheduled Ancient Monument' and protected under the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979.*
	Scheduled monuments, Heritage Sites, and Archaeology – grid connection corridor Respondents associated the indicative overhead line with disruption to the historical visual and physical landscape.	Respondents suggested that the historical visual landscape and viewpoints from Moulton Chapel would be permanently altered by the southwestern connection corridor	N	The heritage assets at the village of Moulton Chapel have been considered in **ES Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage** (Doc Ref. 6.1). No significant effects from a change in the setting of heritage assets are considered likely, due to distance from the Scheme and lack of intervisibility.
		Respondent felt that the proposed pylons would "scar" the historic landscape	N	Viewpoint analysis has been undertaken using the Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV), visualisations and photography. These have been used to determine the setting and extent of visibility between the Scheme and sensitive receptors. An assessment of impacts on the setting of heritage assets and the historic landscape character is provided within

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				ES Appendix 8-4: Summary of Heritage Setting Assessment (Doc Ref. 6.3) and **ES Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage** (Doc Ref. 6.1).
	Human mental health – general comments Respondents perceive the Scheme to be a direct threat to the mental health and wellbeing of local communities. Some respondents noted that the process of understanding and responding to consultation materials had resulted in increased anxiety and stress. Others emphasised the long-term impact the construction and operation of the Scheme may have on a range of social groups, particularly children, families, those with disabilities and existing conditions, and elderly people.	Respondents felt that the construction, operation and decommissioning of the Scheme would negatively impact the mental health of those living and working in proximity to the Scheme Respondents referenced visual impact, noise, dust, pollution, and disruption to everyday life, and mental health	N	The Applicant confirms that the impact of the Scheme on mental wellbeing of local residents has been considered in **ES Chapter 10: Human Health** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The assessment considers elements of the Scheme which could affect mental health (for example, changes in landscape and visual amenity, noise, access to open space and employment) as well as physical health and concludes that there are no significant effects expected, with the implementation of mitigation measures committed to in the management plans submitted with the DCO Application.
		Respondents stated that the existing landscape supported their mental health. The potential impact of the Scheme on visual amenities is considered a threat to their quality of life and wellbeing	N	The Applicant confirms that the impact of the Scheme on mental wellbeing of local residents has been considered in **ES Chapter 10: Human Health** (Doc Ref. 6.1) and concludes that there are no significant effects expected and concludes that there are no significant effects expected, with the implementation of mitigation measures committed to in the management plans submitted with the DCO Application.
		Respondents expressed concern about the impact construction noise may have on their mental health	N	The Applicant confirms that the impact of the Scheme on mental wellbeing of local residents has been considered in **ES Chapter 10: Human Health** (Doc Ref. 6.1). This includes consideration of noise. **ES Chapter 13: Noise and Vibration** (Doc Ref. 6.1) outlines that construction activities are likely to result in significant residual effects at a residential receptor at Broad Gate within the Grid Connection Rout) during nighttime construction activity and construction traffic noise effects at receptors along Langary Gate Road. No significant effects were identified at any other sensitive receptor during the construction phase. Overall, the likely effect on health arising from noise and vibration effects during the construction phase of the Scheme is assessed to be short-term temporary minor adverse (not significant) for the general population and vulnerable groups, considering the small minority of the study area population that would be affected for a short period of time. The Applicant confirms that further details are provided in the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10) on how noise and vibration emissions will be minimised as far as reasonably practicable.
		Respondents noted that the lack of direct benefit from the energy generated by the Scheme may exacerbate any mental health impacts generated by the Scheme	N	The Applicant appreciates that the potential for the Scheme to have adverse effects creates uncertainty and anxiety for local residents. The Applicant is committed to ongoing consultation with the community so

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				that anxieties can be communicated and, as far as possible, addressed throughout all stages of the Scheme. The **Environmental Statement** (Doc Ref. 6.1)and **Planning Statement** (Doc Ref. 7.1) provide an assessment of the adverse and beneficial effects associated with the Scheme, an explanation of why the Scheme is needed and the benefits of renewable energy, and the other benefits associated with the Scheme.
		Respondents felt that consultation materials, meetings and discussions at events had generated local uncertainty and anxiety	N	The Applicant acknowledges this comment and the impact a potential scheme can have on a surrounding community. The Applicant has made every effort to ensure all information has been easily accessible, clear and concise throughout the programme of consultation and the community were also able to contact the team with any issues or concerns throughout.
		Respondents felt that the Human Health and Wellbeing chapter of the PEIR did not adequately acknowledge the cumulative and long-term psychological impact of the Scheme. They felt that human mental and psychological impact should be formally assessed as part of the planning process	N	The Applicant confirms that **ES Chapter 10: Human Health** (Doc Ref. 6.1) assesses potential effects of the Scheme on the health and wellbeing, including mental health, of local residents across all phases of the Scheme. The chapter includes a cumulative effects assessment with a wider 2km zone of influence applied to capture potential interactions with other developments that could collectively impact community health and wellbeing and concludes that no significant effects are expected, with the implementation of the mitigation measures set out within the management plans submitted with the DCO Application.
		Respondents highlighted that seldom heard groups and vulnerable people may be at a higher risk of negative mental health and wellbeing impact over the lifespan of the Scheme	N	The Applicant notes that, as set out in **ES Chapter 10: Human Health** (Doc Ref. 6.1), vulnerable groups have been considered in the assessment of likely significant effects, acknowledging that vulnerable groups are likely to be more sensitive to changes and concludes that no significant effects are expected, with the implementation of the mitigation measures set out within the management plans submitted with the DCO Application.
	Human mental health – land parcels and inter-array areas Respondents suggested that the construction and operation of the infrastructure within the Land Parcels and Inter-array areas could cause significant mental harm to those living in proximity to these areas. Respondents referenced the impact of changes to their visual	Respondent suggested the Applicant monitors local suicide rates and cancer diagnoses in local communities living in proximity to the Land Parcels	N	An assessment of potential impacts and likely significant effects on human health, including mental health and wellbeing, is set out within the **ES Chapter 10: Human Health** (Doc Ref. 6.1)The assessment concludes that with the implementation of the mitigation measures set out within the management plans submitted with the DCO Application, no significant effects on human health are considered likely. Local health statistics monitoring is undertaken by the Office for National Statistics, NHS and the local authorities.
		Respondents expressed concern for the wellbeing of their children, whose bedrooms are set to face the Land Parcels	N	The Applicant confirms that, as set out in **ES Chapter 10: Human Health** (Doc Ref. 6.1), landscape and visual effects of the Scheme during all

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
	amenity, quality of outdoor recreational activities, changes in temperature, noise, and air quality. For some respondents, the prospective of the Scheme has already impacted their mental health.			phases of the Scheme have been considered within the human health assessment. The chapter acknowledges that given the rural setting, the local area could be sensitive to changes in visual effects potentially impacting quality of life for residents, should local tranquillity be impacted. The chapter concludes that no significant effects are expected, with the implementation of the mitigation measures set out within the management plans submitted with the DCO Application.
		Respondents have suggested that the inter-array areas would negatively impact their mental and physical health. They stated that changes to the landscape surrounding their property may exacerbate their stress and anxiety levels	N	The Applicant confirms that the impact of the Scheme on mental wellbeing of local residents has been considered in **ES Chapter 10: Human Health** (Doc Ref. 6.1) and concludes that no significant effects are expected, with the implementation of the mitigation measures set out within the management plans submitted with the DCO Application..
		Respondent stated that the proximity of Land Parcel A to residential dwellings fails to consider human well-being and mental health	N	The Applicant confirms that the impact of the Scheme on mental wellbeing of local residents has been considered in **Chapter 10: Human Health** (Doc Ref. 6.1) and concludes that no significant effects are expected, with the implementation of the mitigation measures set out within the management plans submitted with the DCO Application. It is acknowledged that negative impacts on landscape and visual amenity have the potential to reduce resident's enjoyment of their environment, in particular their perception of tranquillity and rurality, impacting mental health. The assessment methodology for human health follows a single consistent framework based on the Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (IEMA) Guide to Determining Significance for Human Health in Environmental Impact Assessment.
		Respondent noted that 75% of the view points from their property, along Queens Bank, will overlook Land Parcel B. There is significant concern that their mental wellbeing will be impacted by the reduction in privacy and visual amenity	N	The Applicant confirms that the impact of the Scheme on mental wellbeing of local residents has been considered in **Chapter 10: Human Health** (Doc Ref. 6.1) and concludes that no significant effects are expected, with the implementation of the mitigation measures set out within the management plans submitted with the DCO Application. However, it is acknowledged that negative impacts on landscape and visual amenity have the potential to reduce resident's enjoyment of their environment, in particular their perception of tranquillity and rurality, impacting mental health.
		Respondent suggested that the pre-application phase of the Scheme was causing high levels of mental stress, which has resulted in the individual seeking support from their GP	N	The Applicant acknowledges this comment and the impact a potential scheme can have on a surrounding community. The Applicant has made every effort to ensure all information has been easily accessible, clear and concise throughout the programme of consultation and the community were also able to contact the team with any issues or concerns throughout.

