

Green Hill Solar Farm

EN010170

Consultation Report Appendix: Section 47 and Section 48 Applicant Responses

Prepared by: Copper Consultancy

Date: May 2025

Document Reference: APP/GH5.10

APFP Regulation 5(2)(q)



Contents

Introduction	3
Biodiversity	4
Connection Corridor.....	27
Connectivity	40
Construction	60
Flooding.....	88
Land Parcels.....	146
Soils.....	171
Watercourses & Contamination.....	181
Needs Case.....	197
People	269



Introduction

This appendix presents the Applicant's response to feedback received from Section 47 consultees during the statutory consultation. The feedback has been categorised into thematic categories based on the key topics raised by respondents. Each theme is accompanied by a summary of feedback received and the Applicant's response.

The thematic categories are as follows:

- Biodiversity
- Connection Corridor
- Connectivity
- Construction
- Consultation
- Flooding
- Property
- Soils
- Watercourses and contamination
- Need Case
- People

Biodiversity



Issue	Sub- issue	User IDs	Summary	Applicant's Response
Environment	Biodiversity and Ecology	33	General comments / conservation sites / cumulative impact	General comments / conservation sites / cumulative impact
	Ecology – unique IDs only. Responses summarised into above section.	106		
		129		
		146	Respondents expressed concern about the impact of the Scheme, from	Chapter 9: Ecology and Biodiversity [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.9]
		148	construction to its decommissioning, on both	of the
		146	local and national levels of wildlife and	Environmental Statement considers the
		197	biodiversity. Whilst the force of climate	potential impacts and mitigation regarding the
		205	change was broadly acknowledged, the	Scheme on wildlife and biodiversity.
		211	Scheme was perceived as an additional	
		213	threat to the local environment and	The Applicant notes that Appendix 9.13 to
		216	ecosystem, rather than a protector.	Chapter 9: Ecology and Biodiversity
		222		[EN010170/APP/GH6.2.9]
		224		of the Environmental Statement provides the
		230		Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Assessment
		233		[EN010170/APP/GH6.3.9.13] for the Scheme. The
		234	Respondents frequently referenced general	assessment shows how the Scheme will likely
		235	concerns for Local Wildlife Sites (LWS),	result in over 10% gain in all Unit types (70.68% in
		236	Potential Wildlife Sites (PWS), Protected	Habitat Units; 18.55% in hedgerow Units; and
		239	Wildflower Verges (PWV), Special Protection	16.16% in Watercourse Units).
		241	Areas (SPAs), Ramsar sites, National Site	
		242	Networks, Functionally Linked Land (FLL),	The applicant has
		244	and Sites of Specific Scientific Interest	distinguished designated sites in close
		247	(SSSIs) in or close to the Scheme.	proximity to the Scheme and has assessed
		257	Examples of SSSIs referenced in feedback	potential effects and evaluated ecological
		261	included Sywell, Pitsford and Brixworth	mitigation and enhancements that may be
		263	reservoirs, Upper Nene Valley Gravel Pits,	required. These can be found within Chapter 9:
		264	Irchester Old Lodge Pit, Hardwick Lodge,	Ecology and Biodiversity
		265	Summer Leys nature reserve, Bush Walk	[EN010170/APP/GH6.2.9]
		266	Woods, Bozeat Meadow and the Nene Valley	of the Environmental Statement.
		270	Waterways.	
		273		
		275	Respondents were concerned that the	As outlined in Chapter 9: Ecology and Biodiversity
		277	Scheme falls within four SSSIs 5km Impact	[EN010170/APP/GH6.2.9],
		278	Risk Zones and that the Battery Energy	a suite of baseline ecological surveys for the
		279	Storage Systems (BESS) site is close to the	Scheme has been undertaken since August



		<p>280 Grendon Conservation Area and immediately 281 adjacent to the Upper Nene Gravel Pits SPA, 290 Ramsar, and SSSI site. Easton Maudit and 294 Mears Ashby were also referenced as 297 conservation areas.</p> <p>301 306 Further surveys to identify PWSs were 307 recommended. Sywell Bottom in Green Hill C 312 was offered as an example of a PWS that 313 would potentially be impacted by the proposed 320 development.</p> <p>321 322 Several respondents noted the proximity of 326 Green Hill C and D to Wood Lodge Farm. 327 Concern focused on the potential impact on 328 the diversity of wildlife in this area.</p> <p>330 331 Some respondents suggested that solar 332 panels be removed from Green Hill D and E to 333 protect local conservation 334 areas.</p> <p>335 Horn Wood, described by respondents as an 337 ancient woodland situated to the southeast of 340 Easton Maudit, was referenced as a site of 341 ecological and historical significance.</p> <p>342 344 Concern was raised about the potential impact 345 of the proposed 15m buffer on wildlife 349 movements in this area.</p> <p>350 351 353 The importance of being able to access and 355 enjoy an array of wildlife was emphasised by 356 local community initiatives, including The 358 Seeds of Change therapeutic learning centre, 359 at The Acorn Centre in Walgrave. A few 361 respondents also noted the proximity of the 362</p>	<p>2023 to inform the assessment and requirement mitigatory measures.</p> <p>Areas of ancient woodland, including Horn Wood, have been buffered by a minimum of 30m, above the 15m minimum within standing guidance, to ensure these important habitats are protected during all stages of the Scheme.</p> <p>The Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (OLEMP) [EN010170/APP/GH7.4] provides an overview of how the ecology mitigation measures identified and proposed would be implemented and managed to ensure the effectiveness and certainty in achieving the objectives. This plan demonstrates how the land within the Scheme will be managed for the benefit of biodiversity. In relation to Woodlodge Farm, solar panels have been removed from the adjacent fields to this property, these fields are identified for ground nesting bird mitigation and wildflower meadow.</p> <p>Chapter 7: Climate Change [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.7] of the Environmental Statement provides an assessment of Greenhouse Gas emissions arising from the Scheme as well as an assessment the combined impact of the Scheme and future climate change on the environment.</p> <p>Chapter 12: Cultural Heritage</p>
--	--	--	---



		<p>364 Scheme to SPAs and National 366 Statutory Designated Sites, including 368 Badsaddle and Withmale Park. There are 370 concerns the sites will suffer from habitat 371 fragmentation and pollution over the lifetime of 373 the Scheme.</p> <p>376</p> <p>378</p> <p>382 The proximity of the infrastructure, including 384 solar panels, BESS and the sub-station to 385 SPAs, Ramsar wetland sites, and local nature 388 reserves was also perceived as a high 389 ecological risk. Respondents raised concerns 391 that new infrastructure would damage and 392 disrupt the ecological balance of the region.</p> <p>393</p> <p>397 Respondents associated the changes in land 399 use with the significant disturbance and 400 destruction of the historical environmental 403 landscape and its rural character. The 408 cumulative impact of changes to land use on 409 the ecosystem were often considered to be 410 permanent. The possibility of replacing or 415 reintroducing wildlife areas was viewed with 419 scepticism.</p> <p>420</p> <p>421</p> <p>423 Respondents felt the Applicant had a duty of 424 environmental care across all nine sites, and 426 as a result, felt that the site design should 433 prioritise the protection, restoration and 435 enhancement of existing wildlife and habitats. 446 In doing so, the Applicant would safeguard the 453 health, wellbeing and recreational benefits of 457 the natural environment.</p> <p>458</p> <p>461</p> <p>464 Some respondents suggested that areas</p>	<p>[EN010170/APP/GH6.2.12], supported by the heritage statement in Appendix 12.1, considers impacts on heritage and conservation areas.</p> <p>Chapter 10: Hydrology, Flood Drainage [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.10] of the Environmental Statement sets out the likely significant environmental effects of the Scheme on the local hydrology during its construction, operation and decommissioning phases. The Applicant notes that a Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy [EN010170/APP/GH6.3.10. 1] has been produced for the Sites which demonstrate that flood risk will not be exacerbated as a result of their installation and is likely to provide betterment over the existing surface water regime due to the reintroduction of natural land cover beneath the panels. Where additional infrastructure is proposed (e.g. battery sites), additional Drainage Strategies have been produced which indicate how sustainable drainage systems will be provided on-site to attenuate any increased runoff to greenfield rates.</p>
--	--	--	--



		466 467 468 106 129 146 189 196 199 209 210 211 213 216 232 236 237 238 239 241 242 256 257 260 261 273 275 276 277 278 280 285 286 287 292 297 300	dedicated to energy infrastructure should be smaller to mitigate any potential negative impacts on the local environment. Alternative technologies, such as wind turbines, were perceived to have a less detrimental effect on wildlife and local ecology compared to solar farms.	
--	--	---	---	--



		306	Impact on flora and fauna	Impact on flora and fauna
		307		
		314	Concern for the potential impact on a range	Chapter 9 Ecology and Biodiversity
		315	of animals was raised, including deer, foxes,	[EN010170/APP/GH6.2.9]
		318	badgers, rabbits, hares, hedgehogs, elks,	of the Environmental Statement confirms that
		320	water voles, mice, horses, livestock, birds,	impacts on all protected and notable species have
		321	and endangered species including the Great	been considered as part of the proposals. This
		323	Crested Newt. Possible impacts referenced	has been informed by a suite of targeted surveys
		325	included: displacement, the restriction of	of different species groups. General and
		326	movement, grazing and breeding, the	dedicated mitigation measures have then been
		327	heightened risk of	set out to ensure that adverse effects can be
		328	incidents, and the fragmentation of habitats.	avoided, mitigated or compensated.
		330		
		332	Many respondents expressed concern about	The applicant notes some respondents
		333	the potential impact of the Scheme on local	expressed concerns about elks, however this is
		334	deer populations. It was noted that changes	not an extant species in the UK.
		337	to deer movements may increase the risk of	
		340	road traffic accidents and both human	Security fencing at the solar array perimeters is a
		341	and animal fatality. To mitigate this risk,	necessary security feature. The Applicant notes
		342	respondents expressed a preference for	that deer and other mammal species have been
		345	hedgerow over fencing to secure the sites.	seen to surmount or undermine solar installation
		346		fencing at other locations. Due to their wide
		350	Concern was raised about the impact of	ranging habits and movements, deer will most
		352	polluted run-off and water from the site on the	likely continue to move through the landscape
		353	habitats, and spawning and	around the proposed fencing. However, it is not
		355	migratory behaviours of fish. Concern centred	considered that this would lead to any negative
		356	upon the construction phase, when sensitive	effects on the conservation status of these
		358	fish species associated with the River Nene	species. Furthermore, site fencing is not used in
		359	are perceived to be at highest risk from drilling	parts of the Site that do not have solar arrays,
		361	noise and other construction impacts.	allowing for uninterrupted movement corridors for
		370	Respondents also raised concern about the	larger mammals.
		373	impact of glint and glare on the behaviour of	That notwithstanding hedgerows around field
		376	invertebrates. Mitigation measures were	boundaries and along road frontages of the Sites
		377	strongly encouraged.	are proposed to be supplemented and enhanced
		380		where set out in the OLEMP
		382		[EN010170/APP/GH7.4].
		384	Respondents also raised concern about the	Whilst there may be some changes to deer
		385	role of security infrastructure, including	



		<p>388 fencing, CCTV and lighting, in disrupting 391 ecological harmony and 392 exacerbating the possible risk of incident, 393 injury and contamination of flora and fauna. 397</p> <p>398 Respondents perceived the BESS 400 infrastructure to be a high-risk element of the 402 Scheme. There is concern that the BESS will 403 disrupt and destroy a sensitive and protected 406 wildlife area. 408 Respondents also raised concerns about the 409 potential impacts of BESS construction, 410 including increased sediment, dust and 415 contaminants, on local SSSIs, wetland areas 416 and Ramsar sites. 419 420 421 423 424 426 430 433 435 446 447 454 455 457 461 462 464 466 467</p>	<p>movements routes as a result of the Scheme, it is not anticipated that this will notably increase the number of deer on roads in the surrounding areas. As a result, the impact on traffic incidents and resultantly on human or animal casualties is not anticipated to be greater than negligible.</p> <p>Impacts on fish are considered in Chapter 9 Ecology and Biodiversity [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.9] of the Environmental Statement, informed by desk study data and an assessment of the suitability of watercourses within the Zone of Influence of the Scheme. Use of open-cut trenching or HDD when crossing watercourses will be informed by these assessments. Measures to mitigate against noise, pollution and EMF impacts are discussed.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that lighting impacts on retained habitats, bats and freshwater fish are reduced through measures within the Outline Ecological Protection and Mitigation Strategy (OEPMS) [EN010170/APP/GH7.5] to minimise the need for lighting and the timing of its usage, during all project phases.</p> <p>The Scheme provides landscape mitigation that seeks to enhance the public footpath and provide permissive paths, which is aimed to benefit the community as a whole as well as tourists, visiting walkers, local residents and ornithologists. The landscape mitigation measures will seek to provide new planting which will include new native hedgerows and tree cover, and this will also</p>
--	--	---	---



				<p>include their management and maintenance.</p> <p>Chapter 16: Air Quality [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.16] of the Environmental Statement includes a construction dust risk assessment that assesses the risk of dust during the construction phase and proposes mitigation measures to ensure effects would not be significant.</p> <p>The Outline Battery Storage Safety Management Plan [EN010170/APP/GH7.7]. As part of the BSSMP to be prepared prior to construction of the BESS, 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.</p> <p>The Applicant has assessed the influences of ground conditions and contamination on and resulting from the Scheme in Chapter 22: Ground Conditions and Contamination [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.22] of the Environmental Statement.</p>
			<p>Impact on birds</p> <p>A high number of respondents expressed concern about the potential impact of the Scheme on birds. A plethora of species were included in responses, to illustrate the diversity of bird life in and around the Scheme. This included a number of bird species that are considered endangered, protected or on the Red list. Respondents</p>	<p>Impact on birds</p> <p>Chapter 9: Ecology and Biodiversity [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.9] of the Environmental Statement confirms that a series of bird surveys have been completed in agreement with Natural England which identify all species using the sites in both the breeding and wintering periods.</p>



		<p>frequently referenced: skylarks, lapwings, yellow wagtails, red kites, swallows, swifts, pheasants, partridges, geese, swans, birds of prey, and ground-nesting birds in their responses. There are concerns about how the Scheme will potentially cause displacement and impact nesting, foraging and migratory behaviours.</p> <p>A few respondents questioned how the Applicant would monitor bird species over the lifetime of the Scheme. Others expressed concern about the impact of construction activities, and the cumulative impact displacement would have on biodiversity levels in and around the Scheme.</p> <p>Concerns were also raised regarding yellowhammers that are present along Newland Road and Green Lane. Red kites have also been recorded in Green Hill A and A.2.</p> <p>Sywell Country Park was referenced as a local green space which may be impacted by changes to bird patterns as a result of the Scheme.</p> <p>Representatives of Sywell Aerodrome raised concerns about the cumulative impact of disrupting nesting birds in Land Parcel C. Potential displacement of nesting sites may cause the birds to move closer to the Aerodrome, thereby increasing the risk of bird</p>	<p>Chapter 9 Ecology and Biodiversity [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.9]</p> <p>sets out the baseline information available at the time of writing and considers the likely effects of the Scheme on birds during its construction, operation and decommissioning phases. Mitigation and compensation has been put forward to provide alternative nesting habitats for these species, while it is considered likely that a large proportion of ground nesting birds will benefit from the improved foraging opportunities within the grassland beneath the arrays.</p> <p>Alternative habitat provision for nesting birds will limit displacement from the Sites, and it is not considered likely that displacement will significantly alter patterns of use of Sywell Country Park or increase occupancy of the land at Sywell Aerodrome. Aerodromes are also typically favourable habitats for species such as skylark and likely to already host such species.</p> <p>The Applicant has set out a series of mitigation and landscape management improvements to improve biodiversity in its Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan [EN010170/APP/GH7.4].</p> <p>Long-term monitoring is also set out in this document to assess the success of management measures and the wildlife present in the operational Site.</p>
--	--	--	---



			strike and aircraft engine failure.	
			<p>Impact of construction</p> <p>Other points of concern included the potential impact of construction pollution, including noise, vibration, dust and light, on local wildlife.</p> <p>Several respondents raised concern about the impact of construction on badger setts. Whilst the use of buffers was accepted, it was suggested that additional restrictions on the use of machinery would be required to protect the setts.</p> <p>Some respondents raised concerns about the noise and speed of construction vehicles using local roads to access the site. There are worries that local wildlife, particularly living within verges, will be disrupted from new traffic activities.</p> <p>The impacts of increased dust and vibration levels was also referenced in relation to concerns about the Scheme's construction phase.</p> <p>Some concern was expressed towards the impact of artificial lighting on nocturnal fauna, including local bat populations. The effectiveness of sensitive lighting strategies to mitigate possible negative impacts was deemed insufficient.</p> <p>Others expressed concern about the impact of construction activities at watercourse crossing</p>	<p>Impact of construction</p> <p>Chapter 16: Air Quality [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.16] of the Environmental Statement assesses the effects of the Scheme on air quality at nearby sensitive receptors (including designated ecological sites) during the construction, operation and decommissioning phases, and proposes mitigation measures where required.</p> <p>Chapter 9: Ecology and Biodiversity [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.9] considers disturbance in the form of light and noise impacts. During operation levels of disturbance (light, noise and human presence) upon wildlife within the Sites will be minimal.</p> <p>Watercourse crossing points will be sited sensitively and appropriate methods used during construction to avoid or mitigate impacts. Detailed surveys have been undertaken for otter and water vole, and pre-construction checks will also occur for these species.</p> <p>Works within the cable corridor are temporary in nature and habitats will be reinstated on completion of works. This includes re-establishment of any lost sections of hedgerow. The BNG assessment [EN010170/APP/GH6.3.9.1 3] concludes a net gain for all habitat unit types within the Cable Route Corridor.</p> <p>Having undertaken extensive survey works around the proposed route, we have not identified or been made aware of any specific</p>



