

By email to:
MeridianSolar@planninginspectorate.gov.uk

[REDACTED]
Principal Infrastructure Officer
Planning Services
Lincolnshire County Council
County Offices
Newland
Lincoln LN1 1YL
Tel: [REDACTED]
E-Mail: nsips@lincolnshire.gov.uk

06 October 2026

Dear Sir/Madam,

Meridian Solar Farm Limited EN10169
Lincolnshire County Council – Deadline 2 Response – Comments on DL1 documents
IP No. F94E6834D

This letter sets out Lincolnshire County Council's Deadline 2 comments on the submissions to the Examination made at Deadline 1. The comments are presented predominantly under topic areas. As a result, there are some limited repeat references to certain documents where they cross several topic areas.

Development Consent Order

Draft Development Consent Order (Rev 2) (Tracked) [REP1-007]

LCC provided detailed comments on the originally drafted DCO in its LIR [REP1-106; pp 105 - 119] submitted at DL1, covering the following points:

- Part 1: Interpretation and Schedule 2 Requirement. Definition of 'maintain'
- Part 3 (Streets) Articles 9 and 11 (Street Works, power to alter layout, etc., of streets)
- Part 3 (Streets) Article 10 Application of Permit Scheme
- Part 3 (Streets) Article 13 Temporary closure, restriction of prohibition of use of streets and public rights of way
- Part 6 (Miscellaneous and General) Article 40 Felling or lopping trees or removal of hedgerows
- Part 6 (Miscellaneous and General) Article 41 Trees subject to tree preservation orders
- Part 6 (Miscellaneous and General) Article 47 Procedure in relation to certain approvals etc
- Schedule 2 (Requirements): Requirement 2 Commencement of the authorised development
- Schedule 2 (Requirements): Requirement 17 Public Rights of Way
- Schedule 2 (Requirements): Requirement 21 Decommissioning and restoration
- Schedule 2 (Requirements): Requirement 3 (Approved Details and Amendments to them), 5 (detailed design approval), 7 (Landscape & Ecological Management Plan), 8 (Biodiversity Net Gain), 20 (Skills Supply Chain and employment), 21 (Decommissioning and restoration)

- New Requirement – Grid connection
- Schedule 14 Procedure for discharge of requirements
- Schedule 14 Part 5 Fees
- Protective provisions for Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue

LCC awaits comments from the applicant on the dDCO comments raised in our LIR, which remain outstanding. Supplementary comments are provided below, some of which reinforce the Council's original views expressed in its LIR.

Schedule 2 Requirements

Requirement 5 (Detailed design Approval). With respect to Requirement 5, in line with other made DCO's, we would request that LCC, as relevant Highways Authority, be a Required Consultee, given the nature of the details that need to be approved.

Requirements 7 (LEMP) & 8 (BNG): Lincolnshire County Council (LCC) is the Responsible Authority for the Greater Lincolnshire Local Nature Recovery Strategy and maintains a strategic overview of the delivery of BNG across the County. LCC therefore requests to be added as a consultee for the discharge of Requirement 7 (Landscape and Ecology Management Plan) and Requirement 8 (Biodiversity Net Gain).

Also at Requirement 7 (LEMP) there is inconsistency in the reference to "commence", said here to include demolition of existing buildings and structures, but under Article 2 (Interpretation), this part of the definition has been removed. Under the Schedule of Changes to the Draft DCO [REP1-101], the reason for the removal of '*demolition of existing buildings and structures*' is because there are no demolition works proposed as part of the Scheme.

Requirement 12 (CEMP) – with respect to Requirement 12 (Construction Environmental Management Plan), LCC seek clarification on the reference to '*site waste management plan*' at 12(4) and confirmation as to whether this is a cross-reference to Requirement 14 (Waste Management Plan).

In LCC's LIR [REP1-106], under the draft DCO section, there is reference (paras 8.17 & 8.17) to the need for an additional requirement to restrict commencement of development until such time as a grid connection into Weston Marsh has been secured. In the Relevant Representations Report [REP1-074] at LCC-013, the applicant reiterates that there is no evident barrier to being granted a Gate 2 status, but with unresolved objections from NGET, LCC remains concerned that this position is not supported. The uncertainty in the grid connection offers process is acknowledged by the applicant in their response at LCC-014, with reference to their justification for seeking a seven-year commencement period.