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
		Respondent noted that disruption caused by the construction, operation and decommissioning of the inter-array areas may exacerbate pre-existing conditions for members of their household, including C-PTSD, Anxiety, Suicidal Ideation and Acute Stress Disorder. Preserving the character of their environment was deemed critical to protecting any mental harm	N	The Applicant acknowledges the concerns of the respondent and reiterates its commitment to minimizing any effects to the local community. An **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10) has been prepared which presents an outline of the measures that would be implemented to ensure the management of environmental impacts during the construction phase of the Scheme. If the DCO Application is approved, a detailed CEMP will be produced following the appointment of a Principal Contractor and approved by the relevant planning authorities. A Community Liaison Group will be set up prior to construction and will continue through until final commissioning of the Scheme as a formal forum for local issues to be raised. A Community Liaison Officer will be appointed to lead discussions with local communities, and also act as the primary point of contact should there be any queries or complaints.
	Human mental health – grid connection corridor The overhead line and pylon infrastructure was less frequently referenced in comments about the impact of the Scheme on mental health. However, there is concern that changes to noise and vibration levels will exacerbate those living with sensitive conditions, including Misophonia Aspergers.	Respondent has stated that their Misophonia Aspergers may be negatively impacted by noise produced in the construction and operation of the overhead line. There is a concern that this will significantly impact their mental health, and make residing at the property untenable	N	The Applicant acknowledges this as a concern and reiterates its commitment to minimising any effects on the local community. An **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10) has been prepared which presents an outline of the measures that would be implemented to ensure the management of environmental impacts during the construction phase of the Scheme. If the DCO Application is approved, a detailed CEMP will be produced following the appointment of a Principal Contractor and approved by the relevant planning authorities. A Community Liaison Group will be set up prior to construction and will continue through until final commissioning of the Scheme as a formal forum for local issues to be raised. A Community Liaison Officer will be appointed to lead discussions with local communities, and also act as the primary point of contact should there be any queries.
	Human health and safety – general Respondents are generally concerned that the Scheme will increase the risk of human harm in the local area. The construction phase is of particular concern, with respondents noting the proximity of access routes to local primary schools. Other concerns include increased traffic congestion, noise and pollution.	Respondents expressed a general concern for human health and safety and the management of risks associated with the Scheme	N	The Applicant confirms that a full assessment of the likely significant effects of the Scheme on human health is set out in **ES Chapter 10: Human Health** (Doc Ref. 6.1) and concludes that no significant effects are expected, with the implementation of the mitigation measures set out within the management plans submitted with the DCO Application. The assessment considers elements of the Scheme which could affect human health, including air quality, landscape and visual, noise and vibration, traffic and access, and social infrastructure. Safety risks, including Electric and Magnetic Fields (EMF) and Major Accidents and Disasters are assessed in **ES Chapter 16: Other Environmental Topics** (Doc Ref. 6.1). Both assessments identified no significant effects.
		Respondents noted the proximity of local schools and nurseries to the proposed road networks for construction	N	Since the Preliminary Environmental Information Report was published, the Application has updated the proposed routing for the Scheme to

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
		traffic. There is concern for their safety as vulnerable pedestrians. Crowland was given as an example impacted locality		avoid residential communities and sensitive local receptors, including South View Primary School in Crowland. The Applicant confirms that **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref. 6.1) has considered road safety for both road users and pedestrians and concluded that there are no significant effects. Measures have been implemented to control traffic, including a default priority that construction traffic will give-way to other users. This includes several Public Rights of Way (PRoW) crossing points, as detailed within the **Outline PRoW-MP**(Doc Ref. 7.15). Further details on how roads will be managed to mitigate impacts is set out in the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10). The **ES Chapter 10: Human Health** (Doc Ref. 6.1) also assesses the safety of the Scheme on pedestrians, cyclists, and equestrian receptors and concludes that no significant effects are expected, with the implementation of the mitigation measures set out within the management plans submitted with the DCO Application..
		Respondents felt that construction traffic along Queens Bank, Langary Gate Road, Long Lane, Delgate Bank, and Austendike Road would compromise the safety of road users and pedestrians	N	The Applicant confirms that **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref. 6.1) considered road safety for both road users and pedestrians and concluded no significant effects. Measures have been implemented to control traffic, including a default priority that construction traffic will give-way to other users. This includes several Public Rights of Way (PRoW) crossing points, as detailed within the **Outline PRoW-MP**(Doc Ref. 7.15). Further details on how roads will be managed to mitigate impacts is set out in the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10). **ES Chapter 10: Human Health** (Doc Ref. 6.1) also assesses the safety of the Scheme on pedestrians, cyclists, and equestrian receptors and concludes that no significant effects are expected , with the implementation of the mitigation measures set out within the management plans submitted with the DCO Application. The full assessment for road safety, including receptors considered, is set out in **ES Appendix 15-4: Transport Assessment Note** (Doc Red. 6.3).
		Respondents felt that they did not have enough information about how the Scheme would impact human health and safety	N	The Applicant acknowledges these comments and remains confident in the level of information presented to the community throughout the pre-application consultation process. **ES Chapter 10: Human Health** (Doc Ref. 6.1) also assesses the safety of the Scheme on pedestrians, cyclists, and equestrian receptors and concludes that no significant effects are expected, with the implementation of the mitigation measures set out within the management plans submitted with the DCO Application.

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
		Respondents expressed concern about the impact of the Scheme on the safety of recreational activities, such as walking, horse riding and cycling The health and safety of members of local Gliding Clubs was a concern	N	The Applicant confirms that **ES Chapter 10: Human Health** and **Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref. 6.1) assess the safety of the Scheme on pedestrians, cyclists, and equestrian receptors and concludes that no significant effects are expected, with the implementation of the mitigation measures set out within the management plans submitted with the DCO Application. Measures have been implemented to control traffic, including a default priority that construction traffic will give-way to other users. This includes several PRoW crossing points, as detailed within the **Outline PRoW-MP**(Doc Ref. 7.15). Further details on how roads will be managed to mitigate impacts is set out in the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10). The Applicant further confirms that Crowland Airfield and Fenland Airfield have been considered in **ES Chapter 16: Other Environmental Topics** (Doc Ref. 6.1) within both the Glint and Glare and Major Accidents and Disasters sections. Suitable buffers have been incorporated into the Scheme design to ensure infrastructure is outside a theoretical Obstacle Limited Surface of the airfield, and therefore not impact on the operation of the airfield.
		Respondents expressed concerns about the potential for an increased risk of fire due as a result of Scheme infrastructure, particularly the Battery Energy Storage Systems	N	An **OBSMP** (Doc Ref. 7.18) has been produced which sets out the BESS safety and firefighting requirements, which will be implemented in consultation with the Lincolnshire Fire & Rescue Service. The Applicant will take into account the latest good practices for battery system failure prevention and detection, consequence modelling, risk analysis, and emergency response planning, as guidance continues to develop in the UK and around the world.
		Respondents expressed concern about the impact of increased levels of pollution from construction activities on human physical health, and conditions such as Asthma	N	The Applicant notes that **ES Chapter 6: Air Quality** (Doc Ref. 6.1) assesses the effects of the Scheme on air quality at nearby sensitive receptors during construction and concludes that no significant effects are expected , with the implementation of the mitigation measures set out within the management plans submitted with the DCO Application. The overall risk level for human health has been classified as low risk. Pollution impacts will be mitigated through adherence to measures detailed in the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10), **OOEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.11) and **ODEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.12).
		Respondent noted that any deaths or accidents related to the Scheme would have to be investigated	N	The Applicant notes this comment.
		Respondents raised concerns about the impact of light pollution to human health	N	The Applicant confirms that lighting will be required during the construction and decommissioning phases for safety reasons, but will be temporary in nature and predominantly limited to the core working