		<p>points, particularly in relation to otter and water vole habitats.</p> <p>Some concern was raised about the construction and long-term impact of a new cable corridor on the local ecosystem, particularly on existing hedgerows.</p> <p>Respondents also expressed concern about the potential impact of the cable corridor on a recent rewilding project close to the proposed route.</p> <p>Respondents emphasised the need to protect existing wildlife corridors close to site access roads, including in Green Hill C, D and along the Cogenhoe to Grendon road. The rural corridor between Northampton, Wellingborough and Kettering was also deemed to be historically, culturally and ecologically significant</p>	<p>rewilding projects close to our proposals.</p> <p>The final cable route will be sited to best avoid impacts on ecological features as identified during the desk study and ecological fieldwork. This will include observing appropriate buffers from sensitive boundary features wherever possible and will follow the Construction Environmental Management Plan</p>
		<p>Further research needed / assessments / surveys</p> <p>Some respondents felt the Scheme represented a new form of energy infrastructure that had not been sufficiently researched for long-term ecological impact. Respondents referenced the need for further research to be conducted on the impact of solar farms on local wildlife, including birds, bats and insects.</p> <p>Further detail about the environmental impact of the BESS directly adjacent to the SPA was</p>	<p>Further research needed / assessments / surveys</p> <p>Chapter 9: Ecology and Biodiversity [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.9] and Chapter 22: Ground Conditions and Contamination [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.22] consider the BESS locality and potential impacts to the SPA. This and the Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA) [EN010170/APP/GH7.21] conclude that potential impacts can be avoided or mitigated.</p> <p>The scope of surveys has been established and agreed with Natural England, including for wintering birds. Appropriate mitigation for</p>



		<p>requested for the Environmental Statement.</p> <p>Respondents highlighted need for further investigation into over-wintering birds connected to the Nene Valley Gravel Pits SPA. It was noted that over- wintering birds, such as Lapwing and Golden Plover, depend on a wider area of the local landscape for foraging, roosting and commuting. The loss of open land surrounding the SPA has contributed to a decline of both species. As a result, respondents emphasized the importance of protecting any potential further losses to foraging land.</p> <p>Some respondents suggested that there is heightened wildlife activity around the edges of the Scheme, including around the Three Shires Woods. It was suggested that further surveys should be conducted to assess the potential impact of the Scheme on connectivity, foraging and nesting.</p> <p>Respondent's felt that the Scheme's ecological assessments did not appear to consider Biological Notification Sites or Milton Keynes wildlife corridors, said to be located within 2km of Green Hill G. The expansion of ecological assessments to include both was suggested.</p> <p>Further assessments were recommended for</p>	<p>Functionally Linked Land is included in the ES chapter and discussed in detail in the HRA [EN010170/APP/GH7.21].</p> <p>Additional designated sites have been included within the desk study (including Biological Notification Sites and Milton Keynes Wildlife Corridors) to inform the impact assessment, following consultation feedback.</p> <p>A regime of monitoring surveys is set out within the OLEMP [EN010170/APP/GH7.4] which covers various ecological features during the operation of the Scheme.</p>
--	--	---	--



		<p>breeding birds, arable weeds and margins, ponds, Great Crested Newts, badgers and bats.</p> <p>Further bat surveys to identify activity from rare species, including Bechstein bats residing near or adjacent to areas of ancient woodland, was encouraged. Periodic impact assessments on bat species over the lifetime of the Scheme was also recommended. Further information about the potential impact of security and construction lighting on bat movements, and their roosting and hibernation sites was requested.</p> <p>It was noted that the PEIR does not provide an ecological baseline for Green Hill G.</p> <p>Respondents also raised concerns about the lack of consideration of Protected Wildflower Verges (PWVs) in the PEIR. Further research was encouraged to identify the potential impact of proposed access points within PWVs.</p> <p>It was suggested that surveys should be undertaken throughout the lifespan of the project.</p> <p>A small number of respondents were satisfied with the level of research undertaken to date.</p>	
		<p>General impact to flora</p> <p>Respondents associated the size of the Scheme with a reduction in hedgerows,</p>	<p>General impact to flora</p> <p>It is noted that the Scheme will result in a loss of</p>



			<p>wildflower meadows and corridors. The potential reduction in pollinators, including bees, butterflies and moths, and the cumulative impact of this on the equilibrium of the natural environment was noted. However, other respondents suggested that sowing wildflower seeds along bordering spaces in areas of energy infrastructure would help to encourage pollinators, including bees and insects, to thrive in the site.</p>	<p>hedgerow. However, the Scheme will result in an overall net gain in hedgerow units (18.55% gain), in tandem with broader biodiversity gains for other habitat types, which will be significant for the local area given the large size of the Scheme.</p> <p>Stopping intensive farming practices, including insecticide use, and converting the land to grassland can increase the variety and number of invertebrates as well as pollinators like butterflies and bees. These species have been shown to have increased diversity and abundance in solar arrays.</p>
			<p>Energy / Food security / land use</p> <p>The need to balance environmental protection, food security and energy security was referenced by many respondents.</p> <p>Respondents emphasised the importance of balancing land use across the site, to ensure the natural rural environment and its habitats are protected.</p>	<p>Energy / Food security / land use</p> <p>Creating new woodland, grassland, hedgerow, and wetland habitats will increase the amount of these habitats on the site. Enhancing existing habitats with buffer zones and better connectivity will improve their quality and accessibility for various species. Adding features like artificial nesting boxes and wood piles will provide more nesting, roosting, and sheltering sites for different species. Land uses across the sites are outlined on the Outline Landscape and Ecology Mitigation Plans [EN010170/APP/GH7.4].</p>
			<p>Maintenance / decommissioning phase</p> <p>Respondents viewed the possibility of site biodiversity and maintenance using animals, such as sheep or chickens, with scepticism.</p> <p>Questions were raised in relation to animal welfare and the availability of local farming businesses to support site maintenance. Some felt as though the inclusion of sheep</p>	<p>Maintenance / decommissioning phase</p> <p>Grazing has been successfully implemented on a large number of solar arrays, and serves to reduce the need for mechanical grass cutting, allow for continued agricultural use of the land, and maintain the biodiversity value of the grassland sward.</p> <p>BNG commitments will be secured as part of the</p>



			<p>across consultation materials was misleading.</p> <p>Respondents expressed a lack of confidence in the Applicant to maintain their commitments to BNG and ecological protection for the lifespan of the Scheme. Further detail was requested about the potential environmental disruption during the 'Replacement Phase' of the Scheme.</p> <p>Respondents also raised concerns about the impact of the decommissioning phase on the environmental equilibrium of the site. There are fears that a lack of funding for restorative decommissioning will lead to environmental degradation or the site being classed as brownfield.</p> <p>Others expressed concern about the potential removal of proposed new habitats upon return of the site to agricultural use. Some respondents raised concerns about the potential use of chemicals, fertilisers and other human-made methods to control vegetation and clean site infrastructure. The ecological impact of chemicals on insects, vegetation and the soil was emphasised</p>	<p>DCO, and management of the habitats within the Scheme will be set out in the OLEMP [EN010170/APP/GH7.4] in order to achieve BNG. The establishment of the habitats will be monitored through a detailed programme of monitoring, with remedial measures to be implemented as needed.</p> <p>During replacement of panels and batteries, the impacts on the habitats would be substantially lower than during the construction phase, and any remediation works would be implemented as per the details of the LEMP.</p> <p>Any habitat creation and enhancement will remain for the lifespan of the Scheme. Upon decommissioning all physical infrastructure will be removed, with the land, including created habitats, returned to landowners. The Scheme will not be responsible for the management of habitats within the Order limits following decommissioning and cessation of the DCO. Gains in biodiversity will be managed and monitored for the lifespan of the Scheme (60 years), which is beyond the period of 30 Years as per the requirements of the Environment Act 2021.</p> <p>The Solar PV Panels would be cleaned using water only. No chemical cleaning products would be used, with stubborn dirt brushed or wiped off the panels.</p>
--	--	--	--	---



		<p>General Support</p> <p>However, some respondents identified the potential opportunities the Scheme presents to mitigate the impact of climate change and enhance local biodiversity levels. New planting, along with the creation of new habitats and wildlife corridors, was particularly welcomed. Specific suggested areas including Green Hill F, G and the cable route corridor.</p> <p>Some respondents noted that areas of the Scheme had experienced degradation from previous land uses, including agricultural farming. As a result, respondents welcomed the opportunity to restore lapsed field boundaries and native hedgerows. The positive impact of environmental restoration activities, including potential opportunities for new species, BNG and local recreational enjoyment, was emphasised.</p> <p>Respondents further suggested that a commitment to BNG and habitat enhancement would serve as the foundation for on-site community benefits, including new green spaces and environmental education programmes. Suggestions also included the creation of an Alternative Natural Green Space for recreational activities</p>	<p>The Applicant welcomes feedback on community benefits.</p> <p>Efforts to provide specific benefits in locally impacted communities are set out in the OSSCEP [EN010170/APP/GH7.8] (for employment and economy), in the OLEMP [EN010170/APP/GH7.4] (for landscape and ecological improvements) and through the provision of community benefits such as new permissive access routes, or through the community benefit fund (separate to the DCO process).</p> <p>The Applicant is committed to ensuring that communities benefit from the Scheme including by receiving direct funding to important causes in the local area. During the development of the proposals for Green Hill Solar Farm, we have consulted on community benefits and, based on feedback, will determine how best to distribute funding. The Scheme will also generate business rates that are paid to the local authority.</p> <p>Significant BNG will be secured through the Scheme, with over 10% gain in all Unit types (70.68% in Habitat Units; 18.55% in hedgerow Units; and 16.16% in Watercourse Units). This has been assessed against the baseline conditions of the Site. Habitats created to deliver BNG have been considered in the context of local green infrastructure and nature recovery strategies, as well as to provide opportunities for particular species of conservation concern. Management of habitats will be detailed within the OLEMP [EN010170/APP/GH7.4] and monitored</p>
--	--	--	--



				over time to ensure success.
			<p>Mitigation measures / new planting / screening</p> <p>The prospect of mitigation measures, including ecological buffers, was viewed by respondents as a potential solution to visual impacts, but an insufficient means to protect wildlife.</p> <p>Some respondents rejected the notion of habitat creation and raised concerns about changes to wildlife patterns in the local area.</p> <p>A degree of scepticism was expressed towards the notion of biodiversity beneath site infrastructure.</p> <p>Respondents associated solar panel infrastructure with soil erosion and compaction, and the overall degradation of microbiological life.</p> <p>There is a perception that ecological screening and new planting measures will take a number of years to reach an adequate height, therefore delaying their positive impact.</p> <p>Respondents suggested that new planting measures were a 'tick-box' approach to mitigation and enhancement. They also warned that new screening must consider local topography to avoid becoming an 'alien' structure within the landscape.</p> <p>Concern about the ability for mature screening</p>	<p>Mitigation measures / new planting / screening</p> <p>Wide buffers have been designed into the Scheme to protect valuable habitats, such as hedgerows, ancient woodland and veteran trees; permit movement of wildlife; and enhance habitats.</p> <p>New planting and grass seeding will be appropriate to the local landscape and soil conditions. This will also factor in climate change to build in resilience to future changes.</p> <p>There will be a differentiation in grassland management within panelled areas and outside of the arrays, to provide a mosaic of habitats for a variety of species.</p> <p>Extensive hedgerow, tree and shrub planting will also enhance the capacity of the Site to support a range of wildlife, by providing nesting habitat, foraging resources, and by strengthening connectivity between habitats.</p> <p>New wetland areas will also be created in appropriate locations to diversify the landscape and support a greater diversity of species.</p> <p>Whilst the majority of glare predicted from the Scheme is during the spring, summer, and autumn, it is noted that there is some glare predicted during the winter season. It is expected that due to the maturity of the hedgerows, they will be dense enough to obstruct line of sight</p>



		<p>to mitigate the impacts of glint and glare during the winter season was also expressed.</p> <p>Questions were also raised how the Applicant would accommodate potentially displaced wildlife whilst mitigation measures developed.</p> <p>Respondents suggested the Applicant partner with local nurseries to sustainably source locally adapted plants for mitigation, enhancement and buffer zones.</p> <p>However, others welcomed the proposed environmental enhancement and mitigation measures. Some suggested that hedgerows should be prioritised as opposed to fencing, to support wildlife movements and mitigate the visual impacts of site infrastructure on recreational users, PRowers and residential housing.</p> <p>Some suggested that the plans for ecological buffers, such as trees, shrubs, mixed grasslands, wildflowers, enhanced riparian native planting, and hedgerows should be extended to compensate for the size and multiple site structure of the Scheme.</p> <p>Further details about the width and composition of ecological buffers have been requested.</p> <p>Some respondents suggested that proposed buffer zones should be extended around Mears</p>	<p>towards the arrays during all months.</p> <p>Solar development has been avoided in Fields D4, EF9 and EF34 and setbacks have been proposed in Fields DF1 to DF 3 (along Highfield Road), EF5, EF10 to EF17 (along Wilby Road), as well as Field EF22, EF23 and EF33. These areas of avoidance and setbacks are considered sufficient to mitigate against any impacts to the setting of the Mears Ashby Conservation Area and any Listed Buildings within it.</p> <p>The OLEMP [EN010170/APP/GH7.4] sets out the timeframes for planting and management responsibilities for the duration of operation, including replacement planting, as well as a schedule of ecological monitoring.</p> <p>A minimum 30m buffer from ancient woodland and 20m buffer from other woodland types is proposed.</p> <p>An assessment of hedgerow losses is set out in the ES chapter and further evaluated in the BNG assessment [EN010170/APP/GH6.3.9.1 3]. 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 through ecologically sensitive management regimes.</p> <p>The Cable Corridor does not pass through the SPA/ Ramsar site itself. Where the corridor</p>
--	--	--	---



		<p>Ashby.</p> <p>Respondents suggested that existing hedgerows should be reinforced, strengthened and managed to maximise mitigating effects.</p> <p>Whilst there was an acknowledgement of the benefits of a linear approach to habitat enhancements for connectivity, respondents emphasised the opportunity for further diversification of the ecological strategy via the incorporation of new woodlands. Respondents acknowledged the value of protecting open grassland habitats, but welcomed opportunities to create new wooded areas to support local climate change resilience.</p> <p>Respondents highlighted the importance of protecting existing formal and informal Public Rights of Ways (PRoWs), ancient woodland areas, grasslands, and hedgerows during the construction phase, and in the overall design of environmental mitigation.</p> <p>However, further details about the composition of proposed new wildlife corridors and hedgerows was requested.</p> <p>Ancient woodlands and Ancient and Veteran Trees are considered to be highly valuable, historical and sensitive environmental receptors present adjacent to and within the site.</p>	<p>crosses the River Nene and tributaries near the SPA, the cable will be laid via HDD to avoid impacts to the watercourse and its associated riparian habitats.</p>
--	--	--	--



			<p>Respondents emphasised the need to mitigate both direct and indirect impacts across the lifespan of the Scheme. This includes an 8m or 15m buffer zone around ancient woodland to avoid root damage and pollution.</p> <p>Other suggestions for protection and mitigation included a lighting strategy to prevent illumination of the woodland, the establishment of a root protection zone, and the avoidance of tree removal.</p> <p>The importance of a resilient treescape was also emphasised. Thus, dedicated tree management and maintenance was deemed high importance for the duration of the Scheme.</p> <p>The use of wildflowers to mitigate the visual impact of the site and provide new habitats for bees and insects, was encouraged.</p> <p>The North Northamptonshire Corporate Plan 2022 was also referenced in relation to the protection and enhancement of the natural environment. It was suggested that the Scheme would support North Northamptonshire to increase tree and woodland coverage via new planting.</p> <p>Mitigation suggestions also included rewilding meadows, green corridors, field trees, new native woodlands, and owl and bat boxes.</p>	
--	--	--	---	--



			<p>Others noted that the inclusion of new ponds, wetlands or wet woodlands would simultaneously support wildlife diversification and mitigate run-off and flood risks. However, further design information for pond creation was requested.</p> <p>The retention of grasslands and trees for flood mitigation was also strongly encouraged.</p> <p>Additional planting in and around Green Hill F was welcomed. Suggestions included: new hedgerows along PRoWs and access points, a new tree 'belt' to the south of Easton Lane, and additional planting to screen panels and fencing.</p> <p>Suggestions for ecological mitigation measures were also put forward for Green Hill G. These included: strengthened hedgerows along the A428 south boundary, new tree 'belts', and an open green corridor adjacent to Three Shires Way. New woodland space was also welcomed. Respondents questioned how the Applicant, as the custodian of the land, would ensure new planting and ecological mitigation measures are maintained to ensure longevity</p>	
			<p>Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)</p> <p>A commitment to proactive land management and environmental stewardship was perceived as a vital way to honour the Scheme's Design Principles. Respondents emphasised the need to</p>	<p>Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)</p> <p>Significant BNG will be secured through the Scheme, with over 10% gain in all Unit types (70.68% in Habitat Units; 18.55% in hedgerow Units; and 16.16% in Watercourse Units). This has been assessed against the baseline conditions of the Site.</p>



		<p>improve green infrastructure and environmental connectivity across the landscape: to diversify on-site habitats and achieve BNG ambitions.</p> <p>However, the proposed Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) of 10% was deemed inadequate by some respondents.</p> <p>More information was requested about how biodiversity levels would be measured, reported on and enforced during the lifespan of the Scheme.</p> <p>Respondents suggested that it would be beneficial to conduct an initial BNG assessment prior to the Scheme's construction.</p> <p>Respondents also felt that further information about how existing levels of biodiversity would be protected, particularly during the construction phase.</p> <p>Others welcomed BNG efforts and recognised its role in supporting local sustainability targets. The importance of focussing on local conservation and enhancements was emphasised. For example, respondents suggested that the stone field barns in Site E could be preserved and used to create bird and bat nesting sites as part of the Scheme's BNG strategy.</p> <p>Respondents also suggested that the Applicant consider integrating BNG objectives with local Green Infrastructure Strategies or Local Nature Recovery Strategies</p>	<p>Habitats created to deliver BNG have been considered in the context of local green infrastructure and nature recovery strategies, as well as to provide opportunities for particular species of conservation concern. Management of habitats will be detailed within the OLEMP [EN010170/APP/GH7.4] and monitored over time to ensure success.</p>
--	--	--	---



			<p>Respondents emphasised the need to honour long-term sustainability and community commitments, to support the local ecosystem and foster a positive legacy in the region.</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