Schedule 14 Procedure for Discharge of Requirements

Timescales. Paragraph 2(2) The proposed period for determination of applications submitted to discharge a requirement is six weeks. LCC would contend that this period is too short, given the potential complexity and scale of the applications to be considered and the need for effective consultation (where specified), and is also inconsistent with the determination period given in many other made DCOs within Lincolnshire, which are almost exclusively set at 10 weeks (namely Mallard Pass, Heckington Fen, Tillbridge, One Earth, Beacon Fen, Outer Dowsing, Springwell, West Burton, Gate Burton). A notable exception to this is Cottam, where the determination period is set at 13 weeks.

Similarly, the proposed timescales relating to Further Information and Consultation are considered by LCC to be too short and inconsistent with a host of other made DCOs. Under para 3(2), a period of 20 working days from receipt of application would be more appropriate rather than 10 working days. Equally, under Para 3(3), it is suggested that the timescales are amended here also, to tie in with a proposed 20 working day period in para 3(2), such that the text would read:

*If the provision governing or requiring the application specifies that consultation with a requirement consultee is required, the relevant planning authority must issue the consultation to the requirement consultee within **10 working days** of receipt of the application, and must notify the undertaker in writing specifying any further information the relevant planning authority considers necessary or that is requested by the requirement consultee within **10 working days** of receipt of such a request and in any event **within 20 working days** of receipt of the application (or such other period as is agreed in writing between the undertaker and the relevant planning authority).*

LCC note errors at paras 2(3) and 2(5), where they each should refer to the ‘*period set out in subparagraph (2)*’, not subparagraph (1).

LCC note that there is no time period specified under paragraph 4(2)(a) within which the undertaker can make an appeal.

Fees In line with our LIR comments, LCC would contend that the amounts shown in 5(2)(a), 5(2)(b) and 5(2)(c) should be uplifted in line with more recently made DCOs (e.g. Springwell), as follows:

- (a) £2,578 rather than £2,535
- (b) £588 rather than £578
- (c) £298 rather than £145

We would suggest that the higher fees stipulated in 5(2)(a) should apply to the first submission of all Requirements listed in Schedule 2 (i.e. the list of requirements should be extended to include Requirement 4 (Community Liaison group); 10 (Surface and foul water drainage); 12 (Construction Environmental Management Plan); 17 (Public Rights of Way) and 20 (Skills, Supply Chain and Employment).

Additionally, LCC would like to see the following sub-paragraph 5(2)(3) inserted to safeguard against inflationary effects and ensure that the fee amounts keep pace with other planning fees uplifts, particularly given the potential duration of this project and the proposed 7 year implementation period.

(3) Where an application under sub-paragraph (1) is made and a fee payable on or after 1 April 2025, then section 18A of the Town and Country Planning (Fees for Applications, Deemed Applications, Requests and Site Visits)(England) Regulations 2021 (as amended by the Town and Country Planning (Fees for Application, Deemed Applications, Requests and Site Visits)(England) Amendment Regulations 2023) will apply as modified by this Order, so that “the relevant amount” means the fee payable under sub paragraph 2(a), 2(b) or 2(c) above.

This would bring the dDCO for Meridian in line with other recently made DCOs that have this provision embedded within them.

In view of the comments raised in our LIR concerning the dDCO, which the applicant will be reviewing, it is expected that further revisions to the SoCG, to incorporate outstanding concerns, will be made at the next iteration and submission.

Landscape and Visual Impact

AAH consultants have reviewed the Deadline 1 documents on behalf of LCC and have produced a separate Technical Memo (Technical Memorandum 8 (AAH TM08) Lincolnshire County Council, Meridian Solar: Deadline 1 document review), which is appended to this letter. The AAH technical memo provides comments on the following documents:

- Relevant Representations Report [REP1-074]
- Local Impact Reports (LIRs) from local authorities [REP1-106; REP1-108]
- Initial Statements of Common Ground (SoCG) – South Holland DC, LCC [REP1-081 & REP1-082]
- Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (Rev 1) [REP1-071]
- Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Rev 1) [REP1-062]

Soils and Agriculture

RAC consultants have reviewed the Deadline 1 documents on behalf of LCC and have produced a separate report which is appended to this letter (Meridian Solar Farm. Soils, Agriculture and Land Use Impact. October 2026). The report assesses the revisions made to relevant sections of the ES in the context of published guidelines available to the Applicant, the local and national context of the proposed development, and the likely impacts of the Scheme in light of its own direct and cumulative effects. Documents commented on include:

- 6.1 ES Chapter 5: Agriculture and Soils (Rev 1) (Tracked) [REP1-015]
- 6.3 ES Appendix 5-3: Agricultural Land Classification Report - Parcels B and C (Rev 1) (Tracked) [REP1-031]
- 6.3 ES Appendix 5-2: Agricultural Land Classification Report - Parcels A and D (Rev 1) (Tracked) [REP1-029]
- 7.14 Outline Soil Management Plan (Rev1) [REP1-069]
- 8.29 Post ISH1 Note: Best and Most Versatile (BMV) Land Take [REP1-100]

Ecology and Biodiversity

Chapter 9 Ecology and Biodiversity (Rev 1) [REP1-018]

LCC notes the updates to this document and welcomes the addition and consideration of potential impacts on fish.

ES Appendix 9-4 Wintering Bird Survey 2022-2023 (Rev 1) [REP1-036]

No comments.

ES Appendix 9-5 Wintering Bird Survey 2023-2024 (Rev 1) [REP1-038]

No comments.

ES Appendix 9-6 Grid Connection Route Wintering Bird Survey Report 2023-2024 (Rev 1) [REP1-040]

No comments.

Appendix 9-14 Habitat Regulations Assessment (Rev1) [REP1-042]

LCC notes the updates to the HRA and welcomes the additional information provided and analysis relating to potential disturbance of birds and the identification of Functionally Linked Land (FLL) (Appendix 3). LCC defers to Natural England (NE) on matters relating to the Habitats Regulations Assessment, but notes that despite significant counts of birds being recorded in some areas, the land has not been identified as FLL with limited justification provided. LCC considers that additional information and justification is required about how FLL has been identified.

7.9 Biodiversity Net Gain Report (Rev1) [REP1-059]

LCC has reviewed the updated Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) (REP1-059) report and has the following comments to make:

- LCC notes the updates to the predicted levels of BNG to be delivered.
- LCC agrees with the precautionary approach to the classification of grassland under and around the panels as set out at 4.3.8.
- Strategic Significance of some baseline hedgerows has not been applied correctly in the Statutory Biodiversity Metric. Once a Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS) has been adopted, baseline habitats must be set to low strategic significance.
- Strategic Significance of created hedgerows has not been applied correctly in line with the Greater Lincolnshire LNRS. High strategic significance should only be applied where the habitat being created is consistent with a mapped action in the Greater Lincolnshire LNRS.

Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) (Rev2) [REP1-061]

LCC notes the updates in REP1-061 in relation to ecology and biodiversity and welcomes the inclusion of additional measures to mitigate potential impacts on fish and wintering birds during construction.

Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan (oOEMP) (Rev1) [REP1-063]

LCC notes the updates in REP1-063 in relation to ecology and biodiversity and agrees with the Applicant's proposed approach to agreeing final details of bird diverter specification with Natural England.

Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (oDEMP) (Rev1) [REP1-065]

LCC notes the updates in REP1-065 in relation to ecology and biodiversity and welcomes the inclusion of additional measures to mitigate potential impacts on wintering birds during decommissioning.

Outline Landscape and Ecology Environmental Management Plan (oLEMP) (Rev1) [REP1-070]

LCC notes the updates in REP1-070 and welcomes the additional information and clarification provided.

LCC considers that additional detail is required on reporting arrangements in the oLEMP. This is particularly in relation to habitat establishment and BNG. Local Planning Authorities will have an important role in auditing the successful delivery of BNG proposed by the project and clear reporting arrangements therefore need to be established. As set out in Lincolnshire County Council's Local Impact Report (REP1-106, 10.25-10.27), LCC suggests the Applicant considers establishing an Ecological Steering Group or similar for the proposed development which could form part of the reporting arrangements. Details of funding arrangements to cover LPAs monitoring of BNG/ecological mitigation and enhancement measures should also be included in the oLEMP.

Archaeology

Environmental Mitigation & Commitments Register (Rev 2) (Tracked) [REP1-058] We welcome the commitment within the Environmental Mitigation and Commitments Register under CH-4 Archaeological Mitigation and Management Strategy to set out a Public Archaeology and Engagement Strategy.

The role of Archaeological Clerk of Works should be set out within the Commitments Register, in the same way that the Ecological Clerk of Works has been (Ref LVIA-1).

We note that there are mitigation commitments which may have archaeological implications and should be included within the Archaeological Clerk of Works remit. These include the 400% BNG for hedgerow units (Ref EC-4), the permissive path along the boundary of the Cate's Cove Corner Scheduled Monument (Ref HH-1), if intrusive ground works are needed, the construction of water course crossings (Ref HF-1) and the temporary drainage system (also HF-1).