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				hours. During construction, activities will follow measures set out in the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10) to avoid light pollution, including the use of hoods/cowls to minimize outward light and directing lighting towards the middle of the Order Limits, rather than towards land outside of the boundaries. During the Scheme's operation, no onsite lighting will be used for the Solar Development Area. Security lighting with motion detectors is proposed at the On-Site Substation Compounds.
	Human health and safety – land parcel and inter-array areas Respondents raised concerns about the impact that the construction, operation and maintenance of the Land Parcels and Inter-array areas may have on the safety of the communities living nearby.	Respondents suggested that Land Parcel C was too close to Shepeau Stow primary school and Dowsdale Bank primary school. The health and safety risk from construction and in the event of a fire was emphasised as a key concern	N	Shepeau Stow Primary School has been considered in **ES Chapter 10: Human Health** (Doc Ref. 6.1) due to its proximity to the Order Limits. No likely significant effects to this receptor were identified. The **OBSMP** (Doc Ref. 7.18) has been produced which sets out the BESS safety and firefighting requirements, which will be implemented in consultation with the Lincolnshire Fire & Rescue Service.
		Respondents raised concerns about the proximity of Land Parcel D to Country Kids nursery and Gedney Hill primary school. There is concern for staff and pupil health and safety	N	Country Kids Holbeach Drove Nursery and The Gedney Hill Church of England (VC) Primary School have been considered in **ES Chapter 10: Human Health** (Doc Ref. 6.1) due to their proximity to the Order Limits. No likely significant effects to these receptors were identified, with the implementation of the mitigation measures set out within the management plans submitted with the DCO Application.
		Respondent felt that they did not have enough information about the human health risks associated with panel cleaning chemicals and methods	N	The Applicant confirms that, as set out in **ES Chapter 2: The Scheme** (Doc Ref. 6.1), the solar panels will require cleaning once a year. This will use clean water with no added chemicals, sourced from local potable water suppliers and therefore there is no human health risk.
	Human health and safety – grid connection corridor Respondents raised specific concerns about the risks associated with living in proximity to overhead lines and pylons. There are concerns that the pylons may increase the risk of developing health conditions.	Respondents raised concerns about the human health and safety impacts of overhead lines and pylons. Respondents suggested that living in proximity to pylons may increase their risk of cancer. The sharing of further information was encouraged	N	Electric and Magnetic Fields (EMF) are produced whenever electricity is used or transmitted. Background EMFs are present in most homes, produced from household wiring and electrical appliances. Examples of these are presented in Section 16.3 of **ES Chapter 16: Other Environmental Topics** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The Applicant confirms that EMF are assessed in **ES Chapter 16: Other Environmental Topics** (Doc Ref. 6.1) and within the **EMF Compliance Assessment** (Doc Ref. 7.8). The **EMF Compliance Assessment** (Doc Ref. 7.8) includes an assessment of the potential EMFs from the Scheme against the exposure limits developed by ICNIRP and includes evidence on potential impacts from exposure to radiation. The approach has been agreed with UKHSA following the inclusion of DECC (2012) 'Power Lines: Demonstrating compliance with EMF public exposure guidelines A voluntary Code of Practice' guidance.

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				As set out in Section 16.3 of **ES Chapter 16: Other Environmental Topics**, the UK policy on public exposure limits to EMF radiation is designed to comply with the 1998 International Commission on the Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) guidelines. No significant effects were identified in the EMF assessment, and levels of electromagnetic radiation from the Scheme are predicted to be well below 1998 ICNIRP reference levels at all surrounding locations where public exposure levels are relevant.
		Respondents raised concerns about the impact of potential noise emitted from pylons on human health, particularly sleep quality and cognitive function	N	The potential impact of noise from overhead lines has been assessed in **ES Chapter 13: Noise and Vibration** (Doc Ref. 6.1). A Tier 2 assessment of overhead line noise has been undertaken. Full details of the overhead line noise calculations and result are presented in **ES Appendix 13-3: Construction and Operational Noise Modelling** (Doc Ref. 6.1). A worst-case scenario has been assessed, assuming flat terrain between the source and receptor and point and no acoustic absorption due to the ground and use of the smallest possible pylon size. Mitigation measures are proposed including multiple subconductors spaced by non-conductive spacers, use of hydrophilic coatings and increasing the distance between conductor groups reduces the electrostatic stress between them, which when implemented would reduce all effects to not significant. As detailed information about the overhead line design is not available at this stage of the application, a commitment to undertake a Tier 3 assessment in accordance with guidance provided in TGN(E)322 is secured in the **Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan** (OOEMP) (Doc Ref. 7.11). This will include mitigation measures to be applied during detailed design to reduce noise.
	EMFs – land parcels and inter-array areas	Respondents raised concerns about the potential radiation emitted from solar panels in the proposed Land Parcels	N	The Applicant confirms EMF are assessed in **ES Chapter 16: Other Environmental Topics** (Doc Ref. 6.1) and within the **EMF Compliance Assessment** (Doc Ref. 7.8). The **EMF Compliance Assessment** (Doc Ref. 7.8) includes an assessment of the potential EMFs from the Scheme against the exposure limits developed by ICNIRP and includes evidence on potential impacts from exposure to radiation. The approach has been agreed with UKHSA following the inclusion of DECC (2012) 'Power Lines: Demonstrating compliance with EMF public exposure guidelines A voluntary Code of Practice' guidance. As set out in Section 16.3 of **ES Chapter 16: Other Environmental Topics** (Doc Ref. 6.1), the UK policy on public exposure limits to EMF radiation is designed to comply with the 1998 International Commission

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				on the Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) guidelines. No significant effects were identified in the EMF assessment, and levels of electromagnetic radiation from the Scheme are predicted to be well below 1998 ICNIRP reference levels at all surrounding locations where public exposure levels are relevant.
	EMFs – overhead lines and Weston Marsh Substation – grid connection corridor A significant level of concern was expressed towards the potential impact of EMFs on human health, particularly for those living in proximity to the proposed pylons. Respondents suggested that the Applicant conducts further research and commits to ongoing monitoring.	Respondents raised concerns about the potential adverse, long-term human health impacts from EMF radiation Respondents noted risks of headaches, sleep disturbances, fatigue, anxiety, skin rashes, muscle pain, cancer, leukaemia and brain tumours, particularly for residents living in proximity to the overhead lines	N	EMF are produced whenever electricity is used or transmitted. Background EMFs are present in most homes, produced from household wiring and electrical appliances. Examples of these are presented in Section 16.3 of **ES Chapter 16: Other Environmental Topics** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The Applicant confirms EMF are assessed in **ES Chapter 16: Other Environmental Topics** and within the **EMF Compliance Assessment** (Doc Ref. 7.8). The **EMF Compliance Assessment** includes an assessment of the potential EMFs from the Scheme against the exposure limits developed by ICNIRP and includes evidence on potential impacts from exposure to radiation. The approach has been agreed with UKHSA following the inclusion of DECC (2012) 'Power Lines: Demonstrating compliance with EMF public exposure guidelines A voluntary Code of Practice' guidance. As set out in Section 16.3 of **ES Chapter 16: Other Environmental Topics**, the UK policy on public exposure limits to EMF radiation is designed to comply with the 1998 International Commission on the Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) guidelines. No significant effects were identified in the EMF assessment, and levels of electromagnetic radiation from the Scheme are predicted to be well below 1998 ICNIRP reference levels at all surrounding locations where public exposure levels are relevant.
		Respondents noted that the fear and uncertainty around the impact of EMFs is generating psychological stress amongst local communities	N	The Applicant acknowledges these concerns and is committed to cause the least disturbance to the environment and those who live, work and enjoy recreation close to the Scheme. The Applicant confirms that a full assessment of the likely significant effects of the Scheme on human health is set out in **ES Chapter 10: Human Health** (Doc Ref. 6.1) and concludes that no significant effects are expected. The assessment considers elements of the Scheme which could affect human health, including air quality, landscape and visual, noise and vibration, traffic and access, social infrastructure and impacts on mental health and wellbeing. EMF are produced whenever electricity is used or transmitted. Background EMFs are present in most homes, produced from