Connection Corridor



Issue	Sub- issue	User IDs	Summary	Applicant's Response
Connection Corridor	General corridor	301	<u>Environmental and ecological impact</u>	<p>Environmental and ecological impact Chapter 9: Ecology and Biodiversity [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.9] of the Environmental Statement considers the potential impacts and mitigations regarding the Scheme and wildlife. The Applicant notes that Appendix 9 to Chapter 9: Ecology and Biodiversity of the Environmental Statement provides the Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Assessment [EN010170/APP/GH6.3.9.13] for the Scheme. The assessment shows how the Scheme will likely result in over 10% gain in all Unit types (70.68% in Habitat Units; 18.55% in hedgerow Units; and 16.16% in Watercourse Units).</p> <p>The Applicant has proposed a series of ecological mitigation measures. Firstly, identified high-value habitats and areas where protected or notable species are known to be present have been avoided when siting the Cable Corridor. Prior to construction, pre-works inspections will be conducted to determine the presence of valuable habitats or species. The route will either be micro-sited to avoid impacts, or mitigation measures then implemented accordingly and in line with relevant legislation. Works will be temporary in nature, and habitats will be restored on completion. Mitigation measures are detailed in the OEPMS [EN010170/APP/GH7.5].</p>
		307	<p>The possible destruction of habitats, including those for protected species such as skylarks, red kites, and badgers, was raised. Residents are sceptical of proposed mitigation measures, including new planting and biodiversity buffers. Respondents feel they would take too long to be effective and may not adequately compensate for animal habitat loss.</p>	
		33		
		366		
		397		
		421		
		313		
		367		
		205		
		131		
		217		
		228		
		229		
		232		
		235		
		237		
		239		
		240		
		247		
		282		
		285		
		289		
		314		
		318		
		323		
		326		
		328		
		329		
		332		
		334		
		336		
		3491		
		06		
		351		<u>Land use</u>



		<p>361 365 371 146 384 389 392 398 409 417 418 424 432 435 456 467 468 446 280 296 300</p>	<p>The loss of productive agricultural land is a key issue for respondents with many opposing the use of high- quality farmland (BMV Grade 1–3) for the Scheme.</p> <p>Concerns have been raised about whether the land could ever be restored after decommissioning, with some fearing it would be reclassified as brownfield which would make future agricultural and farming use impossible.</p> <p><u>Construction concerns</u></p> <p>Construction of the project is expected to bring heavy HGV traffic, dust, noise, and disruption to impacted communities. Narrow country lanes have been called unsuitable for large-scale construction traffic by respondents and there are road damage and safety risk fears.</p> <p>As it is proposed to be up to 50 meters wide, the cable corridor some respondents</p>	<p>search for suitable brownfield land, has been undertaken and presented as part of Appendix 5.1: Site Selection Assessment [EN010170/APP/GH6.3.5.1] of the Environmental Statement.</p> <p>In Chapter 5: Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.5] of the Environmental Statement, the Applicant provided further details on the alternatives that were considered and the design evolution process for the Scheme.</p> <p>Detailed Agricultural Land Classification surveys (ALC) have been undertaken to identify the grade of the land within the Sites and these are reported in Chapter 20: Agriculture Circumstances [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.20] of the Environmental Statement and associated Appendix 20.1: Agricultural Circumstances [EN010170/APP/GH6.3.20.1].</p> <p>The Farming Report [EN010170/APP/GH7.27] sets out that the land quality will not be affected and that land should be capable of restoration in full during the decommissioning phase</p> <p>Chapter 13: Transport and Access [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.13] of the Environmental Statement details the Applicant's consideration of the effects of increased traffic levels during construction.</p> <p>The Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN010170/APP/GH7.9] also considers road user safety and how to reduce traffic impacts from the development.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that mitigation measures are summarised in the Transport Assessment, the</p>
--	--	--	--	--



			expressed concern that the amount of land that will be used with some suggesting that underground cabling should instead follow existing road verges.	<p>Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan, presented as Appendix 13.1 to Chapter 13: Transport and Access [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.13] of the Environmental Statement.</p> <p>The Applicant has ensured that prior to the commencement of any phase of development a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) will be submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority, and the Requirements in the DCO will secure this. The CEMP for each phase will be in accordance with the Outline CEMP [EN010170/APP/GH7.1] which will be submitted as part of the DCO application.</p>
			<p><u>Disruption to the community</u></p> <p>Respondents expressed that the project will industrialise rural communities and make irreversible and permanent changes to the character of historic villages.</p>	<p>Chapter 12 Cultural Heritage [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.12] of the Environmental Statement presents an assessment of the effects of the Scheme on cultural heritage and archaeological receptors. This includes an assessment of the Scheme's effect on heritage, historic landscape and archaeology arising from likely impacts alongside proposed appropriate mitigation.</p> <p>The assessment identifies and evaluates heritage assets within and surrounding the Study Area and assesses how the Scheme may potentially affect those heritage assets. The Heritage Statement (ES Appendix 12.1 [EN010170/APP/GH6.3.12.1] assesses the potential impact of the Scheme on the historic setting of the area.</p>
	Undergrounding - Whole Route	94 231 329 106 339	A few respondents expressed support for use of undergrounding cabling for at least some, if not all, of the connection corridor as an alternative to overhead lines.	Chapter 12: Cultural Heritage [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.12] and Chapter 22: Ground Conditions and Contamination [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.22] consider the impact of the Scheme and potential environmental



		<p>304 33 358 392 384 406 397 497 422 409 444 424 289 318</p>	<p>Some respondents suggested that undergrounding the connection corridor could reduce the visual impact of the project and, as a result, preserve the existing rural landscape.</p> <p>Some respondents have welcomed the possibility of new public walkways and cycleways that could be developed and integrated alongside underground cable routes, particularly near Sywell Reservoir.</p> <p>A few respondents expressed concern about potential environmental disturbance caused by excavation and construction where underground cable may be used.</p>	<p>disturbance caused by excavation.</p> <p>The Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan [EN010170/APP/GH7.1] outlines measures required for the safe management of excavation works or other intrusive works.</p> <p>Chapter 4: Scheme Description [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.4] comments on the potential environmental disturbance in relation to the underground cabling and how these will be laid/removed to reduce impacts.</p>
			<p><u>Opposition to undergrounding and land use</u></p> <p>Several respondents have strongly opposed underground cabling because of its potential disruption to agricultural land and conservation areas. With some expressing concern that trenching and installation may lead to long-term habitat destruction, particularly for deer, birds of prey, brown hares, and partridges.</p> <p>Some respondents have highlighted that their nearby areas have been designated as conservation zones, and any infrastructure, including underground cables, could be incompatible with that environment.</p> <p>A few respondents raised concerns that the use</p>	<p>Detailed Agricultural Land Classification surveys (ALC) have been undertaken to identify the grade of the land within the Sites and these are reported in Chapter 20: Agriculture Circumstances [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.20] of the Environmental Statement and associated Appendix 20.1: Agricultural Circumstances [EN010170/APP/GH6.3.20.1].</p> <p>A soil survey is proposed pre-construction on the refined Cable Corridor in the Outline Soil Management Plan [EN010170/APP/GH7.6]</p> <p>Chapter 4: Scheme Description [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.4] comments on the potential environmental disturbance in relation to</p>



			would not mitigate known flood risks and that it could lead to additional water management issues.	the underground cabling and how these will be laid/removed to reduce impacts. Chapter 9: Ecology and Biodiversity [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.9] of the Environmental Statement Explains that the Cable Route Corridor has been subject to detailed surveys to identify the habitats present and evidence of protected species. Prior to construction, updated walkovers will be conducted by an Ecological Clerk of Works to ensure that no important features, such as badger setts, will be impacted by the works.
			<p><u>Disruption to the community</u></p> <p>Respondents have expressed concerns about the impact of the construction works that may need to implement underground cabling, particularly the disruption to roads, bridges, and villages.</p> <p>Some have expressed concern about the impact of construction, including of underground cabling, on local communities, particularly noise, pollution and road congestion.</p> <p>The cabling corridors have been seen as invasive and likely to negatively affect respondents' privacy – particularly when they run through residential areas and alongside private properties.</p> <p>Some respondents questioned the long-term feasibility of the use of underground cables due to the need for regular maintenance</p>	<p><u>Disruption to the community</u></p> <p>Chapter 18: Human Health [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.18] of the Environmental Statement assesses noise and vibration against human health receptors and advises the Scheme adopts a best practice measure to reduce noise and vibration impacts. Also to adhere to time limits for noisy works and ensures planning conditions for night works where required are agreed in advance.</p> <p>Chapter 16 Air Quality [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.16] of the Environmental Statement assesses the effects of the Scheme on air quality at nearby sensitive receptors during the construction, operation and decommissioning phases. The aim of this assessment is to predict the levels of air quality pollutants and assess them to determine whether there are any likely significant effects, taking account of relevant policy, guidelines and best practice.</p>



			<p>which could potentially lead to soil degradation</p>	<p>Chapter 14 Noise and Vibration [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.14] of the Environmental Statement evaluates the likely significant effects of the Scheme on nearby noise and vibration sensitive receptors during construction, operation and decommissioning. The aim of this assessment is to predict the levels of noise and assess these against relevant guidelines, and where necessary, identify any required mitigation measures to make effects acceptable.</p> <p>Worst-case noise and vibration activities associated with the proposed cabling have been assessed at the closest distances to nearby sensitive receptors to provide a robust assessment.</p> <p>Chapter 13 Transport and Access [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.13] of the Environmental Statement, details the Applicant's consideration of the effects of increased traffic levels during construction.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that mitigation measures are summarised in Appendix 13.1: Transport Assessment [EN010170/APP/GH6.3.13.1] and the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (OCTMP) [EN010170/APP/GH7.9] of the Environmental Statement.</p>
			<p><u>Flooding risks and soil impact</u></p> <p>Flooding was raised as a concern by some respondents who suggested that the use of underground cables in flood-prone areas</p>	<p><u>Flooding risks and soil impact</u></p> <p>The potential effect of the cable route on flood risk has been assessed and any associated mitigation presented in Chapter 10: Hydrology,</p>



			<p>could lead to serious environmental consequences.</p> <p>Respondents suggested that the construction and placement of underground cables will compact soil and therefore increase runoff and exacerbate flood risks.</p> <p>Some respondents noted that underground cables may interfere with natural drainage systems and increase surface water pooling.</p> <p>The potential use of underground cables near waterways such as the Upper Nene Valley Gravel Pits has been seen as a significant pollution risk with some respondents expressing concern that toxic materials may find their way into the water table.</p>	<p>Flood Risk and Drainage [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.10] of the Environmental Statement, supported by Annex B – 10.1.1: Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy – Cable Route.</p> <p>The Applicant has assessed the influences of ground conditions and contamination on and resulting from the Scheme in Chapter 22 Ground Conditions and Contamination [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.22] of the Environmental Statement.</p>
			<p><u>Viability of undergrounding</u></p> <p>Several respondents have questioned the economic and technical viability of undergrounding, stating that it is likely to significantly increase costs and prolong the construction time of the project.</p> <p>Some respondents expressed questioned the long-term resilience of underground cables, particularly given that the area has a high water table and has suffered from frequent flooding.</p> <p>Other respondents have questioned whether adequate planning has really been conducted to assess the potential impact of underground cables on soil stability, agricultural productivity/use and local</p>	<p><u>Viability of undergrounding</u></p> <p>Chapter 4 Scheme Description [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.4] outlines the construction activities related to underground cabling within the Cable Route Corridor and provides the expected construction timeline for this work.</p> <p>The Funding Statement [EN010170/APP/GH4.2] estimates with total cost of the Scheme which includes construction costs of underground cabling.</p> <p>As described in Chapter 10 Hydrology, Flood Risk and Drainage [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.10] all underground cabling will be designed and installed to be flood resilient/water compatible.</p>



			Ecosystems.	The impact to soil and agricultural holdings within the Cable Route Corridor are considered in Chapter 20 Agricultural Circumstances [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.20].
	Undergrounding - Site specific	505 454 372 146 80 33 139 246 292 321 512 355 339 358 497 383 498 200 286 262	<p><u>Disruption to the community</u></p> <p>Respondents have raised concerns that the proposed underground cabling routes and the associated project infrastructure are going to be too close to villages and conservation areas.</p> <p>Respondents expressed concern that cable corridor between sites D and E would be too close to the village of Mears Ashby</p> <p>The views from local conservation areas and key landmarks could be significantly impacted, with some respondents raising fears that the proximity of the project will fundamentally impact the area's character.</p>	<p><u>Disruption to the community</u></p> <p>The Applicant's site selection process, including a search for suitable brownfield land, has been undertaken and presented as part of Appendix 5.1 (Site Selection Assessment [EN010170/APP/GH6.3.5.1]) of the Environmental Statement. Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.5]) of the Environmental Statement explains in further detail the alternatives that were considered and the design evolution process for the Scheme.</p> <p>Table 5.11: Main Stages of Refinement for the Cable Route Corridor within Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.5]) of the Environmental Statement explains how the cable route has been refined. The initial cable corridor search area included whole fields with multiple river crossing options.</p> <p>This was then narrowed to a target route, predominantly 100m in width, which was fully surveyed by geophysical surveys, ecological surveys, and landscape assessments to generate options within the target route. The final cable corridor is 50m in width over the majority of its length.</p> <p>Chapter 8: Landscape and Visual Impact [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.8] of the Environmental Statement set outs the ways in</p>



				<p>which the Applicant has considered the potential visual and landscape impacts to local residents and visitors, potential effects associated with the panels and associated infrastructure.</p> <p>Chapter 12 Cultural Heritage [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.12] of the Environmental Statement presents an assessment of the effects of the Scheme on cultural heritage and archaeological receptors. This includes an assessment of the Scheme's effect on heritage, historic landscape and archaeology arising from likely impacts alongside proposed appropriate mitigation.</p>
			<p><u>Impact to roads</u></p> <p>Several respondents have expressed their concerns about the potential impact of the use of underground cabling on local roads and infrastructure.</p> <p>Some suggested that, as the proposed connection route runs through villages with already congested roads, further congestion and disruption may arise.</p> <p>Respondents have also emphasised that the public's rights of way, including footpaths and equestrian routes, which could be affected by project work, have to be protected.</p>	<p><u>Impact to roads</u></p> <p>Chapter 13 (Transport and Access [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.13]) of the Environmental Statement details the Applicant's consideration of the effects of increased traffic levels during construction.</p> <p>The Crossing Schedule [EN010170/APP/GH7.18] details where the cable route corridor will cross any infrastructure.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Socio-economics, Tourism and Recreation [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.17] of the Environmental Statement assesses impacts on the accessibility, desirability and use of public</p>



				<p>rights of way (PRoWs), open spaces, formal and informal recreation facilities in the countryside in Section 17.8 of the chapter. Potential impacts to PRoW are outlined within the PRoW management plan.</p> <p>Chapter 9: Ecology and Biodiversity [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.9] of the Environmental Statement considers the potential impacts and mitigation measures regarding the Scheme and wildlife. The Applicant notes that Appendix 9 to Chapter 9: Ecology and Biodiversity of the Environmental Statement provides the Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Assessment [EN010170/APP/GH6.3.9.13] for the Scheme. The assessment shows how the Scheme will likely result in over 10% gain in all Unit types (70.68% in Habitat Units; 18.55% in hedgerow Units; and 16.16% in Watercourse Units).</p>
			<p><u>Environmental and ecological impact</u></p> <p>Several respondents have expressed strong concern about the potential impact of underground cabling on wildlife and biodiversity.</p> <p>One respondent noted that their land has an active badger sett next to the proposed connection route.</p> <p>Some others raised concerns about what they viewed as the destruction of recently rewilded fields.</p> <p>The impact on local bird species, including pheasants, partridges, and skylarks, has also</p>	<p>The Cable Route Corridor has been subject to detailed surveys to identify the habitats present and evidence of protected species. Prior to construction, updated walkovers will be conducted by an Ecological Clerk of Works to ensure that no important features, such as badger setts, will be impacted by the works.</p> <p>Given the temporary nature of the cabling works and the type of habitats through which the Cable Route Corridor runs, the habitats can be restored relatively quickly. High value habitats will be avoided through use of Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD), rather than open-cut trenching.</p> <p>The Applicant noted the concerns regarding the use of overhead lines and confirms that the</p>



			<p>been highlighted by some respondents, as well as the risk to brown hares, barn owls, deer, and bees.</p> <p>Some respondents said that they feel underground cabling will still cause significant environmental damage, especially in areas where land has been set aside for wildlife conservation.</p> <p><u>Placement and impacts</u></p> <p>A few respondents expressed some concern about how the placement of towers may affect existing pathways, roads and agricultural land.</p> <p>Some respondents feel that the use of overhead line infrastructure would encircle villages and limit connectivity between areas.</p>	<p>cables will be underground.</p>
	Location of Towers	<p>182 33 387 380 550</p>	<p><u>Visual impact and disruption to land</u></p> <p>Several respondents have expressed concerns about the potential/ proposed placement of towers and that tall structures may create an industrialised-looking landscape and permanently impact the area's unique character.</p> <p>One respondent has a concern about the enclosure effect of fencing and infrastructure and others have described the project as possibly creating a "tunnel effect" leading into villages, making the environment feel closed off and artificial.</p>	<p>The Applicant notes that the cables will be underground.</p> <p>Details on fencing, lighting and security can be found in Chapter 4: Scheme Description [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.4].</p>



			<u>Overhead vs. Underground</u> Several respondents expressed concern that while the proposals suggest that the majority of cabling would be underground, it still left room for a significant percentage (up to 49.9%) to be overhead. Respondents commented on the presence of towers across the landscape, undermines claim that underground cabling was the preferred infrastructure for the connection corridor. Some respondents expressed frustration about confusion regarding proposed use of overhead line and underground cable infrastructure for the connection corridor, with some calling for clearer commitments and communication on the extent of undergrounding and whether new overhead lines would be introduced.	<p>The Applicant notes that the cables will be underground.</p> <p>Please refer to Chapter 4: Scheme Description [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.4] of the ES for further details on the Cable Route Corridor</p>
--	--	--	---	---