Where flood risk mitigation is proposed through plinths, bunds or walls (Ref HF-4), impacts on areas of previously unmitigated archaeological remains should be considered.

There should be consideration of heritage skills and employment opportunities within the Outline Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan (Ref SE-1).

7.14 Outline Soils Management Plan (Rev 1) (Tracked) [REP1-069]

We have some concerns regarding the level of decommissioning, with below ground concrete foundations only being removed to a depth agreed with the landowner (Section 2.6.1 of Volume 7: 7.14 Outline Soil Management Plan. This may limit the opportunities for further archaeological surveys in the future.

We would need further input and detail of the decompaction strategy once known (Volume 7: 7.14 Outline Soil Management Plan Section 4.1.3).

Where drainage is laid below track and compound hardstanding (Volume 7: 7.14 Outline Soil Management Plan Section 5.3.2), it is important that archaeological impacts have been assessed and mitigated.

Where the decommissioning stage requires subsoil decompaction and loosening to a depth of 30cm (Volume 7: 7.14 Outline Soil Management Plan Section 5.7.2), it may be necessary for the Archaeological Clerk of Works to ascertain if archaeological mitigation is required.

7.16 Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (Rev 1) (Tracked) [REP1-071]

We note within the Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan that there is a requirement for the Applicant and Appointed Contractor to keep the appointed ecologist / landscape architect / arboriculturist informed of work activities that require support and supervision, so that it is clear when attendance is required (Section 1.4.2). This requirement should be added to the Outline Archaeological Management and Mitigation Strategy [REP1-078] under the Archaeological Clerk of Works role (OAMMS Section 5.2).

We require further details where the OLEMP states that “Standard environmental practice and mitigation will be implemented to ensure construction and operation of the Scheme complies with legislation relating to protected species” (Section 4.3.3). Standard environmental practice and mitigation may have archaeological implications.

We welcome the commitment that “All landscape and ecological management works will be undertaken with reference to the Outline Archaeological Mitigation and Management Strategy, secured in accordance with Requirement 11 of the Draft DCO (Doc Ref. 3.1)” and that “Where works are proposed that may impact on important deposits of archaeological interest, mitigation works may be required in advance of the works progressing. Details of this work will be included in the detailed LEMP” (Section 5.1.3).

Likewise, the commitments made within the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan Table 3-4 are welcome. We would stress the need for the Archaeological Clerk of Works to be embedded within all aspects of the construction phase. Archaeological impacts may arise from changes in works programmes, works locations or when unexpected constraints arise for other disciplines, evolving mitigation measures may have unanticipated consequences on archaeological remains and it is important that the Archaeological Clerk of Works is made aware of any changes.

We are pleased to see the inclusion of archaeology and cultural heritage within the Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (Table 3-4) [REP1-066]. However, we note that the Mitigation/Enhancement Table states that “No previously undisturbed land will be disturbed within the Order Limits to deliver decommissioning activities” and “Further archaeological evaluation may be required in the event that ground disturbance does not occur in the same locations as during construction” and would require the Archaeological Clerk of Works to be informed of any decommissioning activities that may result in the disturbance of unevaluated or mitigated land. We would consider a paragraph similar to the Ecological Clerk of Works in Table 3-5 is needed for the Archaeological Clerk of Works. The roles are broadly similar to each other and the scope of the ACoW role needs to be set out robustly.

Minerals and Waste

Draft Development Consent Order (Rev 2) (Tracked) [REP1-007]

As covered in the latest SoCG, LCC are happy to agree that the DCO and Outline documents secure the arisings date and LCC input that we’ve asked for.

6.1 Chapter 18 - Summary of Likely Significant Effects (Rev 1) (Tracked) [REP1-023]

The document states “*No significant residual effects on... Waste predicted during construction of the Scheme*” and likewise during “*operation*” and “*decommissioning*”. However, with regard both to decommissioning and to operational replacements, as per the response to the SoCG, LCC remain concerned about recycling capacity for PV panels, particularly cumulatively with other solar NSIPs.

7.10 Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Rev 2) (Tracked) [REP1-062]

7.11 Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan (Rev 1) (Tracked) [REP1-064]

7.12 Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (Rev 1) (Tracked) [REP1-066]

In terms of all 3 of the above EMPs, no major changes noted in respect of minerals and waste matters. As per the SoCG, LCC are happy to agree that the dDCO and Outline documents secure the arisings data and LCC input that has been requested. LCC remain concerned about recycling capacity for PV panels, particularly cumulatively with other solar NSIPs.