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				household wiring and electrical appliances. Examples of these are presented in Section 16.3 of **ES Chapter 16: Other Environmental Topics** (Doc Ref. 6.1). EMF are assessed in **ES Chapter 16: Other Environmental Topics** (Doc Ref. 6.1) and within the **EMF Compliance Assessment** (Doc Ref. 7.8). The **EMF Compliance Assessment** (Doc Ref. 7.8) includes an assessment of the potential EMFs from the Scheme against the exposure limits developed by ICNIRP and includes evidence on potential impacts from exposure to radiation. The approach has been agreed with UKHSA following the inclusion of DECC (2012) 'Power Lines: Demonstrating compliance with EMF public exposure guidelines A voluntary Code of Practice' guidance. The Applicant confirms that, as set out in Section 16.3 of **ES Chapter 16: Other Environmental Topics** (Doc Ref. 6.1), the UK policy on public exposure limits to EMF radiation is designed to comply with the 1998 International Commission on the Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) guidelines. No significant effects were identified in the EMF assessment, and levels of electromagnetic radiation from the Scheme are predicted to be well below 1998 ICNIRP reference levels at all surrounding locations where public exposure levels are relevant.
		Respondent suggested that moving pylons away from Delgate bank would significantly reduce the potential impact of EMF radiation for residents	N	A detailed explanation of how the siting of pylons has been developed is set out in **ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution** (Doc Ref. 6.1) and the **Design Approach Document** (Doc Ref. 7.3). EMF are produced whenever electricity is used or transmitted. Background EMFs are present in most homes, produced from household wiring and electrical appliances. Examples of these are presented in Section 16.3 of **ES Chapter 16: Other Environmental Topics** (Doc Ref. 6.1). EMF are assessed in **ES Chapter 16: Other Environmental Topics** (Doc Ref. 6.1) and within the **EMF Compliance Assessment** (Doc Ref. 7.8). The **EMF Compliance Assessment** (Doc Ref. 7.8) includes an assessment of the potential EMFs from the Scheme against the exposure limits developed by ICNIRP and includes evidence on potential impacts from exposure to radiation. The approach has been agreed with UKHSA following the inclusion of DECC (2012) 'Power Lines: Demonstrating compliance with EMF public exposure guidelines A voluntary Code of Practice' guidance. The Applicant confirms that, as set out in Section 16.3 of **ES Chapter 16: Other Environmental Topics** (Doc Ref. 6.1), the UK policy on public

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				exposure limits to EMF radiation is designed to comply with the 1998 International Commission on the Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) guidelines. No significant effects were identified in the EMF assessment, and levels of electromagnetic radiation from the Scheme are predicted to be well below 1998 ICNIRP reference levels at all surrounding locations where public exposure levels are relevant.
		Respondent raised concerns for the potential impact of EMF and Electro-Magnetic Radiation (EMR), from the overhead line, on sensitive radio equipment located on their property. The respondent reported that their equipment uses frequencies between 1.8Mhz and 24GHz	N	The design of the Scheme has been developed in accordance with UK electromagnetic compatibility (EMC) regulations and relevant British Standards to limit electromagnetic interference with third-party equipment, including radio and telecommunications apparatus. The risk of interference to existing radio equipment under normal operating conditions is extremely low. Any potential interference is mitigated through good engineering practice and adherence to EMC design standards. In the event that a complaint is received during the operational phase of the Scheme with regards to interference, it would be investigated in accordance with the **OOEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.11) and addressed through maintenance or remedial action to ensure continued safe and effective operation of all affected communications equipment.
		Respondent suggested that the ongoing monitoring of EMF levels should be established upon the completion of the construction phase	N	As set out in **ES Chapter 16: Other Environmental Topics** and within the **EMF Compliance Assessment** (Doc Ref. 7.8), levels of electromagnetic radiation from the Scheme are predicted to be well below 1998 ICNIRP reference levels at all surrounding locations where public exposure levels are relevant and therefore monitoring will not be required.
	Noise – post construction – general Respondents raised concerns about the potential noise pollution generated by the Scheme across its lifespan. Some suggested that the flat topography of the local landscape may exacerbate noise levels.	Respondents expressed concern about the potential impact of noise pollution from the Scheme throughout operation and decommissioning phases, on local communities	N	The Applicant confirms that an assessment of potential noise impacts from the Scheme during operation and decommissioning has been set out in **ES Chapter 13: Noise and Vibration** (Doc Ref. 6.1). Measures to effectively manage and control noise emissions throughout the lifespan of the Scheme are secured in the OEMP, which would be prepared in accordance with the **OOEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.11) and secured by way of Requirement in the DCO. The operational phase accounts for direct noise effects as a result of solar farm and overhead line infrastructure associated with the Scheme. No likely significant residual effects are identified during the operational phase. No likely significant residual noise or vibration effects are identified during the decommissioning phase from decommissioning activities on

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				Site. Likely significant residual effects are identified at receptors along Langary Gate Road as a result of peak decommissioning traffic.
		Respondents noted that the flat topography of the Fens landscape would likely exacerbate the impact of any noise produced from the Scheme Further consideration be given to the mitigation of noise travelling across the flat topography of the area was requested	N	The Applicant confirms that, as set out in **ES Chapter 13: Noise and Vibration** (Doc Ref. 6.1), a worst-case assessment of noise effects has been undertaken by assuming flat terrain between noise sources and receptors.
		Respondents suggested that the potential noise emitted from elements of the Scheme should be mapped and consulted on. It was suggested that this could be included as part of an inclusion assessment	N	Operational noise mapping at 1.5m height is provided in **ES Figure 13-2: Noise Contours (1.5m) – Operational Phase without mitigation** and **ES Figure 13-3: Noise Contours (1.5m) – Operational phase with mitigation** (Doc Ref. 6.2) to demonstrate noise propagation at first floor height, to represent living rooms or bedrooms.
		Respondent suggested that changes to noise levels may negatively impact the yield of local chicken farms	N	The operational phase accounts for direct noise effects as a result of solar farm and overhead line infrastructure associated with the Scheme. As set out in **ES Chapter 13: Noise and Vibration** (Doc Ref. 6.1), no likely significant residual effects are identified during the operational phase and is therefore unlikely to affect the operation of local businesses.
	Noise – post construction – land parcel and inter-array areas Respondents raised concerns about the noise generated from the construction, operation, maintenance and decommissioning of the Land Parcel and Inter-array areas.	Respondents expressed concerns about the potential noise emitted from infrastructure located within the proposed land parcels and inter-array areas. It is felt that the noise will negatively impact those living in proximity to the land parcels	N	An assessment of potential noise impacts during all phases of the Scheme has been set out in **ES Chapter 13: Noise and Vibration** (Doc Ref. 6.1). Measures to effectively manage and control noise emissions throughout the lifespan of the Scheme are secured in the OEMP, which would be prepared in accordance with the **OOEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.11) and secured by way of Requirement in the DCO. The operational phase accounts for direct noise effects as a result of the solar farm and overhead line infrastructure associated with the Scheme. No likely significant residual effects are identified during the operational phase, with the implementation of mitigation measures set out within the **OOEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.11).
		Respondents opposed the potential for sheep grazing within land parcels, due to the noise impacts on residential areas and activities	N	The Applicant confirms that, as set out in **ES Chapter 14: Socio-Economics and Land Use** (Doc Ref. 6.1), sheep grazing may be possible within the Solar Development Areas during operation. This will be explored with landowners in areas where suitable grass species have been planted. Should grazing not be possible in some or all areas of the Solar Development Areas, grassland will instead be mechanically maintained.