Connectivity



Issue	Sub- issue	User IDs	Summary	Applicant's Response
Connectivity	Access to site	33 105 106 107 108 121 129 146 178 211 212 216 217 219 222 228 229 231 233 236 237 240 241 246 255 263 273 274 280 284 286 287 294 301 303 304	<p>Many of the respondents expressed concern that use of local roads for access to the site may impact the adequacy of existing roads. Some expressed concern that attempts to access the site may result in disruption and impacts on the local community.</p> <p>Impacts on road safety and existing traffic flows being changed were also raised in some responses.</p> <p>Several responses made specific reference to the suitability of access points. In relation to Site A, a suggestion was made to locate the access point at the most northerly point of the site, near the entrance to Glebe Farm.</p> <p>Access to other nearby sites such as Sywell Aerodrome, Sywell Country Park, and Grendon Marina was also highlighted as an issue.</p> <p>Some respondents suggested that an access point at Grendon should be discounted due to the supposed sensitive nature of the location.</p> <p>The proposed use of HGVs to access the site during construction was raised as a concern by many respondents.</p> <p>Respondents also noted that large vehicles,</p>	<p>The Applicant notes this comment and has presented relevant assessment and mitigation in Chapter 13: Transport and Access [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.13] of the Environmental Statement. The Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN010170/APP/GH7.9] considers road users' safety and how to reduce traffic impacts from the development.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that mitigation measures are summarised in the Transport Assessment (Section 8), the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN010170/APP/GH7.9], and the Outline Public Rights of Way and Permissive Access Routes Management Plan [EN010170/APP/GH7.10].</p> <p>Mitigation measures associated with transport and access are summarised in the Transport Assessment (Section 8) the Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP), presented as Appendix 13.1 to Chapter 13: Transport and Access [EN010170/APP/GH6.3.13.1] in the Environmental Statement.</p> <p>The access points have initially been assessed through consideration of the factors such as, the nature of the highway from which access may be taken. This includes the wider connections through to the Strategic Road Network and consideration of road widths and posted speed limits. The ability to utilise existing points of access was also considered as preferable in the first instance.</p>



		<p>307 such as HGVs, may struggle due to the</p> <p>313 narrow nature of the rural roads close to the</p> <p>314 site.</p> <p>318</p> <p>320 The access points were identified by some as</p> <p>321 a safety risk for other road users, including</p> <p>323 cyclists and pedestrians, particularly their</p> <p>328 needing to share already limited space with</p> <p>333 HGVs and plant machinery.</p> <p>337</p> <p>341</p> <p>342 Some respondents suggested that vehicles</p> <p>346 attempting to access the site would cause an</p> <p>347 adverse impact to local traffic.</p> <p>349</p> <p>350 It was noted that the access point for the</p> <p>351 Battery Energy Storage System (BESS)</p> <p>352 facility would require HGVs to drive along</p> <p>355 Station Road which has tight bends.</p> <p>356</p> <p>358</p> <p>366</p> <p>372</p> <p>377</p> <p>384</p> <p>390</p> <p>391</p> <p>395</p> <p>396</p> <p>397</p> <p>398</p> <p>401</p> <p>404</p> <p>408</p> <p>409</p> <p>410</p> <p>415</p> <p>416</p> <p>419</p> <p>421</p>	<p>Technical considerations such as achieving suitable visibility have also been assessed. The access to Green Hill A is proposed in the northern section of the Site and utilises the existing farm access.</p> <p>Chapter 17: Socio-Economics [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.17], Tourism and Recreation assesses the likely impact of traffic on nearby visitor attractions, including but not limited to Sywell Aerodrome, Sywell Country Park, and White Mills Marina.</p> <p>Access to the Green Hill BESS sites utilise existing farm access points. The route via Station Road is already used by HGVs associated with the aggregates site. HGV routes will avoid travelling through Grendon.</p> <p>HGV access the Applicant notes this comment and has presented relevant assessment and mitigation in Chapter 13 Transport and Access [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.13] of the Environmental Statement. The Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN010170/APP/GH7.9] considers road users' safety and how to reduce traffic impacts from the Scheme. The Applicant notes the local highway network that makes up the construction vehicle routes to the Site will be managed in accordance with the Construction Traffic Management Plan to ensure appropriate use by the vehicle numbers forecast over a temporary period.</p> <p>Furthermore, Chapter 17: Socio-Economics, Tourism and Recreation</p>
--	--	---	--



		424 425 426 432 446 454 455 456 457 464 466 467 468		<p>[EN010170/APP/GH6.2.17] specifically assessed the potential impacts of the Scheme, including HGV access points, on the recreational use of highway and public rights of way for pedestrians, cyclists, and equestrian users.</p> <p>The applicant notes that CTMPs will be informed by baseline traffic information, professional experience, and data from other projects.</p> <p>They will also provide an anticipated number of Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGV) movements associated with the construction works for the projects.</p>
General traffic		33 82 106 136 146 196 198 207 211 216 220	<p>Road capacity</p> <p>Some observed that there are already high levels of traffic in the local community, with some suggesting that the local road network will struggle to cope with the additional traffic associated with each stage of the Project lifespan (i.e. construction, maintenance and decommissioning).</p> <p>Respondents felt that housing developments, businesses and venues nearby had not been</p>	<p>Road capacity</p> <p>The Applicant notes this comment and has presented relevant assessment and mitigation in Chapter 13: Transport and Access [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.13] of the Environmental Statement. The Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN010170/APP/GH7.9] considers road users' safety and how to reduce traffic impacts from the development. Specific local events can be considered and aspects such as traffic</p>



		223 227 229 231 233 234 235 236 242 245 246 251 255 256 268 269 273 285 286 287 288 290 292 294 297 298 300 303 304 308 309 311 312 313 314 317 318	<p>fully considered, despite their contribution to existing traffic flows.</p> <p>Some questioned whether specific local events, often held at Santa Pod Raceway and Sywell Aerodrome, which often result in increased traffic, have been considered.</p> <p>Many respondents noted that there were several major roads surrounding the proposed Site, including the A45, A4500, A43 and A509 which may be impacted by the proposal.</p> <p>Some noted that the proposed site sits on the east-west route between the M1, A14 and A5 which respondents feel already experiences heavy congestion at peak times.</p> <p>Respondents also suggested that routes around Holcot, Mansley, Olney and Lavendon are likely to be especially affected as a result of increased traffic on the east-west route between the M1, A14 and A5.</p> <p>Residents observed that access to the proposed Site E would be just off the A4500, a particularly busy junction. This road is used as a diversion route when issues occur on the A45 and by HGVs accessing the Whitehouse industrial estate.</p> <p>Other adverse effects</p>	<p>management removed / or used outside of periods where such events are taking place.</p> <p>The wider assessment is based on Annual Average Daily Traffic rather than short term peaks associated with short-term events such as those highlighted. The methodologies for assessment have been developed in line with relevant industry guidance.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that mitigation measures are summarised in the Transport Assessment (Section 8), the Construction Traffic Management Plan, and the Outline Public Rights of Way and Permissive Access Routes Management Plan [EN010170/APP/GH7.10].</p> <p>The identified construction routes seek to use more major roads, avoiding minor roads and routes through villages wherever possible. The CTMP will control HGV movements, ensuring suitable routes are used. It will also restrict site access to ensure construction traffic movements occur outside of peak periods and the more congested parts of the day. A Travel Plan will also be in place to minimise car and LGV movements associated with construction workers: measures such as shuttle services linking key destinations and local hotels will be used.</p>
--	--	---	--	--



		320		Other adverse effects
		321	Some respondents suggested that motorists	
		324	driving past the site may be adversely	
		326	affected by glint and glare.	Chapter 15: Glint and Glare
		327		[EN010170/APP/GH6.2.15] of
		328	Some expressed concern about the impact of	the Environmental Statement describes the
		330	increased traffic on local flood plain.	baseline conditions, glint and glare guidelines,
		333		methodology, and the potential glint and glare
		337	Concern was also raised about the impact of	effects from the Scheme with regard to road safety,
		339	increased traffic, including during	residential amenity, aviation activity, and railway
		341	construction, on local businesses.	operations and infrastructure.
		351		
		352	The safety of children attending local schools	The Glint and Glare Assessment considers the
		356	who may be impacted by increased traffic,	impact of the Scheme towards road users on
		355	was also raised by a few.	nearby major roads such as A-roads and B-roads.
		357		
		358	Respondents questions the suitability of the	The landscape mitigation measures will seek to
		361	existing roads around the River Nene for	provide new planting to mitigate the potential
		364	construction and operational traffic.	impacts and effects of glint and glare, which will
		366		include new native hedgerows and tree cover,
		367		and this will also include their management and
		372		maintenance.
		373		
		374		Chapter 10 Hydrology, Flood Risk and Drainage
		376		[EN010170/APP/GH6.2.10] of
		380		the Environmental Statement sets out the likely
		381		significant environmental effects of the Scheme on
		384		the local hydrology during its construction,
		389		operation and decommissioning phases.
		390		
		392		Mitigation measures associated with transport and
		395		access are summarised in the Transport
		396		Assessment (Section 8), the Outline Construction
		397		Traffic Management Plan (OCTMP)
		398		[EN010170/APP/GH7.9] , and
		400		presented in Appendix 13.1 to Chapter 13:
		402		Transport and Access
				[EN010170/APP/GH6.3.13.1]



		403 404 405 406 408 409 414 415 417 419 420 421 422 424 426 434 435 436 444 446 447 453 454 456 457 460 467 468 478 495 497 510 525 573 575 578 579		<p>of the Environmental Statement.</p> <p>Chapter 10 Hydrology, Flood Risk and Drainage [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.10] of the Environmental Statement also assesses the impacts on schools and pedestrians and mitigation measures have been included in the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (OCTMP) [EN010170/APP/GH7.9.]</p>
--	--	---	--	--



	Mitigating impact		<p>Mitigation and community benefits</p> <p>Respondents suggested a number of mitigation and community benefits including regular road inspections; the banning of HGV movements between the hours of 09:00 and 16:00 or peak time; and improved traffic management measures, including the use of traffic marshals).</p>	<p>Mitigation and community benefits</p> <p>Chapter 13 Transport and Access [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.13] of the Environmental Statement notes that Construction vehicle trips will be coordinated to avoid movement during peak hours. This will be secured through the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN010170/APP/GH7.9].</p> <p>Construction traffic will be spread out throughout the day, and will be coordinated, where possible, to avoid the network peak hours. Therefore, the effect of construction traffic on the Strategic Road Network (SRN) within the local proximity of the Site will be limited.</p> <p>Construction vehicles will avoid travel during the network peak hours where possible. Therefore, deliveries will be scheduled for between 09:30 and 16:30 where possible.</p> <p>Construction worker shifts will be scheduled so that workers are not traveling during the network peak hours of 08:00- 09:00 and 17:00-18:00. The OCTMP will limit construction movements to largely occur outside of peak periods (0800 to 0900 and 1700 to 1800). Measures such as banksmen and traffic marshals will be used. While proposed measures will minimise construction traffic movements as much as practicable during peak traffic movement hours, will be in place, it is not feasible to restrict HGV</p>



				<p>movements between 9:00am and 16:00pm as these would be key operating times over the construction period.</p> <p>If movements could not occur over this core period, construction activity would be occurring at night, and potentially over a much longer construction phase, neither of which are realistic and/or would likely result in more significant adverse effects.</p>
	Public Right of Way (PROW)	<p>122</p> <p>146</p> <p>178</p> <p>204</p> <p>205</p> <p>211</p> <p>213</p> <p>216</p> <p>219</p> <p>220</p> <p>223</p> <p>229</p> <p>231</p> <p>233</p> <p>234</p> <p>236</p> <p>237</p> <p>246</p> <p>261</p> <p>263</p> <p>264</p> <p>266</p> <p>267</p> <p>268</p> <p>270</p> <p>275</p> <p>280</p> <p>282</p> <p>287</p>	<p>Negative impact of construction and operation</p> <p>Many respondents raised concerns that the proposals could have wide- ranging negative effects on existing Public Rights of Way (PRoW).</p> <p>With some expressing concern about the future of local PRoW, in particular around construction and operation of the proposed Site. This included concerns that the proposed new infrastructure will remove or restrict access to PRoW through construction and operation.</p> <p>Commented that the development will make the area unappealing, with the noise and glint and glare potentially being intrusive to walkers. Some also suggested that the proposed safety measures, including lighting, fencing, CCTV will make the surroundings feel like a 'prison'. Some respondents felt that the nearby paths would be changed permanently.</p>	<p>Chapter 17: Socio- Economics, Tourism and Recreation [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.17] of the Environmental Statement assesses impacts on the accessibility, desirability and use of public rights of way (PRoWs), open spaces, formal and informal recreation facilities in the countryside in Section 17.8 of the chapter.</p> <p>There may be opportunities to improve connectivity within the project area and the Applicant welcomes input from the local community and interested parties on their proposals to do this, so these can be explored further.</p> <p>Opportunities to develop local authority green infrastructure strategies are under consideration and being explored in tandem with landscape and ecological requirements.</p> <p>The applicant notes that the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment will look to provide landscape mitigation that seeks to enhance the public right of way (PRoW) network as a community benefit, which is aimed to benefit the community as a whole.</p> <p>During the Scheme's operation, no onsite lighting will be used for the solar array areas, fencing will be set back away ~10m from PRoWs, and CCTV</p>



		289 293 294 297 307 311 314 318 320 322 326 327 328		cameras will only point into or along the solar array boundaries. Security for onsite substations will be self-contained. The Scheme is design to retain the route and physical quality of PRowS throughout its lifetime. As the Scheme is to be decommissioned and the land restored to its agricultural use thereafter, the only remaining permanent change to paths and other PRowS would be as a result of planting that is retained by the landowner.
		329 330 332 333 334 337 341 342 343 345 353 355 356 359 361 363 364 366 369 371 373 375 382 384	<p>Respondents were keen to emphasise the importance of the PRow for the local community.</p> <p>Some emphasised the positive effect on general health and wellbeing that the PRow network provides and the vital role it plays to village life.</p> <p>Concerns relating to heritage Heritage was repeatedly identified as a key concern, with respondents highlighting the historical and cultural significance of the area.</p> <p>Respondents commented that proposed site is currently open arable countryside, crossed by the Three-Shire Way, an ancient trackway of international significance well-used by walkers, riders, and cyclists. It also provides views of several ancient churches.</p> <p>In addition, its positive impact on tourism was highlighted - ramblers from other regions travel to this part of Northamptonshire because of the</p>	<p>The Applicant is cognisant of the importance of the PRow network for local community for physical and mental health and wellbeing. As a result, the impact of the Scheme on the direct desirability and use of PRowS is assessed in Chapter 17: Socio-Economics, Tourism and Recreation [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.17] of the Environmental Statement, while the resultant impacts on health and wellbeing are assessed under the heading “open space, leisure and play” in Chapter 18: Human Health [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.18].</p> <p>The Applicant has committed to mitigation of adverse impacts on PRowS, and through enhancement measures such as planting, offsetting from PRowS to onsite infrastructure, and the provision of new permissive paths. These are set out in the OPROWPPMP [EN010170/APP/GH7.10], which is secured by requirement in the draft DCO [EN010170/APP/GH3.1].</p> <p>Chapter 12: Cultural Heritage</p>



		391 392 395 396 397	landscape and views and for international events such as the Waendel Walk.	[EN010170/APP/GH6.2.12] , supported by the heritage statement in Appendix 12.1 [EN010170/APP/GH6.3.12.1] , considers impacts on heritage receptors.
		398 399 406 409 410 418 419 421 424 425 426 435 446 454 455 457 459 467 468	<p>Suggestions for improvements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A commitment should be made to maintain current paths and Public Rights of Way (PRoW) • Respondents suggested the creation of a network of interlinked footpaths, including across Site E • Some suggested that enhancements to existing PRoW's should be considered • Respondents requested that a new PRoW or walking route should be created between Mears Ashby and Earls • Barton where there is currently a 100-200m section where walkers have to use the A43 • A few suggested that minimum width for PRoWs and footpaths needs to be maintained. • Some suggested improvements be made to support active travel in general, including cycling, walking and horse riding. • Some respondents suggested that improvements to stiles be made. • Respondents suggested that a 15m buffer around all bridleways should be implemented. 	<p>Suggestions for improvements</p> <p>The Applicant commits to maintaining current public rights of way throughout the Scheme's lifetime, seeking to minimise any potential construction impacts . The Scheme design furthermore features a number of new permissive paths across most of the Sites to improve access to the countryside and PRoW network connections.</p> <p>The Applicant is also happy to explore opportunities to improve existing PRoW signage, stiles, gates etc as part of the community benefit fund.</p> <p>All PRoWs have a minimum 15m buffer from the centreline of the route to the nearest infrastructure.</p>
	Aviation	129 213 236	<p>Glint and glare</p> <p>Several respondents expressed concern about</p>	Chapter 15: Glint and Glare [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.15] of the Environmental Statement describes the



		<p>248 the impact on pilots of aircraft and hot air 264 balloons landing at Sywell Aerodrome as a 277 result of glint and glare from the panels. 319 Some noted that there are several other 328 airstrips in the vicinity of the proposal (in 337 addition to Sywell Aerodrome) which could also 339 be affected. 366 389 Some respondents suggested that the potential 391 impact of glint and glare from the proposed 397 panels on pilots could negatively impact the 398 use of sites in the vicinity of the proposals, as 402 they may gain a reputation of being difficult to 409 use. 422 424 Respondents noted that the possible impact of 468 glint and glare on pilots may affect airshows and displays that are carried out in the area.</p> <p>One respondent suggested that the proposal could affect the aircraft performance when taking off and landing. A respondent noted that pilots often use landmarks as part of Visual Flight Rules when landing, and suggested that the Project would alter the landscape in a manner that would impact pilots attempting to do this. Suggested mitigation measures Respondents suggested moving the solar panels away from the Sywell Aerodrome boundary and implement mitigation measures to limit glare.</p>	<p>baseline conditions, glint and glare guidelines, methodology, and the potential glint and glare effects from the Scheme with regard to road safety, residential amenity, all relevant aviation receptors, and railway operations and infrastructure. Public Rights of Way have not been included within the assessment because they are receptors with “low” sensitivity which means the receptor is tolerant to change without detrimental effect and is of low or local importance.</p> <p>The effects of glint and glare upon road safety and aviation have been considered and assessed as part of Chapter 15: Glint and Glare [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.15] of the Environmental Statement. The effects towards Sywell Aerodrome have also been assessed as part of this report, as detailed in Section 15.8.</p>
	Cyclist	<p>33 General Concerns 106 Responses where cycling was mentioned 131 centred around concerns relating to the safety 146 of cyclists and the nature of the roads 189 surrounding the proposed site; the visual</p>	<p>The Applicant notes that the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, as described in Chapter 8: Landscape and Visual [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.8] of the Environmental Statement, looks to provide landscape mitigation that seeks to enhance the</p>