8.5 Relevant Representations Report [REP1-074]

8.11 Statement of Common Ground with Lincolnshire County Council [REP1-082]

In terms of both of the above documents, which share common reference numbers:

Waste Management (LCC-018) & Solar panel recycling capacity (LCC-020) – We generally accept their comments/response but, as per the SoCG: “remain concerned about recycling capacity for PV panels, particularly cumulatively with other solar NSIPs”. In terms of each phase:

- Construction = Although, as stated by the applicant, PV panels are likely to be a relatively small quantity, the nature of the waste will require specialised recycling, for which capacity is limited at present.
- Operational = Whilst full-scale PV panel replacement programmes for different projects may not coincide, there will be an annual failure rate everywhere and the cumulative quantities could be large.
- Decommissioning = This remains a concern, particularly due to the number of proposed projects running to a similar timeframe, at which point the recycling capacity requirement may ramp up too quickly for capacity to emerge.

Site Waste Management Plan (LCC-019) – As per the SoCG, LCC are happy to agree that the DCO and Outline documents secure the arisings data and LCC input that we’ve asked for.

Socio-economics

REP1-074: 8.5 Relevant Representations Report

LCC-099 – The Council acknowledge the Applicant’s response, and explanation. As we identified, 855 is a peak number of workers, the 650 peak for solar development areas and inter-array connections is also a significant number. While, as previously stated, the 60 minute drive time is established using a standard method, we would still stress that this is used with caution. In particular, we have concerns that Wellingborough would be outside the 60 minute drive, reducing the pool of bedspaces and ‘local’ employees. A simple google journey planner search at 2.20 on a Thursday afternoon identified that Wellingborough is 1 hour and 3 minutes from the application site.

LCC-100, LCC101 – The Council acknowledge the Applicant’s response and direction to various chapters within the ES. While we appreciate the points raised, the increase in overhead cables and the visual effects will impact upon the public perception of the Lincolnshire, and in particular the fenland landscape. This impact in perception has a real potential to impact upon the visitor economy and its value to the County. As stated in the Applicant’s response, there will be no direct impact on Springfields Gardens themselves, however, the visual impact on the main routes to and from the Gardens will undoubtedly be significant especially if approaching

from the north via the A16. In addition, the long fenland views will also suffer undoubtable impact, especially when considered in combination with the potential Grimsby to Walpole and Weston Marsh to East Leicestershire projects, all of which will pass through the proposed Weston Marsh Substations.

LCC-102 noted

LCC-103, LCC-104 – This is still a considerable area of concern. While we appreciate that issues such as peak workforce may well not overlap, there is significant potential for this to occur. Therefore, this should be considered as a significant ‘what-if’ scenario to ensure that should overlaps occur potential issues have been identified and potential mitigation measures identified in advance. An awareness of schemes overlapping with multiple others is required. This is in terms of 60 minute drive time, demand for workforce and temporary accommodation.

In respect of those schemes close to the coast, we would highlight to the applicant to be aware that these naturally have a restricted pool of all of the above from the outset. While not necessarily the case for this scheme, potential impacts from overlapping schemes are not clear cut and may be skewed as a result of cumulative impacts.

As demonstrated by the examples provided in the table below, there is the likelihood that among the schemes closest to the proposed project, and with overlapping travel time boundaries there will be noticeable overlap in construction periods. It is also likely that should any of these examples experience delays that there will be overlap with the applicant's scheme.

Project	Est. start	Est. completion	Average Temp workforce
Springwell	2027	2030	400
Beacon Fen	2027	2031/2	550
Heckington Fen	started	2027	150
Grimsby to Walpole	2029	2033	Not stated
Weston Marsh to East Leics	2030	2034	Not stated
EGL3&4	2028	2033	1,130 max
EGL5	2030	2035	Not stated
Fosse Green	2031	2033	330
Sub total			2,560
<i>Meridian</i>	<i>2027</i>	<i>2029</i>	<i>650</i>

While each NSIP will have a slightly different travel to work area (which we do not dispute), it is inevitable that there will be overlaps in demand. When the lack of chain hotel provision to the east of the A15 is taken into account it is clear that projects are going to have to be well coordinated and work together to ensure that it is possible to secure accommodation for the temporary workforce, that also does not impact on the tourist or other business demand for accommodation in the county. It is essential that the applicant understands and works with the limitations posed within and by Lincolnshire as a large rural county that is facing a period of very high construction activity.