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				Sheep grazing is typically a less noisy activity than noise caused from machinery used on an arable farm, and has not been considered within **ES Chapter 13: Noise and Vibration** (Doc Ref. 6.1).
	Noise – post construction – grid connection corridor Respondents expressed concerns about the potential for noise pollution from the overhead line infrastructure and pylons, particularly in poor weather conditions.	Respondents raised concerns about the potential for a continuous low humming emitted from the proposed overhead line and pylon route. It was noted that poor weather conditions would likely exacerbate noise levels	N	The potential impact of noise from overhead lines has been assessed in **ES Chapter 13: Noise and Vibration** (Doc Ref. 6.1). A Tier 2 assessment of overhead line noise has been undertaken. Full details of the overhead line noise calculations and result are presented in **ES Appendix 13-3: Construction and Operational Noise Modelling** (Doc Ref. 6.1). A worst-case scenario has been assessed, assuming flat terrain between the source and receptor and point and no acoustic absorption due to the ground and use of the smallest possible pylon size. Mitigation measures are proposed including multiple subconductors spaced by non-conductive spacers, use of hydrophilic coatings and increasing the distance between conductor groups reduces the electrostatic stress between them, which when implemented would reduce all effects to not significant. As detailed information about the overhead line design is not available at this stage of the application, a commitment to undertake a Tier 3 assessment in accordance with guidance provided in TGN(E)322 is secured in the OEMP, which h would be prepared in accordance with the **OOEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.11) and secured by way of Requirement in the DCO. This will include mitigation measures to be applied during detailed design to reduce noise.
		Respondent suggested that placing the Grid Connection Corridor underground would eradicate any noise produced from pylons	N	**ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution** (Doc Ref. 6.1) sets out why overhead lines have been chosen instead of underground cables, including a comparison of the potential environmental effects. It is acknowledged that operational noise effects would only occur for the overhead line option, however, with appropriate buffers maintained from residential properties and implementation of measures during the detailed design of the overhead line infrastructure to reduce noise, significant effects can be avoided. The selection of an overhead line as the preferred technology for the Grid Connection is guided by national policy contained in the NPS for Electricity Networks, EN-5.
	Vibration – post construction – land parcel and inter-array areas Respondents raised concerns about the potential for solar PV panels to generate vibrations.	Respondents raised concerns about the potential vibration from solar panels. It was noted that vibrations emitted may cause distress amongst local populations	N	As set out in **ES Chapter 13: Noise and Vibration** (Doc Ref. 6.1), the operational phase accounts for direct noise and vibration effects as a result of solar farm and overhead line infrastructure associated with the Scheme. No likely significant residual effects are identified during the operational phase.

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				Measures to effectively manage and control noise and vibration emissions throughout the lifespan of the Scheme are secured in the **OOEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.11).
	Vibration – post construction – grid connection corridor Respondents raised concerns about the potential for the overhead line and pylons to generate vibrations.	Respondents raised concerns about the potential vibration from the overhead line and pylons. It was noted that vibrations would negatively impact the quality of life of local communities	N	The Applicant confirms that, as set out in **ES Chapter 13: Noise and Vibration** (Doc Ref. 6.1), no vibration effects have been identified during the operational phase of the Scheme.
		Respondent noted that they were in possession of specialist equipment which is sensitive to vibration	N	Potential sensitive receptors (i.e. buildings whose occupants may be disturbed by adverse noise and vibration levels, and structures that are sensitive to vibration) have been identified and taken into consideration when assessing the effects associated with noise and vibration levels from the construction, operational and decommissioning phases of the Scheme. As set out in **ES Chapter 13: Noise and Vibration** (Doc Ref. 6.1), no vibration effects have been identified during the operational phase of the Scheme.

2.16. Property

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
Property KM	**Impact of overhead line route on property prices** Respondents raised concerns that the proximity of pylons and overhead power lines to residential properties has been shown to negatively impact property values.	Respondents highlighted that the installation of pylons and overhead lines had been shown to result in a significant decrease in property value	N	The Applicant has sought to minimise effects on residential properties, as far as reasonably practicable, through the routeing and design of the Grid Connection. Further information on the routeing and design development is provided within the **Design Approach Document** (Doc Ref. 7.3) and **ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution** (Doc Ref. 6.1). An assessment of the potential impacts and likely significant effects of the Scheme, including the Grid Connection Route, is provided within the **Environmental Statement** (Doc Ref. 6.1), with mitigation specified through the **Design Parameters** (Doc Ref. 7.4), **Works Plans** (Doc Ref. 2.3), and the management plans submitted with the DCO Application. 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 residential areas (overhead line) Respondents raised significant concerns that the proposed substation, pylons and overhead cables would create substantial visual intrusion, negatively affecting local views, landscape character, and residential amenity. Respondents also highlighted risks of properties becoming uninhabitable due to the proximity of pylons, citing noise sensitivity which would potentially lead to adverse health impacts.	Respondents were apprehensive that the installation of overhead cables and pylons will have a negative visual impact on the surrounding area, disturbing the views that are currently available to residents and potentially generating shading over properties Some suggested that the overhead line and pylon route should be redesigned to incorporate buffer zones around residential clusters	N	The Applicant has sought to minimise effects on residential properties, as far as reasonably practicable, through the routeing and design of the Grid Connection. Further information on the routeing and design development is provided within the **Design Approach Document** (Doc Ref. 7.3) and **ES Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The Applicant confirms that the visual impact of the overhead line and pylons are assessed within **ES Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The assessment considers the potential impact on residential receptors, recreational users, vehicle users and outdoor workers from the proposed overhead line alignment. The alignment has been sited to avoid routing close to residential clusters, where practicable.
		Respondents are concerned that the proximity of pylons to their property will make their home uninhabitable due to noise sensitivity, potentially resulting in adverse health conditions	N	The Applicant confirms that the impact of the construction and operation of the Scheme on noise levels has been assessed within **ES Chapter 13: Noise and Vibration** (Doc Ref. 6.1).

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				During construction, the assessment concludes that, with the incorporation of mitigation, the only significant noise effects are those associated with HDD at Broad Gate and construction traffic on Langary Gate Road. Measures have been included within the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10) and **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13) to manage and minimise construction noise. **ES Chapter 13: Noise and Vibration** (Doc Ref. 6.1) concludes that once mitigation measures are implemented through detailed design, there would be no significant overhead line noise effects during the operational phase upon residential receptors.
		Respondents raised concerns about the impact the proposed pylons may have on sensitive equipment, including existing solar PV panels and radio equipment. It was noted that the proximity of their properties to the proposed pylons may affect the performance of the existing equipment	N	The impact of the Scheme on Electric and Magnetic Fields (EMFs) has been assessed within **ES Chapter 16: Other Environmental Topics** (Doc Ref. 6.1) and the **EMF Compliance Assessment** (Doc Ref. 7.8) which concludes that levels of EMF from the Scheme would be well below the guidelines set by the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) for the protection of human health and that no significant effects are predicted. The design of the Scheme has been developed in accordance with UK electromagnetic compatibility (EMC) regulations and relevant British Standards to limit electromagnetic interference with third-party equipment, including radio and telecommunications apparatus. The risk of interference to existing radio equipment under normal operating conditions is extremely low. Any potential interference is mitigated through good engineering practice and adherence to EMC design standards. In the event that a complaint is received during the operational phase of the Scheme with regards to interference, it would be investigated in accordance with the **OOEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.11) and addressed through maintenance or remedial action to ensure continued safe and effective operation of all affected communications equipment.
	Impact of PV and inter-array areas on property prices Respondents raised concerns about the proximity of Solar PV panels and inter-array areas to residential homes, highlighting detrimental impacts to local property value.	Respondents objected to the Scheme on the grounds that the installation of solar PV land parcels in close proximity to resident's houses would significantly reduce the value of their property	N	The Applicant 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