		205 206 208 216 222	impact of the solar farm; disruption to the existing cycleways and bridle paths; the overall impact on recreation, health, and wellbeing; and the appeal of the area to cyclists from further afield and, therefore, the local economy.	public footpath, permissive footpath and green lane network, which is aimed to benefit the community as a whole as well as tourists, visiting walkers, local residents, ornithologists and cyclists.
	Safety	231 232 233 234 236 240 246 263 268 270 275 290 300 321 323 328 333 337 343 355 364 369 373 397 399 403 409 419 424 446 467 468	<p>Safety was of particular concern, with many respondents believing that the roads around the site are narrow, have poor visibility, and, in places, lack separation between the road and paths for non-motorised transport. It was suggested that it is a challenge for vehicles that use those roads now to overtake cyclists.</p> <p>Some suggested that the glint and glare from the solar panels could dazzle a driver, potentially causing injury or death to a cyclist. Respondents also highlighted that there is a local school in the area, and pupils cycle to school, using the local roads to get there who may be at risk as a result of increased traffic.</p> <p>Mitigation measures and community benefits Respondents suggested that proposed community benefits could be utilised to make improvements to cycle paths in relation with some suggesting the creation extensive cycle network and converting the haul roads built for the construction stage into mixed-use non-vehicular paths.</p>	<p>The effects of glint and glare upon road safety has been considered and assessed as part of Chapter 15: Glint and Glare [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.15] of the Environmental Statement.</p> <p>Construction traffic will be spread out throughout the day, and will be coordinated, where possible, to avoid the network peak hours.</p> <p>Therefore, the effect of construction traffic on the Strategic Road Network (SRN) within the local proximity of the Site will be limited. Construction routes seek to avoid routes that pass near to schools.</p> <p>The Applicant has committed to a number of permissive paths, including a proportion with permissive horse riding and cycling use. These are set out on the Indicative Permissive Paths Plan [EN010170/APP/GH6.4.4.22] and secured through the OPROWPPMP [EN010170/APP/GH7.10], which is secured by requirement in the draft DCO [EN010170/APP/GH3.1].</p> <p>These do not however include the conversion of haul roads, as these are temporary routes solely for Scheme construction. Haul routes are to be removed, and the land restored to its agricultural use (on the Cable Route Corridor).</p>



	Road quality	<p>29 Issues associated with current road condition</p> <p>33 A large proportion of the feedback made</p> <p>82 reference to the suitability of the existing road</p> <p>105 network surrounding the proposed Site.</p> <p>106 Many respondents suggested that the roads</p> <p>121 are very narrow or, in places, single-track, in</p> <p>131 poor conditions (i.e. the presence of</p> <p>146 potholes or lack of footpaths), and are weak or</p> <p>178 prone to flooding.</p> <p>196</p> <p>202 Many expressed concern about impact on the</p> <p>204 local road network from HGVs using these</p> <p>205 roads to and from the proposed Site, especially</p> <p>213 as many bridges over the River Nene had 7.5-</p> <p>217 tonne weight limits in place.</p> <p>222</p> <p>223</p> <p>224 Impact of nearby industry and traffic</p> <p>227 Respondents noted that vehicles from nearby</p> <p>228 industrial estates often leave mud, sand, and</p> <p>229 other aggregates behind, making the road</p> <p>232 surface slippery and dangerous. This was</p> <p>233 identified as a concern relating to vehicles</p> <p>236 travelling to and from the construction Site,</p> <p>237 where building materials and mud may be</p> <p>238 spread across the already hazardous local</p> <p>239 roads.</p> <p>242</p>	<p>Mitigation measures associated with transport and access are summarised in the Transport Assessment (Section 8) of the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (OCTMP)[EN010170/APP/GH7.9], presented as Appendix 13.1 to Chapter 13: Transport and Access [EN010170/APP/GH6.3.13.1] of the Environmental Statement.</p> <p>The majority of weight limits are in place to deter HGV movements using local, minor routes, generally allowing access only. This is suitable for temporary construction traffic.</p> <p>The Outline CTMP [EN010170/APP/GH7.9] will include measures such as wheel cleaning to limit sediment being left on the highway.</p>
	Road degradation	<p>246 Several respondents suggested that the</p> <p>247 additional traffic associated with the proposal</p> <p>251 could exacerbate the issue of road quality,</p> <p>252 causing further degradation due to the size of</p> <p>254 the vehicles and the frequency of the journeys</p> <p>256 required.</p> <p>257</p> <p>258 Several respondents expressed concern about</p> <p>259 the impact on local villages as a result of</p>	<p>It is usual for construction projects to undertake road condition surveys prior to commencement to ensure any defects caused by the development are identified and rectified. The requirement to undertake road condition surveys are outlined in the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (OCTMP) [EN010170/APP/GH7.9].</p>



		263 262 264 265 266 267 268 273 277 278 280 281 282 264 265 266 267 268 273 277 278 280 281 282 284 285 286 287 289 290 292 294 296 297 298 300 308	<p>additional traffic attempting to access the sites proposed. Some suggested that almost all available existing routes would be required to access the proposed site, making it difficult for local communities not to be impacted.</p> <p>Community benefits</p> <p>Respondents suggested that community benefits could be used to make improvements to existing road infrastructure (including traffic management measures), public transport and ongoing maintenance of roads during the construction of the Project.</p> <p>Some suggested an upgrade to Earls Barton Bridge and the use of flood alleviation measures.</p>	<p>Road condition surveys prior to commencement will help with maintenance of roads and ensure that any defects caused by the development are identified and rectified.</p> <p>The requirement to undertake road condition surveys are outlined in the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (OCTMP)[EN010170/APP/GH7.9].</p>
--	--	---	--	---



		309		
		310		
		311		
		312		
		314		
		315		
		316		
		318		
		319		
		320		
		321		
		325		
		326		
		327		
		328		
		330		
		331		
		332		
		333		
		340		
		341		
		342		
		343		
		345		
		346		
		347		
		350		
		351		
		352		
		353		
		354		
		355		
		358		
		359		
		360		
		361		
		362		
		363		



		366		
		367		
		368		
		371		
		372		
		373		
		376		
		381		
		382		
		383		
		384		
		385		
		387		
		388		
		389		
		390		
		392		
		393		
		394		
		395		
		396		
		397		
		398		
		399		
		400		
		403		
		404		
		406		
		408		
		409		
		410		
		416		
		417		
		418		
		419		
		420		
		422		



		423 424 425 426 427 428 432 446 447 454 455 457 458 462 465 467 468		
Connectivity	Equestrians	33 146 189 206 211 233 236 240 245 260 263 268 275 290 297 300 315 317 318	<p>Safety</p> <p>Several respondents expressed concern about the impact of the proposals on the safety of horse riders and on bridleways.</p> <p>Many respondents noted that roads around the proposed new infrastructure are narrow and have poor visibility, which could lead impact the safety of riders.</p> <p>Some noted that due to the narrow roads, it is already difficult for vehicles to overtake horse riders in a safe manner and expressed concern that this could be exacerbated by additional construction traffic, which some noting that this could lead horses becoming 'spooked'.</p>	<p>An outline Construction Traffic Management Plan has been produced to set out measures that will be undertaken to help ensure safety management actions are embedded into the construction phase.</p> <p>Chapter 17: Socio- Economics, Tourism and Recreation [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.17] of the Environmental Statement considers environmental effects arising as a result of the Scheme, in relation to topics including population health, tourism and accessibility and desirability of recreational facilities. This involves considering the amenity value of the existing footpath network.</p> <p>Impacts on equestrian facilities have also explicitly been considered as part of the assessment of impacts on the use and economic performance of recreational sites and facilities The Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (OCTMP)</p>



		323 327 328 329 333 336 337 341 342 343 345 361 364 366 369 373 375 385 390 391 397 398 399 404 406 409 418 419 421 424 425 460 467 468	<p>Impact on bridleways</p> <p>Respondents commented that it's important that bridleways are not impacted by the development, given how they contribute to the health and wellbeing.</p> <p>Respondents expressed concern that access to bridleways could be restricted or removed during both the construction and operation of the Project. Some concern was also raised that bridleways could be permanently altered as a result of the scheme.</p> <p>Some suggested that the Project may be intrusive to both horses and riders as a result of the perceived visual impact and potential glint and glare from the Project.</p>	<p>[EN010170/APP/GH7.9] also considers the safety of road users.</p> <p>Chapter 17: Socio- Economics, Tourism and Recreation [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.17] of the Environmental Statement considers environmental effects arising as a result of the Scheme, in relation to topics including population health, tourism and accessibility and desirability of recreational facilities.</p> <p>This involves considering the amenity value of the existing footpath network. Impacts on equestrian facilities have also explicitly been considered as part of the assessment of impacts on the use and economic performance of recreational sites and facilities</p>
			<p>Impact on nearby equestrian facilities</p> <p>Respondents expressed concern that local equine related businesses, including liverys, riding schools and facilities for children with SEND requirements) could be impacted as a result of the school as a result of the changes to the landscape.</p> <p>Some expressed concern about the impact of the scheme on the local economy as a result of the important role local equine related businesses, which may be affected by the proposals, currently play.</p>	<p>Chapter 17: Socio- Economics, Tourism and Recreation [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.17] of the Environmental Statement considers environmental effects arising as a result of the Scheme, in relation to topics including population health, tourism and accessibility and desirability of recreational facilities. This involves considering the amenity value of the existing footpath network.</p> <p>Impacts on equestrian facilities have also explicitly been considered as part of the assessment of impacts on the use and economic performance of recreational sites and facilities</p>



			<p>Community benefit</p> <p>Respondents suggested that using proposed Community Benefits to improve or create new bridleways, would be value.</p> <p>Some suggested that benefit could be used to create a 15m buffer around all local bridleways. Respondents suggested financial compensation for businesses adversely affected by proposed Project.</p>	<p>The Applicant has committed to a number of permissive paths, including a proportion with permissive horse riding and cycling use. These are set out on the Indicative Permissive Paths Plan [EN010170/APP/GH6.4.4.22] .</p> <p>Furthermore, 15m buffers from the centreline of all PRowWs to onsite infrastructure has been implemented in the Scheme design. These measures are secured through the OPROWPPMP [EN010170/APP/GH7.10], which is secured by requirement in the draft DCO [EN010170/APP/GH3.1].</p> <p>The Applicant would gladly consider Community Benefit Funds to be used for upgrade and enhancing other PRowWs in the surrounding areas, subject to local stakeholder (residents, landowners, parish councils) agreement.</p> <p>The Scheme is not anticipated to have a significant adverse financial effect on any local business or their ability to operate, and as such, is not anticipated to provide any direct financial compensation.</p>

Construction



Issue	Sub- issue	User IDs	Summary	Applicant's Response
Construction Impact	General		Respondents raised concerns about the impact the construction operations will have on the local community. The concerns were related to;	Chapter 17: Socio-economics, Tourism and Recreation [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.17] has assessed the potential impact on the local community during construction.
	Impact of construction on local wildlife	211 222 224 236 237 246 258 259 264 33 266 275 286 299 321 327 329 344 349 106 351 356 364 370 373 376 384 385 391	Wildlife – construction operations of the solar farm will affect habitats of local wildlife such as owls, badgers, skylarks and bats. The construction work would disrupt the movement of deer.	Chapter 9 Ecology and Biodiversity [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.9] of the Environmental Statement considers the potential impacts and mitigations regarding the Scheme and wildlife. Chapter 9: Ecology and Biodiversity [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.9] of the Environmental Statement (ES) considers the potential impacts and mitigations regarding the Scheme and birds and wildlife. The Applicant notes that Appendix 9.13 to Chapter 9: Ecology and Biodiversity [EN010170/APP/GH6.3.9.13] of the Environmental Statement provides the Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Assessment for the Scheme. The assessment shows how the Scheme will likely result in a net percentage gain in Habitat Units of approximately 96%. Construction works have the potential to disturb and temporarily displace wildlife such as deer from the Sites. However, deer roam widely in the landscape and suitable habitat exists in the form of retained fields within the Scheme and land adjacent to the Sites. Moreover, such displacement effects will be temporary. Pollution impacts will be mitigated through



		392 397 403 384 454 457		appropriate pollution control measures, in combination with protective buffer zones, detailed in the OCEMP [EN010170/APP/GH7.1]. The Cable Corridor has been sited to avoid impacts on designated sites for nature. Construction of the solar PV sites likewise avoids all designated sites. Construction activities will follow measures prescribed in the OCEMP to avoid pollution, lighting and noise impacts.
	Traffic and access points	200 33 218 211 222 224 236 237 246	Access points/ routes for the sites are not appropriate and proposes increased traffic to single track roads.	Chapter 13 Transport and Access [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.13] of the Environmental Statement notes that Construction vehicle trips will be coordinated to avoid movement during peak hours. This will be secured through the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN010170/APP/GH7.9], set out at Appendix to the Environmental Statement.
	Impact to residents	258 259 264 33 266 275 286 299 321 327 329 344 349 106 351 356 364 370 373	Two-year construction schedule near residential areas of Mears Ashby would make resident lives 'intolerable'. Part of the construction backs on to residents private gardens which would take away their privacy and increase noise levels significantly. Prolonged construction phase could have an adverse impact on mental health and wellbeing.	The Scheme has been designed to minimise direct impacts on residential properties by offsetting a minimum of 50m between the property boundaries of any residential areas and where solar panels are to be placed. This offset area will also be planted to protect long-term privacy and amenity for residential properties. Specifically to Mears Ashby, the nearest fields to the village in Green Hill D and Green Hill E have been set aside for ecological mitigation, and therefore works on these fields will be minimal, with the aim of reducing impacts on construction and long-term impacts to villagers. The Applicant acknowledges there will always be some impact on mental health from this type of development in the areas most immediately affected and has assessed this in ES.



	Human Health	<p>376 384 385 391 392 397 403 384 454 457 (Q5) 33 298 328 339 366 384 384 395 396 384 426 33 (Q6) 229 236 33 273 311 328 341 351 358 361</p>	<p>The proximity to major accident hazard sites and pipelines necessitates more robust safety assessments and mitigation measures. The increased HGV traffic will inevitably pose a greater risk of accidents on already congested and narrow roads.</p> <p>Respondents felt the mitigation measures proposed were not adequate for the impact the construction will have.</p>	<p>The Applicant confirms that all relevant health risks have been assessed in regard to the Scheme and the authorities' Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategies have been considered and are listed in Appendix 18.1: Human Health Legislation, Policy and Guidance [EN010170/APP/GH6.3.18.1]. The Applicant confirms that consideration of the potential impacts of the Scheme on the mental health and wellbeing of the existing resident population has also been included in the assessment of human health effects, and is committed to ensuring sufficient mitigation measures are put in place to minimise these. These mitigation measures are set out in the OCEMP [EN010170/APP/GH7.1], OOEMP [EN010170/APP/GH7.2], and ODS [EN010170/APP/GH7.3], each of which is secured by Requirement in the draft DCO [EN010170/APP/GH3.1].</p> <p>Chapter 16: Air Quality [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.16] of the Environmental Statement assesses the effects of the Scheme on air quality at nearby sensitive receptors during the construction, operation and decommissioning phases. The aim of this assessment is to predict the levels of air quality pollutants and assess them to determine whether there are any likely significant effects, taking account of relevant policy, guidelines and best practice. Chapter 16: Air Quality of the Environmental Statement assesses the effects of the Scheme on air quality during the construction, operation and decommissioning phases as a result of construction dust emissions, vehicle emissions, non-road mobile machinery emissions and BESS fire emissions. Mitigation measures have been</p>
--	--------------	---	--	---



		364		proposed where required.
	Public Rights of Way	372 380 382 33 384 384 391 395 396 397 409 384 419 424 198	Loss of public rights of way during construction – closure of roads would have a daily impact on residents' lives.	<p>The applicant notes that the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment will look to provide landscape mitigation that seeks to enhance the public right of way (PRoW) network as a community benefit, which is aimed to benefit the community as a whole.</p> <p>The Outline CTMP [EN010170/APP/GH7.9] prepared sets out a range of measures to manage construction traffic. It also commits to liaison with the relevant highway authorities.</p> <p>Prior to commencement, the extent and duration of the closure will be reviewed depending on, construction programming and sequencing, the final design of the scheme and the time of year.</p>
	Cultural Heritage	273 311 321 367 390 397 398 400 409 424 455 220 334	Impact to conservation and heritage sites – construction operation close to conservation sites pose a significant risk of structural damage to the historic buildings.	<p>Chapter 12: Cultural Heritage [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.12] of the Environmental Statement includes an initial assessment of potential effects upon Historic Landscape Character of the Scheme.</p> <p>The assessment identifies and evaluates heritage assets within and surrounding the Study Area and assesses how the Scheme may potentially affect those heritage assets.</p> <p>The Heritage Statement assesses the potential impact of the Scheme on the historic setting of the area.</p>
	Management of the construction phase	351 372 397 408 409 33 424	<p>Proposed working hours – will have detrimental impact on the lives of local residents. It will be long hours of noisy and dusty work, which lead to poor air quality and risks to health and safety.</p> <p>As the construction programme has not yet been defined, respondents raised questions on</p>	<p>Chapter 13 Transport and Access [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.13] of the Environmental Statement notes that Construction vehicle trips will be coordinated to avoid movement during peak hours. This will be secured through the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN010170/APP/GH7.9].</p>