With respect to the Outline Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan (oSSCEP) (Rev 1) [REP1-073] and inclusion of Requirement 20 in the draft DCO, LCC would reiterate the comment made in its LIR [REP1-106] at 16.15 that if there is to be reliance on this plan to provide key benefits for

the lifetime of the development, then there needs to be some form of funding mechanism by which the objectives of the oSSCEP can be delivered. In Lincolnshire similar contributions have been provided by way of a section 106 agreement for other solar NSIP schemes, for example, Heckington Fen and Springwell.

Public Health

Lincolnshire County Council Public Health welcomes the further development of the Human Health assessment within the Environmental Statement (ES) and considers that many of the matters previously raised by the Council have been addressed.

In particular, Public Health welcomes the more detailed consideration of mental health and wellbeing across construction, operation and decommissioning, including potential effects associated with landscape and visual change, tranquillity and rural character, noise, access to open space and Public Rights of Way (PRoW), traffic and employment. The consideration of vulnerable groups, including older people, people with existing health conditions or disabilities, deprived communities, agricultural workers, shift workers and veterans, is also welcomed.

Public Health also welcomes the use of ward-level information where available, consideration of Lincolnshire's Joint Health and Wellbeing priorities, the additional assessment of electromagnetic fields (EMFs), and the inclusion of a cumulative human health assessment. The latter is particularly important given the scale and number of major infrastructure projects proposed within this part of Lincolnshire.

Notwithstanding these improvements, Public Health remains cautious regarding the conclusion that the overall impacts on human health and mental wellbeing will predominantly be minor or not significant. The ES itself identifies significant environmental effects for some receptors, including construction noise and landscape and visual effects, as well as significant cumulative visual effects for some residential and recreational receptors.

Assessing and predicting impacts on mental health and wellbeing is inherently challenging. People's responses to environmental change vary according to factors including existing health, personal circumstances, attachment to place, duration of exposure and the cumulative effects of other changes within their community. Effects may also emerge over time. There therefore remains uncertainty as to whether the predicted minor adverse effects will fully reflect the lived experience of residents and communities most affected by the Scheme, particularly where they experience prolonged or cumulative change.

Public Health would caution against interpreting a population-level conclusion of "not significant" as an absence of meaningful health and wellbeing impacts at an individual, household or community level. This is particularly relevant where a relatively small number of residents may experience substantially greater effects than the wider population.

The proposed Community Liaison Group and Community Liaison Officer is welcomed. However, Public Health requests a specific commitment to periodically review health and wellbeing concerns during construction, drawing on community engagement, complaints and relevant monitoring. Particular attention should be given where clusters or patterns of concerns emerge, or where communities are simultaneously affected by other major infrastructure works. Where concerns are identified, there should be a mechanism for review with relevant

local authorities and consideration of additional or adapted mitigation where reasonably practicable.

Public Health also welcomes the protection and management of PRowS and the proposed permissive route between Queens Bank and Shepeau Stow. Opportunities to support physical activity, active travel and access to the natural environment should continue to be considered as detailed plans develop.

Overall, Public Health considers that the principal matters raised previously are considered within the ES. However, whilst acknowledging the applicant's conclusions, Public Health is not able to conclude with the same degree of certainty that health and wellbeing effects will remain minor or not significant, particularly for communities and vulnerable residents experiencing the greatest direct and cumulative change. Continued monitoring, meaningful community engagement and a responsive approach to mitigation will therefore be important to ensure that unforeseen or greater-than-predicted effects are identified and addressed.

Miscellaneous

Post ISH1 Note: Community Benefit Fund, September 2026[REP1-100]

Para 3.1.3 – LCC note the reference to a lower CBF rate for solar projects of between £700 - £1000 per MW of installed capacity, recognising the lower load factor of solar developments compared to onshore wind. The currently proposed £500,000 per year would fall below the lower end of this range for Meridian's 750 MW installed capacity but we welcome and acknowledge the applicant's commitment to revisit appropriate guidance once issued to ensure the CBF rate is in alignment at the relevant time.

Yours faithfully,

[Redacted Signature]

On Behalf of

[Redacted Name]

Head of Planning

Enc.

Appendix 1: AAH Consultants Technical Memorandum 8 (AAH TM08) Lincolnshire County Council, Meridian Solar: Deadline 1 document review

Appendix 2: Reading Agricultural Consultants. Meridian Solar Farm. Soils, Agriculture and Land Use Impact, October 2026