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				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 residential areas (solar PV and inter-array areas) Respondents took issue with the Applicant's proposed siting of the Scheme in areas that bordered on local homes and residences . Pointing to the potential damaging impact of the construction phase and underlined their belief that the close proximity of the Scheme could have undesirable health impacts.	Respondents questioned whether the Applicant had considered the health and safety risks of living in close proximity to large-scale solar infrastructure and inter-array areas A respondent suggested that the Applicant should adhere to a minimum 2km buffer around residential properties	N	The Applicant confirms that the impact of the Scheme on human health has been assessed within **ES Chapter 10: Human Health** (Doc Ref. 6.1). **ES Chapter 10: Human Health** (Doc Ref. 6.1) provides an assessment of potential impacts and likely significant effects during construction, operation and decommissioning of the Scheme on health and wellbeing. The assessment concludes that with measures set out within the management plans submitted with the DCO Application, no significant effects on health and wellbeing are considered likely. All works associated with the Scheme will be undertaken in accordance with relevant Health and Safety legislation and guidance. The approach to managing health and safety risks, including major accidents, during construction, operation, and decommissioning is set out within the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10), **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13), **OOEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.11), and **ODEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.12). It is not considered feasible or necessary to maintain a 2km buffer from all residential properties, to ensure no significant effects with regards to health and wellbeing.
		Respondents voiced strong opposition to the potential siting of solar PV and inter-array areas in the close vicinity of residents' homes, including the potentially negative impact of the construction phase	N	The siting of the solar PV and inter-array areas and their potential effects on nearby residential receptors has been assessed within the **Environmental Statement** (Doc Ref. 6.1). See **ES Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual** (Doc Ref. 6.1), **ES Chapter 13: Noise and Vibration** (Doc Ref. 6.1) and **ES Chapter 16: Other Environmental Topics** (Doc Ref. 6.1) which includes a glint and glare assessment. The assessment in **ES Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual** (Doc Ref. 6.1) considers the potential impacts and likely significant effects on residential receptors, recreational users, vehicle users and outdoor workers from the Scheme. The Overhead Inter-Array Connection has been sited to avoid routing close to residential receptors where practicable. Setbacks from residential properties have influenced the design of the Solar Development Area and are described in the **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16). The setbacks are secured through the **Works Plans** (Doc Ref. 2.3) and the **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16), to maintain an appropriate distance

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				between the infrastructure and residential receptors. Planting and Habitat Management Areas are proposed within the vicinity of residential properties to reduce visual effects. The Applicant has sought to mitigate landscape and visual impacts through screening with bands of native scattered trees and shrubs throughout the Solar Development Area. The **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16) and its accompanying Outline Landscape Masterplan set out the planting proposals for the Scheme. In conclusion, the Applicant acknowledges that some residual significant effects on certain viewpoints during the construction, operational and decommissioning phases would remain. The assessment in **ES Chapter 13: Noise and Vibration** (Doc Ref. 6.1) considers effects on nearby residential receptors and concludes that, with the incorporation of mitigation, the only significant noise effects are those associated with HDD at Broad Gate and peak construction traffic on Langary Gate Road. Measures have been included within the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10) and **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13) to manage and minimise construction noise. During the operational phase once mitigation measures are implemented, there would be no significant noise effects upon residential receptors. Glint and glare have been assessed within **ES Appendix 16-2: Glint and Glare Assessment** (Doc Ref. 6.3) and summarised within Section 16.4 of **ES Chapter 16: Other Environmental Topics** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The assessment concludes that no significant effects are expected on the basis of the proposed Scheme design.
	Impact of development on property prices Respondents raised concerns that the proposed solar farm would devalue nearby properties. Feedback also requested that the Applicant provide financial compensation to owners whose	Respondents questioned whether the Applicant would provide compensation to residents living in close proximity to the Scheme	N	While the Applicant does not offer direct compensation , it is committed to delivering benefits associated with the Scheme and engaging with local stakeholders throughout the development process. 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.
		Respondents commented on the proposals potentially having a negative impact on the value of their property	N	

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
	properties would see larger decreases in property valuation.	Respondents specifically made reference to property prices suffering as a result of the Scheme impacting on the visual quality of the area	N	The Applicant does though acknowledge 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. In particular, the impact to surrounding landscape, **ES Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual** (Doc Ref. 6.1) outlines the assessment undertaken regarding the local landscape and views. 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.
	Property (general comments) Respondents spoke of fears regarding the development's proximity to residential areas. There was also speculation that the Applicant would take advantage of compulsory purchase order powers to acquire their land.	Respondents are concerned the Scheme's (both the grid corridor and solar PV and inter-array areas) proposed siting is encroaching on to residential properties	N	The Applicant notes that the design of the Scheme has taken into account the location and sensitivity of nearby residential properties. No residential properties or private gardens are directly affected by the Solar Development Area, Inter-Array Connections or Grid Connection Route. This is with the exception of a private yard of a property on Broad Gate Road, which has been included within the Order Limits to provide powers to divert or underground the existing 11kV overhead line in this location, if required, which would otherwise interfere with the Grid Connection Route. Access through the haulage yard would only be required for a short duration to divert the existing 11kV overhead line. The siting of the solar PV and inter-array areas and their potential effects on nearby residential receptors has been assessed within the **Environmental Statement** (Doc Ref. 6.1). See **ES Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual** (Doc Ref. 6.1), **ES Chapter 13: Noise and Vibration** (Doc Ref. 6.1) and **ES Chapter 16: Other Environmental Topics** (Doc Ref. 6.1) which includes a glint and glare assessment. The assessment in **ES Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual** (Doc Ref. 6.1) considers the potential impact on residential receptors, recreational users, vehicle users and outdoor workers from the Scheme. The overhead lines of the Grid Connection Route and the Inter-Array Connection have been sited to avoid routing close to residential receptors where practicable. Setbacks from residential properties have

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				influenced the design of the Solar Development Area and are described in the **Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (OLEMP**) (Doc Ref. 7.16). The setbacks are secured through the **Works Plans** (Doc Ref. 2.3) and the **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16) to maintain an appropriate distance between the infrastructure and residential receptors. Planting and Habitat Management Areas are proposed within the vicinity of residential properties to reduce visual effects. The Applicant has sought to mitigate landscape and visual impacts through screening with bands of native scattered trees and shrubs throughout the Solar Development Area. The **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16) and its accompanying Outline Landscape Masterplan set out the planting proposals for the Scheme. In conclusion, the Applicant acknowledges that some residual significant effects on certain viewpoints during the construction, operational and decommissioning phases would remain. The assessment in **ES Chapter 13: Noise and Vibration** (Doc Ref. 6.1) considers effects on nearby residential receptors and concludes that, with the incorporation of mitigation, the only significant noise effects are those associated with HDD at Broad Gate and peak construction traffic on Langary Gate Road. Measures have been included within the **OCEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.10) and **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13) to manage and minimise construction noise. During the operational phase once mitigation measures are implemented, there would be no significant noise effects upon residential receptors. Glint and glare has been assessed within **ES Appendix 16-2: Glint and Glare Assessment** (Doc Ref. 6.3) and summarised within Section 16.4 of **ES Chapter 16: Other Environmental Topics** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The assessment concludes that no significant effects are expected on the basis of the proposed Scheme design.
		Respondents voiced apprehension at their homes possibly being subject to compulsory acquisition powers	N	The Applicant acknowledges the concerns raised. The design of the Scheme has taken into account the location and sensitivity of nearby residential properties. The Applicant confirms that the DCO does not seek powers to compulsorily acquire any residential properties, nor to subject any homes to compulsory acquisition powers, within the Solar Development Area, Inter-Array Connections or Grid Connection Route.

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
		Respondents are concerned about the cumulative inter-project impact on their property, potentially leading to their residencies being surrounded by infrastructure	N	The potential impacts and likely significant effects on landscape and visual as a result of the Scheme are assessed within **ES Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual** (Doc Ref. 6.1) which acknowledges that significant effects will occur during the construction, operational and decommissioning phases of the Scheme. The Scheme design has been developed to take into account the proximity of receptors and to reduce the perceived industrialisation of the area. The Applicant has sought to minimise effects on residential properties, as far as reasonably practicable, through the routeing and design of the overhead lines within the Grid Connection Route and the Inter-Array Connection. Setbacks are secured within the **Works Plans** (Doc Ref. 2.3) and the **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16) to maintain an appropriate distance between the infrastructure and residential receptors within the Solar Development Areas. Planting and Habitat Management Areas are proposed within the vicinity of residential properties to reduce visual effects. Cumulative landscape and visual effects with other developments are set out within **ES Appendix 12-7** (Doc Ref. 6.3) and summarised within Section 12.11 of **ES Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual** (Doc Ref. 6.1). Following the construction of the cumulative schemes, the additional cumulative effect introduced by the Scheme is not considered to be significant on landscape and visual receptors across all phases of the Scheme. However, the totality of the change in the landscape considering the Scheme and all of the cumulative schemes together is considered to be significant.