		468 198 33 208 217 220 223 224 227 231 232 233 235 241 245 246 251 33 256 258	the uncertainty of the construction work and how mitigation measures would be controlled.	<p>Mitigation measures associated with transport and access are summarised in the Transport Assessment (Section 8) the Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) [EN010170/APP/GH7.9], presented as Appendix 13.1 to Chapter 13: Transport and Access [EN010170/APP/GH6.3.13.1] of the Environmental Statement.</p> <p>The Construction Traffic Management Plan also considers road users safety and how to reduce traffic impacts from the development.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that the aim is to manage public rights of way rather than close them.</p> <p>Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.14] compares the proposed noise to the existing noise levels in the area as per the appropriate planning policy.</p>
	Impact of construction on nature reserves	263 33 394 395 396 398 408 410 417 421 423 33 428	The construction of the cabling is unacceptably close to nature reserves. Respondents felt the destruction, dust, sediment, vibration and noise will severely impact on the resident wildlife and is likely to damage the internationally significant wetlands and nature reserves.	<p>Construction works have the potential to disturb and temporarily displace wildlife from the Cable Route Corridor. However, such displacement effects will be temporary only, and there is extensive similar land adjacent to the Cable Route Corridor for displaced animals to utilise in the short-term.</p> <p>Pollution impacts, including those on designated sites such as nature reserves, will be mitigated through appropriate pollution control measures, in combination with protective buffer zones, detailed in the OCEMP [EN010170/APP/GH7.1].</p>
	Impact on local infrastructure	430 33 446	Respondents felt the local infrastructure is not sufficient for the proposed construction. The country roads are narrow will struggle to	Mitigation measures associated with transport and access are summarised in the Transport Assessment (Appendix 13.1



		454 33 355 456 457 355 33 178 (Q1 1) 198 199 33 200 202 205 206 208 209 211 33	accommodate heavy loads and HGVs.	[EN010170/APP/GH6.3.13.1]) and the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (OCTMP) [EN010170/APP/GH7.9] of the Environmental Statement. The Construction Traffic Management Plan also considers road users safety and how to reduce traffic impacts from the development.
	Flooding	33 216 217 219 33 222 227 227 231 232 233 235 236 237 241 242	<p>Respondents stated that there are roads in and around villages, including Easton Maudit, which periodically flood. Concern was expressed about the impact this may cause on construction activities, including vehicle access to the sites.</p> <p>Many respondents suggested that the proposed access routes are inappropriate due to their propensity to flood.</p> <p>It was noted that The Flats Road near the A509 roundabout floods regularly and is in poor condition.</p> <p>Respondents also stated that the A45, which</p>	<p>Chapter 10: Hydrology Flood Drainage [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.10] of the Environmental Statement sets out the likely significant environmental effects of the Scheme on the local hydrology during its construction, operation and decommissioning phases.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that a Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy has been produced for each of the solar Sites which demonstrate that flood risk will not be exacerbated as a result of their installation and is likely to provide betterment over the existing surface water regime due to the reintroduction of natural land cover beneath the panels.</p>



		<p>246 is already used by heavy lorries, is often 33 flooded due to an overspill of sand, cement 256 and aggregates.</p> <p>257</p> <p>259 Some expressed concern about the 266 cumulative impact the additional vehicles 268 associated with the Scheme will 269 have on road conditions.</p> <p>285</p> <p>286 Respondents stated that Station Road and its 292 bridge flood regularly, which may cause 294 construction traffic to seek alternative, 297 unsuitable routes to access the sites.</p> <p>298</p> <p>300 It was also noted that a bridge by Grendon 304 Marina, which sits along one of the main 308 routes for construction traffic in the Grendon 310 and Easton Maudit area, regularly floods and 311 will likely be closed during the construction 315 phase.</p> <p>82</p> <p>318 Concern was raised about how the Applicant 319 would protect nearby settlements from the 320 potential impacts of route changes.</p> <p>327</p> <p>329 Others expressed concern about the potential 333 in-direct impacts of construction on flood risk. 334 Concerns included the potential impact of soil 336 compaction and ground consolidation on run- 337 off levels.</p> <p>339</p> <p>341</p> <p>33</p> <p>349</p> <p>106</p> <p>352</p> <p>356</p>	<p>Where additional infrastructure is proposed (e.g. battery sites), additional Drainage Strategies have been produced which indicate how sustainable drainage systems will be provided on-Site to attenuate any increased runoff to greenfield rates.</p>
--	--	--	--



		359 362 364 366 371 372 373 376 146 384 384 386 387 389 392 395 396 397		
Construction Traffic	Impact on biodiversity	362 364 366 371 372 373 376 146 384 384 386 387 389 392 395 396 33 398	<p>Respondents expressed concern about the potential construction impact on arable field margins, neutral grasslands, woodlands, trees and hedgerows.</p> <p>Possible impacts included root compaction and loss of roosting and nesting sites.</p>	<p>Mitigation measures associated with transport and access are summarised in the Transport Assessment (Section 8) the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (OCTMP) [EN010170/APP/GH7.9], presented as Appendix 13.1 to Chapter 13: Transport and Access [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.13] of the Environmental Statement.</p> <p>Furthermore, Chapter 17: Socio-Economics, Tourism and Recreation [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.17] specifically assessed the potential impacts of the Scheme, including HGV traffic, on the recreational use of highway and public rights of way for pedestrians, cyclists, and equestrian users.</p> <p>The Outline Construction Management Plan (OCEMP) [EN010170/APP/GH7.1] provides an</p>



		121 406 410 129 421 423 424 425 33		overview of the anticipated construction activities, identification of potential environmental effects and proposed design and other mitigation measures to prevent or reduce potential adverse environment effects. Monitoring and reporting of effectiveness of mitigation measures are also provided along with links to other complementary plans and procedures. This includes measures to protect soils, habitats, and trees.
	Noise pollution	428 436 33 384 106 455 458	One respondent claimed the noise, dust, vibration, increased traffic will influence properties that boundary access roads or development sites and potentially impact on the foundations and stability of listed buildings, and the wellbeing of those who live there.	Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.14] of the Environmental Statement evaluates the likely significant effects of the Scheme on nearby noise and vibration sensitive receptors during construction, operation and decommissioning.
	Decommissioning	462 464 355 33 466 178 467 468 196 33 205 33 211 33 33	Respondents raised concerns regarding the decommissioning of the scheme and the potential impact on local communities and traffic this would have. Concerns were raised regarding the roads surrounding Mears Ashby which is currently used as a 'rat run' for commuters and school traffic with congestion at the village school during drop off and pick up times.	Please refer to the Outline Decommissioning Statement [EN010170/APP/GH7.3] . The Scheme has been designed to minimise direct impacts on residential properties by offsetting a minimum of 50m between the property boundaries of any residential areas and where solar panels are to be placed. This offset area will also be planted to protect long-term privacy and amenity for residential properties. Specifically to Mears Ashby, the nearest fields to the village in Green Hill D and E have been set aside for ecological mitigation, and therefore works on these fields will be minimal, with the aim of reducing impacts on construction and long-term impacts to villagers.
Construction Traffic	Impact on local community	131 213 33 232	Respondents raised the impact of construction operation on Oakfield – a residential care facility for adults with learning difficulties in Easton Maudit. The construction operations will disrupt horse-riding across fields and prevent	Mitigation measures associated with transport and access are summarised in the Transport Assessment (Section 8) the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (OCTMP) [EN010170/APP/GH7.9] , presented as Appendix



		238 242 255 263 264 265 267 273 289 290 298 33 302 303	their enjoyment of riding.	13.1 to Chapter 13: Transport and Access [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.13] of the Environmental Statement. The Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN010170/APP/GH7.9] also considers road users safety and how to reduce traffic impacts from the development. Easton Way, the town where Oakfield is situated, has been assessed with access points positioned to minimise vehicle movements. The PRoW management plan sets out measures to manage effects on associated routes in the area.
	Impact on landscape	33 304 305 306 306 308 309 310 311 316 318 319 320 321 326 328 333 335 336 339	Concerns were raised about the noise and light pollution during the construction which will be clearly heard/ visible from nearby villages for a two year period. Respondents are concerned the construction working hours of six days a week will cause severe disruption and requested a detailed Traffic Management plan is provided. Overall the respondents expressed the impact on local community and traffic congestion over the construction period is not being fully addressed.	Standard good practice measures will be employed to minimise light spill, including glare during construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning. Lighting will be required during the construction and decommissioning phases for safety reasons but will be temporary in nature and predominately limited to the core working hours. The Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (OCEMP) [EN010170/APP/GH7.1] and the Outline Decommissioning Statement [EN010170/APP/GH7.3] will detail principles to ensure potential impacts are minimised. Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.14] of the Environmental Statement evaluates the likely significant effects of the Scheme on nearby noise and vibration sensitive receptors during construction, operation and decommissioning.
	Disruption to local traffic	341		Construction traffic will be spread out throughout the day, and will be coordinated, where possible, to avoid the network peak hours.



		342 33 33 351 352 358 361 363 367 368 369 371 376 380 382 388 389 392 395 396 397		<p>Therefore, the effect of construction traffic on the Strategic Road Network (SRN) within the local proximity of the Site will be limited.</p> <p>Construction vehicles will avoid travel during the network peak hours where possible. Therefore, deliveries will be scheduled for between 09:30 and 16:30 where possible.</p> <p>Construction worker shifts will be scheduled so that workers are not traveling during the network peak hours of 08:00-09:00 and 17:00-18:00.</p> <p>Mitigation measures associated with transport and access are summarised in the Transport Assessment (Section 8) the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (OCTMP) [EN010170/APP/GH7.9], presented as Appendix 13.1 to Chapter 13: Transport and Access [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.13] of the Environmental Statement.</p>
Construction Traffic	Noise	398 33 384 410 33 416	Increased noise from construction traffic could impact local schools, particularly a junior school, affecting children's concentration and learning.	Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.14] of the Environmental Statement evaluates the likely significant effects of the Scheme on nearby noise and vibration sensitive receptors during construction, operation and decommissioning.
	Health and safety	417 419 423 424 425 428 33 384 355 455	<p>The increase in heavy vehicle traffic poses a heightened risk to pedestrians, cyclists, and horse riders, especially in areas with limited road space.</p> <p>There are concerns about the safety of children walking to school and the impact on the equine community, with livery yards and riding schools along the proposed routes.</p>	The Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN010170/APP/GH7.9] also considers road users safety and how to reduce traffic impacts from the development.



		457 458 466 178 467 33 33 33 33 33 468 33 148 236 370		
	Environmental and infrastructure concerns		<p>The proposed construction site is close to historical landmarks and could affect the village's heritage, like the Grade 1 listed building in Easton Maudit. The use of small bridges and narrow lanes for HGV access increases the risk of road damage and accidents.</p>	<p>Chapter 12: Cultural Heritage [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.12] of the Environmental Statement includes an assessment of potential effects upon Historic Landscape Character of the Scheme.</p> <p>The applicant notes that the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment will look to provide landscape mitigation that seeks to enhance the public right of way (PRoW) network as a community benefit, which is aimed to benefit the community as a whole.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that mitigation measures are summarised in the Transport Assessment, the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN010170/APP/GH7.9], and the Outline Public Rights of Way and Permissive Paths Management Plan [EN010170/APP/GH7.10]</p>



	Health and wellbeing		<p>Health and well- being impact</p> <p>There is worry about the mental health of residents due to the disruption, especially those living near schools. Increased traffic and construction will worsen conditions, impacting both adults and children.</p>	<p>The Applicant confirms that all relevant health risks have been assessed in regard to the Scheme and the authorities' Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategies have been considered and are listed in Appendix 18.1: Legislation, Policy and Guidance [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.18].</p> <p>The Applicant confirms that consideration of the potential impacts of the Scheme on the mental health and wellbeing of the existing resident population has also been included in the assessment of human health effects.</p> <p>The Applicant acknowledges the Scheme will have some impact on the rural character and therefore on rural community identity and has assessed this in ES Chapter 18: Human Health. The Scheme design commits to ensuring mitigation measures are put in place to minimise this impact through offsetting from residential areas, PROWs, roads, and through landscape planting to reduce long-term impacts on the visual character of the areas affected.</p>
	Inadequate road infrastructure		<p>Respondents claimed the narrow country roads are in poor state and not suitable for heavy load-bearing HGVs. Most of the roads are single-track roads, therefore slow moving HGVs would cause major disruptions to the roads.</p> <p>Respondents raised this concern on the following roads:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A43 • A509 - unsuitable for HGV turning due to tight bends in the road. 	<p>Mitigation measures associated with transport and access are summarised in the Transport Assessment (Section 8) the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (OCTMP) [EN010170/APP/GH7.9], presented as Appendix 13.1 to Chapter 13: Transport and Access [EN010170/APP/GH6.3.13.1] of the Environmental Statement.</p> <p>The Construction Traffic Management Plan also considers road users safety and how to reduce traffic impacts from the development.</p>



			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Glebe lane and Highfields lane • Sywell Lane and Earls Barton Road • Country road between Mears Ashby and Earls Barton • Access point to the BESS has tight bends and a “major accident hotspot”. • Roads such as Station Road and the Earls Barton Marina bridge are not capable of supporting the proposed increase in HGV traffic. 	
			<p>The sheer size and duration of construction (2 years) will bring disruptions such as noise, traffic, and the destruction of open countryside. The rural character of the village will be changed forever, impacting residents' mental health and safety.</p>	<p>The Applicant confirms that all relevant health risks have been assessed in regard to the Scheme and the authorities' Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategies have been considered and are listed in Appendix 18.1: Human Health Legislation, Policy and Guidance [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.18].</p> <p>The Applicant confirms that consideration of the potential impacts of the Scheme on the mental health and wellbeing of the existing resident population has also been included in the assessments of human health effects.</p>
	Misleading traffic assessments		<p>The traffic studies used to assess the impact are considered inaccurate. The predicted increase in traffic, especially in villages like Easton Maudit, are likely to be underestimated, leading to an unsuitable construction plan based on incorrect figures by the developer.</p>	<p>Mitigation measures associated with transport and access are summarised in the Transport Assessment (Section 8) the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (OCTMP) [EN010170/APP/GH7.9], presented as Appendix 13.1 to Chapter 13: Transport and Access [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.13] of the Environmental Statement.</p> <p>The Construction Traffic Management Plan also considers road users safety and how to reduce traffic impacts from the development.</p>



	Construction in flood prone areas		The Station Road bridge is prone to flooding, and there are concerns that the construction traffic would further erode its capacity, creating access issues. Alternative routes for HGVs would require passing through Grendon, which is unacceptable due to perceived safety risks.	Chapter 10: Hydrology Flood Drainage [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.10] of the Environmental Statement sets out the likely significant environmental effects of the Scheme on the local hydrology during its construction, operation and decommissioning phases.
	Unsuitable transport links		Many of the roads leading to the proposed site are unsuitable for the increased volume of HGVs, with dangerous bends, restricted roads, and flooding issues. Alternative routes would involve driving through villages, which is unacceptable and could lead to further accidents and road closures.	The Outline CTMP [EN010170/APP/GH7.9] defines construction routes and those which HGV vehicles must take. All operators will be required to conform with the stipulations of the CTMP. The majority of weight limits are in place to deter HGV movements using local, minor routes, generally allowing access only. This is suitable for temporary construction traffic.
	Lack of clarity in information		There is a lack of detailed information on the transport plan, with some proposed access points already discounted. This lack of clarity raises concerns about how the construction traffic will be managed and whether sufficient measures are in place to avoid further disruptions. Future concerns- There are doubts about the decommissioning process and long-term management of the site. The sites may be sold to other companies, possibly leaving the area as an abandoned brownfield site, which could further degrade the environment.	Please refer to Chapter 13: Transport and Access [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.13] for full transport assessment. Please refer to the Outline Decommissioning Statement [EN010170/APP/GH7.3] .

Consultation



Issue	Sub- issue	User IDs	Summary	Applicant's Response
Consultation	Consultation (Positive)	237 225 237 253 259 33 301 318 146 394 396 417 418 436	Consultation Respondents generally found the consultation helpful and well-organised, with positive discussions, particularly regarding vegetation. They felt that the information was presented clearly and competently.	Noted.
	Consultation (Negative)	284 365 390 395 421 467 33 33 310 332 351 367 398 409 424 355 355 105 33 213 217	Many respondents have felt that the consultation process has been inadequate, with maps and key technical details being unreadable or unclear. Respondents claimed there is widespread belief that financial interests have been taking precedence over concerns from members of the community, and some viewed the consultation as a box-ticking exercise. Calls have been made for greater transparency, independent oversight, and genuine engagement with affected communities before the project moves forward. Concerns were raised about the designs failing to align with key environmental principles, with respondents believing that the plans do not adequately consider the impact on wildlife and local views.	The Applicant acknowledges these comments but remains confident in the level of consultation undertaken and information presented throughout the pre-application stage, as described in the Consultation Report [EN010170/APP/GH5.1]. As part of the pre-application consultation, the Applicant hosted five early engagement workshops with local stakeholders and community groups to present early concept and design ideas for the Scheme. During the public consultation, the Applicant held four consultation events and three virtual webinars. In addition, the Applicant presented detailed information on the Scheme through the PEIR, and a Non-Technical Summary online and at free to use Local Information Points as well as telephone and email contact for the project team to aid accessibility and understanding of the Scheme.



		220 33 232 236 238 241 246 247 264 267 273 278 279 280 286 294 297 300 136 33 312 313 314 325 326 327 328 314 332 333 334 337 346 33 365 367 371	<p>Some described the process as a “tick-box exercise,” and suggested that large companies like Statkraft would proceed with their plans regardless of public feedback. There was some sentiment that their input was not truly valued and that the proposals put forward were unsatisfactory and unrealistic.</p> <p>Some respondents commented that an exhibition banner displaying key sites should have been included. The six-week consultation period was viewed as too short for a project of this scale.</p>	<p>Chapter 5: Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.5] of the Environmental Statement (ES) sets out the design evolution of the Scheme, including a justification for the changes to the design.</p>
--	--	--	--	---



		372		
		376		
		382		
		387		
		391		
		397		
		398		
		33		
		409		
		415		
		420		
		424		
		432		
		435		
		415		
		446		
		453		
		355		
		455		
		457		
		463		
		178		
		467		
		206		
		220		
		221		
		232		
		238		
		239		
		245		
		256		
		341		
		349		
		358		
		367		
		371		
		388		



		410 433 446		
Consultation	Materials (Positive)	436 384 384 319 349	Some respondents praised the way in which the information was presented while acknowledging that the scheme is complex and not easy to grasp. Large maps and planting schemes were noted as being well displayed, and the overall presentation of materials was regarded as professional and well executed.	Noted.
	Materials (Negative)	242 264 327 272 284 33 221 246 251 33 266 270 271 272 313 33 280 284 338 106 435 446 33 106	Some respondents felt that the consultation questions were designed to elicit certain responses and misrepresented public opinion. Many found the consultation documents vague and generic. Concerns were raised about the scale and clarity of the plans, respondents said that the consultation materials were too small to allow for proper assessment. Some respondents claimed that there were discrepancies between the maps displayed at the consultation event and those available on the scheme website led to confusion. The complexity of the language used was another issue, with respondents finding the materials difficult to read and understand. The website was described as clunky and difficult to navigate. Some respondents said there was a lack of clearly labelled maps with village names.	The Applicant acknowledges these comments but remains confident in the level of consultation undertaken and the information presented. To improve accessibility, the consultation materials were made available on the Scheme website for respondents to zoom in to the maps and print. Maps such as the Indicative Masterplan were also available in hard copy upon request for those who struggled to read the version on the website.



		281 33 358 371 376 355 355 217 232 241 246 247 254 33 264 278 327 328 341 371 146 396 397 398 409 410 33 371 397 409 419 424 432 355 196 206 220 244	<p>Some respondents suggested the need for a shorter, more accessible document with key highlights, as well as a glossary to aid comprehension.</p> <p>Many also felt that the consultation booklet was unhelpful and that the maps in the booklet were unclear and difficult to see. Respondents felt they needed more information such as the potential ecological impact of the cable route corridor required.</p> <p>Concerns were raised about the expertise of those presenting the materials with some respondents suggesting that project representatives lacked local knowledge. Some respondents criticised the use of images which they felt failed to provide realistic images of the local countryside. The large volume of information was also seen as a barrier to participation, with some respondents noting that it discouraged them from providing feedback.</p> <p>Some concerns were raised that the consultation questions were biased and designed to lead respondents toward favourable answers.</p>	
--	--	---	---	--



		245 294 332 347 106 353 367 384 385 390 395 396 398 400 406 409 384 424 446 376 453 33 106 178 414 33 424 446 33		
Consultation	Events (Positive)	436 237 33 301 146 394 396	Some respondents praised the consultation events for providing a good level of information and knowledge. Respondents also found the staff at events to be informative, professional, and approachable. While representatives were friendly and willing	Noted.



		417 418 312 314 319 323 314 33 396 466	to discuss concerns, they were not always able to answer specific questions.	
	Events (Negative)	264 33 365 390 395 271 105 33 213 217 232 236 241 246 247 264 280 286 294 297 300 313 314 318 326 328	<p>Some respondents remained unconvinced by the consultation process. They felt that their concerns, regarding site access and the feasibility of the proposals, were not addressed.</p> <p>The last consultation event was seen as unconvincing, with doubts about whether the project would be delivered out thoroughly and honestly.</p> <p>Some respondents found the event venues to be too small, overcrowded, noisy, and uncomfortable.</p> <p>Many felt there was not enough time at the consultation events for everyone to have their questions answered.</p> <p>Some said the consultation events were poorly advertised, limiting public awareness and engagement.</p> <p>Others suggested that the amount of information presented at once was overwhelming, making it difficult for attendees</p>	<p>The Applicant notes this concern.</p> <p>During the pre-application, the Applicant consulted the local planning authorities on the SoCC, which set out how the Applicant intended to conduct the public consultation.</p> <p>The Applicant is confident in the consultation and the information presented, which included four- 5-hour consultation events were sufficient opportunities for members of the local community to engage with the public consultation.</p> <p>The Applicant advertised the consultation via digital advertising campaigns in local newspapers. Additionally posters were provided to local village halls to display information on the dates of the consultation period.</p> <p>The Applicant also held webinars for people who could not attend the consultation event, where members of the project team presented the proposals of the Scheme and answered questions from attendees.</p>



		314 334 365 367 371 372 376 397 398 33 409 415 424 432 435 415 446 453 355 457 178 467 232 236 245 33 286 289 328 333 334 336 341 345 347 376 408	<p>to absorb everything.</p> <p>Many suggested that the number of consultation events exhibition events should have been doubled to allow for better engagement.</p> <p>Some respondents felt that the number of events was insufficient, particularly as they were held in venues that were too small and overcrowded.</p> <p>Some mentioned that, given the duration of the events, refreshments would have been appreciated.</p> <p>Some suggested that consultation dates should have been posted on village notice boards to increase awareness.</p> <p>There were also unanswered questions about the project's impact on land use, particularly regarding whether cabling would be designed to withstand grazing animals. Respondents also questioned who would be responsible for land maintenance, including hedgerow upkeep and addressing issues such as fly-tipping.</p> <p>Other concerns included the need for a buffer zone in visible areas, the effectiveness of proposed landscaping measures, and the overall impact of the project on the environment. Respondents also asked about the estimated carbon footprint of the project and the recycling plan for materials.</p>	
--	--	---	---	--



		420 446 178		
Consultation	Lack of information at current stage	286 324 260 427 205 264 270 272 284 359 33 33 411 129 436 313 382 394 280 284 371 33 428 33 349 398 33 33 398 399 400 33 410	<p>Respondents felt that they were not well informed enough to assess whether solar panels were the best technology for this project.</p> <p>Some respondents thought that the consultation materials did not provide sufficient details or how the project would function in practical terms.</p> <p>Some respondents expressed frustration with the lack of finalised plans at this stage.</p> <p>Concerns were raised about the lack of clear information on potential disruptions.</p> <p>Some respondents saw the design principles as positive in theory, but expressed doubt about how they could be implemented.</p> <p>The masterplans were criticised for lacking key details such as access roads, indicative panel layouts, and construction timelines.</p> <p>Respondents expressed concern that the proposal did not include more information on potential BESS infrastructure and some expressed worry regarding the potential fire risks associated with lithium-ion batteries.</p> <p>Respondents highlighted perceived weaknesses in traffic impact assessments, noting that there was no detailed plan for road</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges these and that further details on the Scheme have been provided in the DCO submission.</p> <p>Chapter 5: Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.5] in the Environmental statement will detail how the design of the Scheme has evolved following public consultation. The Outline Battery Storage Safety Management Plan [EN010170/APP/GH7.7] As part of the BSSMP to be prepared prior to construction of the BESS, 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.</p> <p>As part of the DCO submission, An Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN010170/APP/GH7.9] will consider the impact on local traffic during the construction phase and will consider safety of pedestrians and local road users (cyclists and horse-riders).</p>



		446 376 458 373 33 400 418 206 148 224 239 268 280 281 282 304 314 323 328 314 332 33 364 366 371 376 146 384 385 388 389 390 395 396 398 400 408	<p>closures, traffic management, or road surface restoration after construction.</p> <p>Respondents expressed concern that environmental measures were vague and unrealistic, with some respondents stating that improving air quality was an overly optimistic goal without clear details of how this could be implemented.</p> <p>Respondents felt that the consultation process was poorly advertised.</p> <p>Public engagement was seen as lacking, with respondents describing the plans as vague and difficult to assess in terms of visual impact.</p>	
--	--	---	---	--



		409		
		384		
		421		
		424		
		446		
		376		
		453		
		355		
		463		
		466		
		178		
		467		

Flooding



Issue	Sub- issue	User IDs	Summary	Applicant's Response
Flooding	Location of the Scheme	33 106 122 129 133 205 207 211 222 224 227 228 229 232 233 235 236 239 241 242 245 246 247 255 256 259 262 264 265 273 276 277 280	<p>The potential impact of the Scheme on the local area's risk of flooding was a leading concern for respondents.</p> <p>Respondents objected to the location of Scheme due to it being situated on the River Nene flood plain with high flood risk. Recent flooding and strong wind events were cited as drivers of risk.</p>	<p>Chapter 10: Hydrology, Flood Risk and Drainage [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.10] of the Environmental Statement sets out the likely significant environmental effects of the Scheme on the local hydrology during its construction, operation and decommissioning phases.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that a Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy [EN010170/APP/GH6.3.10.1] has been produced for each of the solar Sites which demonstrate that flood risk will not be exacerbated as a result of their installation and is likely to provide betterment over the existing surface water regime due to the reintroduction of natural land cover beneath the panels.</p> <p>Where additional infrastructure is proposed (e.g. battery sites), additional Drainage Strategies have been produced which indicate how sustainable drainage systems will be provided on-Site to attenuate any increased runoff to greenfield rates.</p> <p>Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement assesses the potential environmental effects of the Green Hill Solar Scheme on local hydrology during construction, operation, and decommissioning. This chapter covers two key areas:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Flood Risk – how the scheme has been assessed and designed to remain resilient to flood risk from all sources.



		285		2. Drainage – how surface water runoff from the scheme is managed to ensure no off-site impacts.
		286		
		287		
		290		
		292		Flood Risk Assessment and Mitigation
		294		A Flood Risk Assessment (FRA)
		297		[EN010170/APP/GH6.3.10.1]
		300		has been undertaken to assess flood risk to the
		305		site from all sources, including fluvial,
		314		surface water, and groundwater flooding. The
		318		Environment Agency's Flood Map for Planning
		326		identifies the majority of the site within Flood
		327		Zone 1, with some areas of Green Hill D, E, F,
		328		the BESS, and the Cable Route Search Area
		329		(CRSA) encroaching into Flood Zone 3.
		332		
		333		The sequential approach has been applied to
		334		ensure that infrastructure is located in the
		335		lowest flood risk areas where possible. Where
		336		elements of the scheme are situated within
		338		areas of higher risk, appropriate flood resilience
		341		and mitigation measures have been
		342		incorporated, including:
		343		
		346		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Battery Energy Storage System
		351		(BESS) and substation sites have been
		355		positioned outside the 1% AEP +
		359		Climate Change flood extents where
		361		possible, ensuring long-term resilience.
		367		Where
		369		infrastructure must be located in flood-
		376		prone areas, appropriate electrical
		382		equipment above predicted flood levels
		385		have been incorporated.
		388		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The design ensures that there will be no



		390 391 393 395 396 397 398 400 406 408 409 415 416 417 419 424 434 435 446 454 459 460 467 468		<p>loss of floodplain storage, with any potential floodplain loss assessed and compensated for where necessary, following level-for-level and volume-for-volume principles in accordance with national policy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Access tracks in flood- prone areas will be designed to be permeable or raised where required to avoid obstruction to flood flows-
	Recent level of floods		<p>Respondents also drew attention to recent local and regional flood events. Recent flooding has impacted Lavendon, Mears Ashby, Warrington, Easton Maudit, Bozeat, Yardley Hastings and Grendon.</p> <p>Respondents felt that the Applicant had not adequately responded to the existing local flood risk, and the role the Scheme would potentially play in exacerbating the risk.</p>	<p>Chapter 10: Hydrology, Flood Risk and Drainage [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.10]</p> <p>The Scheme as a whole has been designed to ensure no detriment to flood risk offsite through the proposed embedded and other mitigation measures. Solar panels are installed on raised supports and spaced to allow vegetation to be retained and managed beneath and between the rows. The site will be established with improved grassland and or meadow wildflower mix, which</p>



			<p>Others felt that the Scheme would be responsible for more frequent and severe flood events in the area. The potential increased risk to life was included in many respondent references to flooding.</p>	<p>maintains permeability and supports natural infiltration of rainfall.</p> <p>Research by Cook and McCuen (2013) confirms that solar panels installed over permeable, vegetated ground do not result in increased surface water runoff or flood risk. No hard surfacing is introduced across the panelled areas. The Scheme will not result in an increase of flood risk on-site or in surrounding areas.</p>
	Green Hill A and A.2		<p>Respondents raised concern about the location of Green Hill A, A.2 and B, which fall within the Upper Nene Catchment area. This area is vulnerable to flooding. Respondents emphasised the importance of building sustainable drainage systems, into the design of the Scheme.</p>	<p>Chapter 10: Hydrology, Flood Risk and Drainage [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.10]</p> <p>The scheme as a whole has been designed to ensure no detriment to flood risk offsite through the proposed embedded and other mitigation measures. Solar panels are installed on raised supports and spaced to allow vegetation to be retained and managed beneath and between the rows. The site will be established with improved grassland and or meadow wildflower mix, which maintains permeability and supports natural infiltration of rainfall.</p> <p>Research by Cook and McCuen (2013) confirms that solar panels installed over permeable, vegetated ground do not result in increased surface water runoff or flood risk. No hard surfacing is introduced across the panelled areas.</p> <p>The Hydrology, Flood Risk and Drainage ES Chapter includes Appendices for each Green Hill Site. Each Appendix comprises a Flood Risk</p>



				Assessment and Drainage Strategy which considers SuDS in the design where required, such as on the BESS Site.
	Green Hill B		Some concern was expressed about the impact of the Scheme on the flood risk of Sywell Road next to Green Hill B. It was noted that the road is accident-prone in bad weather, and as a result, additional mitigation would be required to protect the road.	<p>Chapter 10: Hydrology, Flood Risk and Drainage [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.10]</p> <p>The scheme as a whole has been designed to ensure no detriment to flood risk offsite through the proposed embedded and other mitigation measures. At Green Hill B, solar panels are installed on raised supports and spaced to allow vegetation to be retained and managed beneath and between the rows. The site will be established with improved grassland and or meadow wildflower mix, which maintains permeability and supports natural infiltration of rainfall.</p> <p>Research by Cook and McCuen (2013) confirms that solar panels installed over permeable, vegetated ground do not result in increased surface water runoff or flood risk. No hard surfacing is introduced across the panelled areas. The Scheme will not result in an increase of flood risk on-site or in surrounding areas.</p>
	Green Hill D, E, F		<p>Respondents also raised concerns about the development of site infrastructure in Green Hill D, E and F, which cross into Flood Zone 3.</p> <p>There is a perception cultivating a 'hard' landscape here will exacerbate run-off and facilitate increased flooding, particularly close to Mears Ashby and Easton Maudit. A few respondents suggested that site</p>	<p>Chapter 10: Hydrology, Flood Risk and Drainage [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.10]</p> <p>Concerns raised in relation to Green Hill D, E and F, including the potential for increased flood risk affecting Mears Ashby, Easton Maudit and Highfield Road, have been specifically considered in the assessment presented in Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.10] and the supporting</p>



		<p>infrastructure in Green Hill E should be moved away from Mears Ashby to ensure additional run-off did not reach the 'High Likelihood' surface water areas Highfield Road was referenced as a low-lying residential area prone to flash flooding.</p> <p>Respondents raised concerns that any undeveloped areas of the Scheme may increase the speed of run-off and exacerbate local flooding.</p>	<p>Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy [Annex F] [EN010170/APP/GH6.3.10.7]. These parts of the site are not hydrologically distinct from other areas proposed for panel installation. Green Hill D, E and F, like the rest of the panelled areas, are located on greenfield land currently in agricultural use. The proposed solar panels will be installed on raised supports, allowing for the retention and enhancement of vegetation beneath and between rows. This design approach maintains ground permeability and promotes infiltration of rainfall at source. No hard surfacing or regrading is proposed in these areas. The Scheme does not introduce any impermeable surfaces or formal drainage connections that would lead to a net increase in surface water runoff. The layout has been developed to avoid infrastructure within functional floodplain (Flood Zone 3b), and only low-risk infrastructure is located within Flood Zone 3a.</p> <p>Highfield Road, which is known to be a low-lying area susceptible to flash flooding, lies downslope of part of Green Hill E. This area has been assessed using the latest surface water flood risk mapping and site-specific topographic data. As confirmed in the Flood Risk Assessment [Annex F, Section 5.4], the Scheme will not result in any additional surface water runoff or flow pathways towards Highfield Road. There will be no detriment or exacerbation to the existing surface water flood risk in this location.</p>
--	--	--	--



				Research by Cook and McCuen (2013) supports these conclusions, demonstrating that solar panels installed over permeable, vegetated ground do not increase surface water runoff or flood risk. This is consistent with national guidance and industry best practice.
	Green Hill G		<p>Respondents emphasised the impact existing geological conditions in Green Hill G were having on flood risk. It was noted that the ground profile, which is characterised by shallow topsoil, clay and limestone, has a low permeability and directly contributes to the risk of flash flooding in the locality.</p> <p>Residents of Lavendon have also expressed concern about the flood risk of parcel GF13.</p> <p>Respondents have suggested that this land parcel should be used for the creation of natural habitats, including a pond or wetland area, to provide a nature-based solution to flood risk.</p> <p>Some local businesses and residents expressed concern that the increase in flood risk across the Scheme would reduce the effectiveness of their flood protection measures, and increase the risk of flooding across their land and properties.</p> <p>Residents close to Green Hill E expressed concern about the high surface water risk and the potential impact an increased flow of</p>	<p>Chapter 10: Hydrology, Flood Risk and Drainage [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.10]</p> <p>Concerns regarding the potential for low permeability soils in Green Hill G to contribute to flash flooding, particularly towards Lavendon, have been fully considered. As set out in the Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy [Appendix 10.1 and Annex I [EN010170/APP/GH6.3.10.10]], Green Hill G is underlain by clayey and limestone-rich soils, including the Oadby Member and Cornbrash Formation, which have naturally low permeability. These conditions were accounted for in the assessment of surface water risk and runoff.</p> <p>All solar panels will be installed on raised supports, with no ground compaction or hard surfacing beneath. The ground between and beneath the panel rows will remain vegetated with grassland or wildflower meadow, which increases surface roughness and supports natural infiltration. These measures prevent any increase in surface water runoff from the site. Parcel GF13, which lies closest to Lavendon, has been specifically assessed. Although a small part of GF13 is within Flood Zones 2 and 3, no infrastructure is located within these areas.</p>



			rainwater across the land might have on their properties.	<p>Surface water flood risk has been reviewed using LiDAR data and 0.1% annual probability mapping.</p> <p>Flood depths are generally shallow and confined to the land drains. The Scheme will not alter existing flow paths or introduce any discharge toward Lavendon. As a result, there will be no increase in flood risk to nearby properties or reduction in the effectiveness of existing local flood protection measures. Suggestions to use GF13 for habitat creation, including a pond or wetland, have been noted. The Applicant is actively exploring opportunities to incorporate natural flood management measures as part of the detailed design process. While a pond is not currently proposed in this location, biodiversity enhancements such as species-rich grassland, hedgerow planting and buffer zones will be delivered across the site. Further nature-based measures are being considered through the Landscape and Ecological Management Plan. In summary, the Scheme has been designed to ensure no increase in surface water runoff or offsite flood risk, including to receptors in Lavendon.</p>
	<u>Climate change</u>		<p>The impact of climate change on heightened flood risk was generally acknowledged.</p> <p>Respondents expressed concern that the risk of flooding continues to grow in the area. Some questioned the Scheme's ability to adapt to future flood events and unpredictable conditions.</p>	<p>Chapter 7: Climate Change [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.7] of the Environmental Statement presents the findings of the Environmental Impact Assessment concerning the potential impacts of the Scheme on the Climate during the construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning stages.</p> <p>The resilience of the Scheme to physical impacts caused by climate change has also been</p>