2.17. Public recreation and access

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
Aviation and airfields	**Concerns regarding aviation safety and impacts on nearby airfields** Respondents raised concerns relating to aviation and airfields. The main issues included aviation safety risks from the location of solar panels and power lines near gliding and private airfields, with potential hazards such as glint, glare, turbulence, and risks of injury to glider pilots. Specific concerns were also expressed about Holbeach St John airfield, which hosts many private planes, with overshooting or interaction with panels highlighted as a safety issue. Several respondents also opposed the proposed 50-metre pylons, warning they could interfere with aviation activities, create significant risks and negatively impact nearby airfields.	Respondents are concerned about aviation safety due to the location of proposed panels and associated power lines around the Gliding Club and nearby airfields. They highlight risks of injury or death to glider/pilot, as well as potential issues with glint, glare, and turbulence from solar panels	Y	The Applicant confirms that Crowland Airfield and Fenland Airfield have been considered in **ES Chapter 16: Other Environmental Topics** (Doc Ref. 6.1) within both the Glint and Glare and Major Accidents and Disasters sections. The chapter concludes that effects upon the runway approach paths to both airfields from the Scheme would be low and acceptable (not significant). Suitable buffers have been incorporated into the Scheme design to ensure infrastructure is outside a theoretical Obstacle Limited Surface of the airfields, and therefore not impact on the operation of the airfield. Solar PV panels are designed to absorb, not reflect, irradiation. A general consensus in relevant studies is that there is potential for glint and glare from PV panels to cause a hazard or nuisance for surrounding receptors, but that the intensity of such reflections is similar to that emanating from still water. A full assessment of glint and glare from the Scheme is provided in **ES Appendix 16-2: Glint and Glare Assessment** (Doc Ref. 6.3). Following statutory consultation, the Applicant opted to underground the Inter-Array Connection between Land Parcels A and B in response to aviation safety concerns associated with Crowland Airfield.
		Respondents are concerned about Holbeach St John airfield, near site B, also hosts many private planes. The risk of aircraft overshooting or interacting with nearby solar panels was highlighted as a safety concern	N	The Applicant confirms that this airfield located near to the village of Holbeach St Johns (referred to as Fenland Airfield)has been considered in **ES Chapter 16: Other Environmental Topics** (Doc Ref. 6.1) and **ES Appendix 16-2: Glint and Glare Assessment** (Doc Ref. 6.3). The chapter concludes that effects upon the runway approach path to this airfield from the Scheme would be low and acceptable (not significant). Suitable buffers have been incorporated into the Scheme design to ensure infrastructure is outside a theoretical Obstacle Limited Surface of airfields, and therefore does not impact the operation of the airfield. Solar PV panels are designed to absorb, not reflect, irradiation. A general consensus in relevant studies is that there is potential for glint and glare from PV panels to cause a hazard or nuisance for surrounding receptors, but that the intensity of such reflections is similar to that emanating from still water.
		Respondents are concerned that the proposed 50-metre pylons would negatively impact nearby	N	The Applicant confirms that aircraft disasters have been assessed in the Major Accidents and Disasters section of **ES Chapter 16: Other**

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
		airfields and other airborne recreational activities, including Paramotoring. Respondents suggest pylons could interfere with aviation activities and create significant risks, particularly during take-off and landing		**Environmental Topics** (Doc Ref. 6.1). The closest pylon is approximately 1.65km from Crowland airfield. In the case of all Scheme infrastructure, it is expected to be outside of a theoretical Obstacle Limitation Surface of the airfields and, therefore, not impact on the operation of the airfield due to the Scheme's height, assuming an approach path of 365m and a worst-case approach angle of 2 degrees. As a result, major accident and disaster risks associated with aircraft are considered to be not significant.
Horses and equestrians	**Impacts on horses, equestrian activities and countryside access** Respondents raised concerns related to horses and equestrian activities. Respondents highlighted the presence of local livery yards and private horse ownership in the area, with concerns that the proposed scheme could negatively affect these activities. Several respondents raised issues about construction traffic on small rural roads used by horse riders, noting insufficient consideration of equestrian safety in relation to increased vehicle movements. One respondent also emphasised the importance of improving countryside access for riders.	Respondents highlight local livery yards and private horse ownership in the area. They are concerned that the proposed scheme will negatively impact these equestrian activities	N	The Applicant confirms that **ES Chapter 10: Human Health and Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref. 6.1) assess the safety of the Scheme on pedestrians, cyclists, and equestrian receptors. Measures have been implemented to control traffic, including a default priority that construction traffic will give-way to other users. Bridleways have been considered in the **Outline PRoW-MP** (Doc Ref. 7.15), with management approaches, if necessary, detailed for each bridleway impacted.
		Respondents raise concerns about construction traffic on small rural roads that are also used by horse riders. They suggest there has been insufficient consideration of equestrian safety in relation to increased vehicle movements	N	The Applicant confirms that **ES Chapter 10: Human Health** and **Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref. 6.1) assess the safety of the Scheme on pedestrians, cyclists, and equestrian receptors. Measures have been implemented to control traffic, including a default priority that construction traffic will give-way to other users. The British Horse Society (East Midlands) were consulted on how the Scheme may affect equestrian safety. Bridleways have been considered in the **Outline PRoW-MP**(Doc Ref. 7.15), with management approaches, if necessary, detailed for each bridleway impacted.
		Respondent highlights the importance of improving countryside access, specifically mentioning the development of bridleways, which directly support equestrian use and benefit horse riders	N	The Applicant acknowledges there may be some disruption to Public Rights of Way (PRoW) during the construction phase of the Scheme, however this will be temporary and short-term. The **Outline PRoW-MP** (Doc Ref. 7.15) sets out how these will be managed, including bridleways, and details any potential closures or diversions. The Applicant notes that **ES Chapter 10: Human Health and Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref. 6.1) assess the safety of the Scheme on pedestrians, cyclists, and equestrian receptors. Measures have been implemented to control traffic, including a default priority that construction traffic will give-way to other users. As stated in **ES Chapter 2: The Scheme** (Doc Ref. 6.1), a permissive path would be provided connecting PRoWs between Queens Bank

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				and Shepeau Stow, following the boundary of the Settlement W of Cate's Cove Corner Scheduled Monument. The permissive path would be located within a corridor that measures approximately 20m in width. The width of the permissive path is subject to detailed design, but is anticipated to be up to 5m wide to provide space for pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders. The corridor also includes space for landscaping and for the provision of information boards on the historic and natural environment. The indicative alignment of the permissive path is shown on **ES Figure 2-2: Illustrative Solar Development Area and Inter-Array Connections Layout Plan** (Doc Ref. 6.2). The permissive path would provide increased public access across the landscape and, thus, responds positively to local planning policies relating to rural access and recreational amenity.
Cyclists	**Impacts on cycling safety, recreation and access** Respondents raised concerns regarding cycling safety. Most highlighted that the scheme would significantly increase construction traffic on small rural roads shared with cyclists, with insufficient consideration given to the risks posed to their safety. Additional comments emphasised the value of cycling in the area for recreation and enjoyment of nature, warning that the development could unnecessarily impact these experiences. Suggestions were also made to enhance countryside access through improved cycle paths, providing safer and more accessible routes for cyclists.	Respondents raise concerns that the scheme will significantly increase construction traffic on small rural roads, which are shared with cyclists. They suggest there has been no proper consideration of the risks this poses to cyclists' safety	N	The access strategy has sought to avoid smaller, local roads wherever practicable. For the Solar Development Area, construction vehicles would utilise points of access from the Barrier Bank/ Spalding Road, Martins Road and Langary Gate Road for Land Parcels A, B & C and D respectively. Access to the Underground Inter-Array Connection would be from Barrier Bank/Spalding Road. Access for the Overhead Inter-Array Connection would be from Back Bank/Eaugate Road / Chapel Hill and B1168 Holbeach Drove Gate. For the Grid Connection Route, construction vehicles would use points of access principally from the A16 and the A151 High Road. Vehicles would also use the B1165 Austendike Road in lesser numbers. 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 limit any potential disruptions and implications on the wider transport network. The Applicant notes that **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref. 6.1) includes pedestrian and cyclist amenity within the assessment of potential impacts of the Scheme and **ES Chapter 10: Human Health** (Doc Ref. 6.1) also assesses the safety of the Scheme on pedestrians, cyclists, and equestrian receptors. Measures have been implemented to control traffic, including a default priority that construction traffic will give-way to other users. This includes several PRoW crossing points, as detailed within the **Outline PRoW-MP**(Doc Ref. 7.15). Further details on how roads will be managed to mitigate impacts is set out in the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13).

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
		Respondent objects to the scheme because they enjoy biking in the area and value the opportunity to see wildlife and plants while cycling. They are concerned that the development will destroy these experiences unnecessarily, as they believe the same outcomes could be achieved in other ways	N	The Applicant notes that **ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref. 6.1) includes pedestrian and cyclist amenity within the assessment of potential impacts of the Scheme and **ES Chapter 10: Human Health** (Doc Ref. 6.1) also assesses the safety of the Scheme on pedestrians, cyclists, and equestrian receptors. Effects are concluded to be not significant with the implementation of mitigation measures set out within the **Outline CMTP** (Doc Ref. 7.13) and the **Outline PRoW-MP** (Doc Ref. 7.15). Furthermore, 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 the **OLEMP** (Doc Ref. 7.16).
		Respondent suggests enhancing countryside access by creating and improving cycle paths, supporting safer and more accessible routes for cyclists	Y	As stated in **ES Chapter 2: The Scheme** (Doc Ref. 6.1), a permissive path will be provided connecting PRoW between Queens Bank and Shepeau Stow, following the boundary of the Settlement W of Cate's Cove Corner Scheduled Monument. The permissive path will be located within a corridor that measures approximately 20m in width. The permissive path will be suitable for pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders and provide information boards on the historic and natural environment. The permissive path would provide increased public access across the landscape and, thus, responds positively to local planning policies relating to rural access and recreational amenity.
Walking/hiking routes	**Impacts on walking, hiking and countryside access** Respondents raised concerns about the impact of the development on walking and hiking routes. Some questioned how routes would be managed, including ground covering and public accessibility. Others highlighted risks from increased construction traffic on small rural roads shared with walkers, cyclists, horse riders and farm vehicles, noting a lack of foresight around safety. Concerns were also raised about the potential loss of a popular single-track road used	Respondents raise concerns about how the solar development will impact walking routes, questioning what ground covering will be used and where people will be able to walk	N	A number of PRoW pass through or in the vicinity of the Site which are shown on **ES Figure 15-2** (Doc Ref. 6.2). Descriptions of all PRoW which intersect with the Scheme or are located within 500m are contained within the **Outline PRoW-MP**(Doc Ref. 7.15). The Common Land on Martins Road has been included within this assessment. The **Outline PRoW-MP**(Doc Ref. 7.15) outlines how PRoW will be managed to ensure continued operation throughout the construction, operation, and decommissioning of the Scheme. A summary of the proposed temporary management measures for PRoW, including possible closures and crossing points during the construction phase, is included in the **Outline PRoW-MP** (Doc Ref. 7.15). Other than access to two PRoWs (Crow/12/1 and Wstn/3/1) which are proposed to be closed temporarily for 4-6 weeks, access to all existing PRoW will be maintained during the construction phase. No permanent diversions or closures are proposed.
		Respondents highlight concerns about construction traffic on small rural roads, which are shared with	N	**ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref. 6.1) considered road safety for road users and pedestrians and concluded no significant

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
	locally for dog walking, walking and running, which could be compromised by construction. Respondents also called for improved countryside access through the enhancement of footpaths to provide safer and more enjoyable walking routes.	walkers, cyclists, horse riders and farm vehicles. They feel there has been no forethought about the safety and impact on these shared routes		effects. Measures have been implemented to control traffic, including a default priority that construction traffic will give-way to other users. This includes several Public Rights of Way (PRoW) crossing points, as detailed within the **Outline PRoW-MP**(Doc Ref. 7.15). Further details on how roads will be managed to mitigate impacts is set out in the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13). **ES Chapter 10: Human Health** (Doc Ref. 6.1) also assesses the safety of the Scheme on pedestrians, cyclists, and equestrian receptors. No significant adverse effects were identified, with the implementation of the aforementioned management plans.
		Respondents note that the site is accessed via a single-track road, which is also a popular local route for dog walking, walking and running because of its low traffic. They raise concerns that the development would result in the loss of this valued recreational route and increase danger from construction traffic	N	**ES Chapter 15: Traffic and Access** (Doc Ref. 6.1) considered road safety for both road users and pedestrians and concluded no significant effects. Measures have been implemented to control traffic, including a default priority that construction traffic will give-way to other users. This includes several Public Rights of Way (PRoW) crossing points, as detailed within the **Outline PRoW-MP** (Doc Ref. 7.15). Further details on how roads will be managed to mitigate impacts is set out in the **OCTMP** (Doc Ref. 7.13). **ES Chapter 10: Human Health** (Doc Ref. 6.1) also assesses the safety of the Scheme on pedestrians, cyclists, and equestrian receptors. The full assessment for road safety, including receptors considered, is set out in **ES Appendix 15-4: Transport Assessment Note** (Doc Red. 6.3). Other than access to two PRoWs (Crow/12/1 and Wstn/3/1) which are proposed to be closed temporarily for 4-6 weeks, access to all existing PRoW will be maintained during the construction phase. No permanent diversions or closures are proposed. **ES Chapter 10: Human Health** (Doc Ref. 6.1) also assesses the safety of the Scheme on pedestrians, cyclists, and equestrian receptors. No significant adverse effects were identified, with the implementation of the aforementioned management plans.
		Respondents call for better countryside access through the provision and improvement of footpaths, enabling safer and more enjoyable walking and hiking routes	Y	A summary of the proposed temporary management measures for PRoW, including possible closures and crossing points during the construction phase, is included in the **Outline PRoW-MP** (Doc Ref. 7.15). Other than access to two PRoWs (Crow/12/1 and Wstn/3/1) which are proposed to be closed temporarily for 4-6 weeks, access to all existing PRoW will be maintained during the construction phase. No permanent diversions or closures are proposed. As stated in **ES Chapter 2: The Scheme** (Doc Ref. 6.1), a permissive path will be provided connecting PRoW between Queens Bank and

Topic	Issue Summary	Sub-issue if relevant	Change to application (Y/N)?	Regard had to response
				Shepeau Stow, following the boundary of the Settlement W of Cate's Cove Corner Scheduled Monument. The permissive path will be located within a corridor that measures approximately 20m in width. The permissive path will be suitable for pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders and provide information boards on the historic and natural environment. The permissive path would provide increased public access across the landscape and, thus, responds positively to local planning policies relating to rural access and recreational amenity.
Impact on local amenities/recreational activities	**Impacts on local amenities, recreation and landscape character** Respondents believe the scheme would seriously harm local amenities and recreational opportunities. They expressed concerns that the development would transform the currently pleasant countryside, used for leisure and enjoyment, into an industrialised landscape. Respondents felt this would destroy opportunities for local recreation, make the area less appealing and significantly reduce the quality of life for residents.	Respondents believe the scheme would severely harm the amenities of the area, turning the pleasant countryside currently used for leisure into an unattractive industrialised landscape. They feel it would destroy opportunities for local enjoyment and recreation, making the area unpleasant for residents	N	As set out in **ES Chapter 10: Human Health** (Doc Ref. 6.1), landscape and visual effects of the Scheme during all phases of the Scheme have been considered within the human health assessment. The chapter acknowledges that given the rural setting, the local area could be sensitive to changes in visual effects potentially impacting quality of life for residents, should local tranquillity be impacted. However, significant landscape and visual effects identified within **ES Chapter 12: Landscape and Visual** (Doc Ref. 6.1) only relate to a small proportion of the population within the study area and the overall effect on the population in the study area is considered to be not significant.