				<p>considered.</p> <p>The following points from the Environment Agency (EA) have been fully addressed in the supporting Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategies completed for each Green Hill site. We have aligned the reporting methodology for hydrology, flood risk, and drainage with the approach discussed with the EA. We have applied the EA's recommendation for a 75- year timeframe and used the upper end allowance for the 2080s epoch as a sensitivity test. The potential flood risk from unmodelled Ordinary Watercourses has been assessed with additional analysis, given the limitations in the EA's hydraulic modelling.</p> <p>The Green Hill BESS site has been subject to detailed hydraulic modelling and is designed to be located outside the 1% AEP +CC flood extents, ensuring resilience to future flood events. Floodplain loss has been mitigated with level for-level and volume-for volume compensation. Pollution control measures for BESS fires have been specifically assessed. These points have been fully considered in the Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy.</p> <p>Chapter 7: Climate Change [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.7] of the Environmental Statement assesses the potential impacts of the Green Hill Solar Scheme on climate change during construction, operation, and decommissioning.</p> <p>A 75-year assessment timeframe has been</p>
--	--	--	--	---



				<p>applied, using the upper-end allowance for the 2080s epoch as a sensitivity test. The flood risk assessment considers the potential for increased rainfall intensity and river flows due to climate change, ensuring that mitigation measures remain effective over the scheme's lifetime.</p> <p>The drainage strategy incorporates SuDS measures to manage the potential for increased surface water runoff and flash flooding due to more frequent extreme weather events. These measures ensure that runoff remains at or below existing greenfield rates, preventing increased flood risk both on-site and off-site.</p> <p>The scheme's infrastructure, including the BESS and substations, has been designed to be flood-resilient, with the BESS site positioned outside the 1% AEP + Climate Change flood extents where possible.</p> <p>Where necessary, additional mitigation measures such as raising infrastructure above predicted flood levels and implementing pollution control measures have been included to manage climate-related risks effectively.</p> <p>With these measures in place, the scheme remains fully compliant with national policy and best practice, ensuring long-term flood resilience while preventing any increase in off-site flood risk.</p>
	Cumulative Impact		Some respondents expressed concern about the cumulative impact new infrastructure, including the Scheme and new housing developments, would have on local flood	<p>Chapter 10: Hydrology, Flood Risk and Drainage [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.10]</p> <p>Cumulative impacts on flood risk have been</p>



			risk.	<p>assessed in Chapter 25: Cumulative Effects and Effects Interactions [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.25], based on a short list of committed developments agreed with local authorities.</p> <p>The Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy [Appendix 10.1] [EN010170/APP/GH6.3.10.1] confirms that the Scheme will not increase flood risk on or off site. No hard surfacing is proposed in panelled areas, greenfield runoff rates are maintained, and existing flow paths are preserved. In higher- risk areas, such as the BESS site, detailed hydraulic modelling has been undertaken and floodplain compensation is provided where necessary.</p> <p>National and local flood risk policies require all developments to demonstrate no increase in flood risk elsewhere. As the Scheme complies with this requirement, and other developments are expected to do the same, there is no reasonable mechanism by which cumulative flood risk would arise.</p> <p>The assessment concludes that the Scheme will not contribute to any cumulative increase in flood risk when considered alongside other planned development.</p>
	Social, economic, health and environmental impacts		The social, economic, health and environmental impacts of flood events was emphasised by all respondents.	<p>Chapters 7, 10, 17, 18, and 25 of the Environmental Statement [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.7, GH6.2.10, GH6.2.17, GH6.2.18, GH6.2.25]</p> <p>The potential for flood-related effects on human health, local communities, businesses, access routes and the environment has been</p>



				<p>assessed across several chapters of the Environmental Statement, including potential in-combination effects.</p> <p>Chapter 10 confirms that the Scheme will not increase flood risk on or off site. Each site has been designed to maintain greenfield runoff rates and preserve existing flow paths, with no hard surfacing introduced in panelled areas. In higher-risk locations, such as the BESS site, site-specific hydraulic modelling has been completed and floodplain compensation is provided where required. Pollution prevention measures for BESS infrastructure have also been embedded in the drainage design.</p> <p>Chapter 7: Climate Change [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.7] confirms that the Scheme has been assessed over a 75-year lifetime using the 2080s upper- end climate change allowance. Additional analysis has been undertaken to assess the risk from unmodelled ordinary watercourses, ensuring resilience to future flood scenarios.</p> <p>Chapter 18: Human Health [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.18] considers the potential effects of flooding on local residents, site operatives, users of public rights of way and highways, and other sensitive receptors. It concludes that, with mitigation in place, the Scheme will not give rise to any significant adverse health effects, including from disruption or waterborne contamination.</p> <p>Chapter 17: Socio-Economics, Tourism and</p>
--	--	--	--	--



				<p>Recreation [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.17] considers potential impacts on local infrastructure and land use, including economic activity and recreational access. These are not predicted to be affected by flood risk as a result of the Scheme.</p> <p>Chapter 25: Cumulative Effects [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.25] confirms that no significant in- combination or cumulative effects relating to flood risk and human or environmental receptors are anticipated.</p> <p>The Applicant hopes that the detailed flood risk and climate resilience information submitted with the DCO application will support public understanding and help address concerns about potential impacts on people, infrastructure and the environment.</p>
	Impact to local amenity		<p>A few respondents expressed concern about the impact an increase in flash flooding risk would have on recreational users of the locality, such as walkers, equestrians and cyclists. It was noted that the increased likelihood of flooding would reduce the accessibility and enjoyment of the area.</p> <p>Respondents raised concerns about the impact of more frequent flooding on settlement isolation. Concern about how the emergency services would access the area, including parts of the Scheme, was referenced.</p>	<p>The Applicant is conscious of the social, economic, and health effects of flooding and has ensured consideration of these aspects has driven the flood mitigation measures as prescribed in ES Chapter 10: Hydrology, Flood Risk and Drainage [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.10] and its supporting appendices. With specific consideration of health effects, these are considered further in ES Chapter 18: Human Health [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.18] to ensure that flooding and water resource impacts do not pose a significant risk to either onsite workers or to members of the public such as PROW and highway users, residents, or business users. This also covers potential risks of contamination to waterways and drinking water resources.</p>



				<p>The Applicant also hopes that further detailed information on flood prevention set out at DCO submission will positively contribute to public understanding of the Scheme and go some way to address outstanding concerns regarding potential flood risks from the Scheme.</p>
	<p>Smaller watercourses</p>		<p>Smaller watercourses, such as streams running adjacent to the Scheme, were cited by respondents concerned about the impact of the Scheme on flood risk.</p> <p>Respondents are concerned that an increase insurface water and run-off will put pressure on springs and riverlets in the area.</p> <p>It was noted that some of the smaller watercourses which bisect the Scheme have no associated Flood Zone due to their size. Respondents suggested that additional modelling is undertaken to determine the extent of Flood Zone 2 and 3.</p>	<p>Chapters 7 and 10 of the Environmental Statement [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.7, GH6.2.10]of the Environmental Statement presents the findings of the Environmental Impact Assessment concerning the potential impacts of the Scheme on the Climate during the construction, operation of the Scheme.</p> <p>Concerns raised about the impact of the Scheme on smaller watercourses, including unnamed streams and springs that cross or run adjacent to the Green Hill sites, have been considered in detail in Chapter 10 and the supporting Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy [Appendix 10.1] [EN010170/APP/GH6.3.10.1].</p> <p>Some smaller watercourses do not have mapped Flood Zones due to their scale and the limitations of national datasets. However, additional assessment has been undertaken using topographic data, LiDAR and surface water flood mapping. Where required, site-specific modelling and flow route analysis have been carried out to ensure these features are understood and flood risk is not increased.</p> <p>The BESS site, located near smaller watercourses, has been subject to detailed hydraulic modelling. It is designed to remain outside the 1% AEP flood extent including</p>



				<p>climate change, with level-for-level and volume-for-volume floodplain compensation incorporated. Pollution control measures for potential BESS firewater discharge have also been included.</p> <p>The Scheme has been assessed using the Environment Agency's upper- end climate change allowance for the 2080s, based on a 75-year lifetime, as set out in Chapter 7: Climate Change [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.7]. This ensures smaller watercourses are considered in a precautionary, climate-resilient manner No hard surfacing is proposed in panelled areas, and the Drainage Strategy ensures greenfield runoff rates are retained. There will be no diversion or concentration of flows into minor watercourses, and downstream catchments will not be put under increased pressure.</p> <p>Where the cable route crosses watercourses, the preferred construction method is Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD), avoiding disturbance to channels or floodplains. Where HDD is not feasible, an Environmental Permit or Land Drainage Consent will be obtained to ensure compliance with regulatory requirements and site-specific mitigation.</p> <p>The Scheme has been designed to ensure there is no increase in flood risk associated with smaller or unmodelled watercourses, and that these features are managed in a way that is consistent with EA policy and best practice.</p>
	<u>Further research and evidence required</u>		Respondents felt that the flood risk assessments presented were inadequate,	Chapters 7 and 10 of the Environmental Statement [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.7, GH6.2.10]



		<p>and only considered on-site impacts as opposed to the surrounding areas.</p> <p>It was suggested that the flood categorisation for the area was incorrect and out of date. Respondents suggested the Applicant consult the 2024 Section 19 report.</p> <p>A few respondents suggested that the potential for increased flood risk as a result of the Scheme had not been adequately researched for Green Hill F. It was noted that Green Hill F is a catchment area for Grendon Brook, which is prone to flooding.</p> <p>Some respondents stated that the PEIR inconsistently reports on flood risk.</p> <p>Further localised flood modelling was suggested.</p> <p>Further liaison with Anglian Water was encouraged.</p> <p>Further flood risk assessments and a detailed mitigation strategy was requested by many respondents.</p> <p>A topography plan for the entire Scheme was requested to be added to the PEIR.</p> <p>Respondents suggested that a substantial increase in surface water run-off would mean that the Scheme would fail to comply with North Northamptonshire Councils'</p>	<p>Flood risk from all sources has been assessed in Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement, supported by the Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy [Appendix 10.1 and Annexes A–J] [EN010170/APP/GH6.3.10.1-11]. This includes fluvial, surface water and groundwater flood risk, using the best available datasets and site- specific assessments where required. The assessment considers both on-site and downstream impacts.</p> <p>The Environment Agency's Flood Map for Planning is due for a total update on 25th March, 2025. Fluvial flood risk to the site can be further confirmed following release of the new mapping. Further to this, the Environment Agency updated their surface water flood risk mapping at the end of January. On the whole this has no visible effect on the surface water flood risk to the Green Hill sites.</p> <p>Green Hill F, located within the Grendon Brook catchment, has been assessed using the Environment Agency's 2013 Grendon Brook hydraulic model. Although this model provides limited coverage at this location, it has informed the baseline assessment. The model was supplemented by site-specific calculations using Manning's equation and EA LiDAR data to estimate the extent of the 1% AEP +36% climate change flood event. The results indicate that flood risk is largely confined to the Grendon Brook channel and immediate margins, and that infrastructure is either located outside flow routes</p>
--	--	--	--



		<p>Policy 5 criteria for Water Environment, Resources and Flood Risk Management.</p> <p>Respondents felt that concerns about flood risk and water had not been adequately addressed during the statutory consultation.</p> <p>Further engagement with local communities vulnerable to flooding was encouraged.</p>	<p>or raised above estimated flood levels. Theoretical floodplain displacement from the proposed panel supports was also assessed. A worst-case scenario across Green Hill F indicated a change in flood level of 0.000025 m (0.025 mm), which is negligible and within natural variability.</p> <p>Since the PEIR, the Flood Risk Assessment has been updated to include the latest National Flood Risk Assessment 2 (NaFRA2) surface water flood mapping, published by the Environment Agency in January 2025. The Flood Map for Planning has also been used for fluvial flood risk, and the March 2025 update will be reviewed once published. No changes to the assessment are expected based on consultation with the Environment Agency to date.</p> <p>Topography, surface flow direction and potential downstream impacts have been considered across the wider catchment using EA LiDAR and site-specific survey data. This informed the Drainage Strategy [EN010170/APP/GH6.3.10.1] and placement of infrastructure and SuDS. The Drainage Strategy includes permeable access tracks, retention of grassland and meadow planting beneath solar panels, and site-specific SuDS for infrastructure such as substations and the BESS. Runoff will be managed to greenfield rates or better.</p> <p>The Drainage Strategy is consistent with the principles of Policy 5 of the North Northamptonshire Joint Core Strategy, which</p>
--	--	--	--



				<p>requires that flood risk is not increased and that runoff volumes are controlled. Attenuation has been sized for the 1-in-100- year storm plus 45% climate change uplift, in line with current guidance.</p> <p>Engagement has been undertaken with the Environment Agency and Lead Local Flood Authority. No objections have been raised. Engagement with Anglian Water is now underway, with initial discussions focused on the Water Resources assessment. No adverse impacts on their surface or foul infrastructure have been identified to date.</p> <p>The December 2020 Section 19 Flood Investigation Report for Lavendon has been reviewed and referenced within Annex I of the FRA documentation. There is no reference in the submitted reports to a 2024 Section 19 Report, and this document was not available at the time of assessment. The Applicant will review the 2024 report, once confirmed and received, and continue consultation with the LLFA to confirm whether further updates are required. The Applicant acknowledges concerns raised during consultation regarding flood risk and water. These concerns have informed further modelling, updated datasets, and refinement of the drainage design. Engagement with local communities and statutory bodies will continue throughout the DCO process to ensure flood risk remains appropriately understood and addressed.</p>
	<u>Impact on existing flood risk</u>		Respondents felt that the Scheme would exacerbate the impact of flooding and	Chapter 10: Hydrology, Flood Risk and Drainage [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.10] of



		<p>cause damage to the rural and cultural landscape.</p> <p>However, a respondent alternatively stated that flooding was less of a concern, due to their village being located on higher ground with good drainage systems.</p>	<p>the Environmental Statement sets out the likely significant environmental effects of the Scheme on the local hydrology during its construction, operation and decommissioning phases.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that a Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy [EN010170/APP/GH6.3.10.1] has been produced for each of the solar Sites which demonstrate that flood risk will not be exacerbated as a result of their installation and is likely to provide betterment over the existing surface water regime due to the reintroduction of natural land cover beneath the panels.</p> <p>Where additional infrastructure is proposed (e.g. battery sites), additional Drainage Strategies have been produced which indicate how sustainable drainage systems will be provided on-Site to attenuate any increased runoff to greenfield rates.</p> <p>Chapter 10: Hydrology, Flood Risk and Drainage [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.10] of the Environmental Statement presents the findings of the Environmental Impact Assessment concerning the potential impacts of the Scheme on the Climate during the construction, operation and maintenance and decommissioning stages.</p> <p>The resilience of the Scheme to physical impacts caused by climate change has also been considered.</p> <p>The following points from the Environment Agency (EA) have been fully addressed in the supporting Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage</p>
--	--	---	--



			<p>Strategies completed for each Green Hill site. We have aligned the reporting methodology for hydrology, flood risk, and drainage with the approach discussed with the EA. We have applied the EA's recommendation for a 75- year timeframe and used the upper end allowance for the 2080s epoch as a sensitivity test. The potential flood risk from unmodelled Ordinary Watercourses has been assessed with additional analysis, given the limitations in the EA's hydraulic modelling. The BESS site has been subject to detailed hydraulic modelling and is designed to be located outside the 1% AEP +CC flood extents, ensuring resilience to future flood events. Floodplain loss has been mitigated with level for-level and volume-for volume compensation. Pollution control measures for BESS fires have been specifically assessed. These points have been fully considered in the Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy</p> <p>The Applicant is conscious of the social, economic, and health effects of flooding and has ensured consideration of these aspects has driven the flood mitigation measures as prescribed in ES Chapter 10: Hydrology, Flood Risk and Drainage [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.10] and its supporting appendices. With specific consideration of health effects, these are considered further in ES Chapter 18: Human Health [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.18] to ensure that flooding and water resource impacts do not pose a significant risk to either onsite workers or to members of the public such as PROW and highway users, residents, or business users.</p>
--	--	--	--



				<p>This also covers potential risks of contamination to waterways and drinking water resources.</p> <p>The Applicant also hopes that further detailed information on flood prevention set out at DCO submission will positively contribute to public understanding of the Scheme and go some way to address outstanding concerns regarding potential flood risks from the Scheme.</p> <p>Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement assesses the potential environmental effects of the Green Hill Solar Scheme on local hydrology during construction, operation, and decommissioning. This chapter covers two key areas:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Flood Risk – how the scheme has been assessed and designed to remain resilient to flood risk from all sources.2. Drainage – how surface water runoff from the scheme is managed to ensure no off-site impacts. <p>Flood Risk Assessment and Mitigation</p> <p>A Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) [EN010170/APP/GH6.3.10.1] has been undertaken to assess flood risk to the site from all sources, including fluvial, surface water, and groundwater flooding. The Environment Agency's Flood Map for Planning identifies the majority of the site within Flood Zone 1, with some areas of Green Hill D, E, F, the BESS, and the Cable Route Search Area (CRSA) encroaching into Flood Zone 3.</p> <p>The sequential approach has been applied to</p>
--	--	--	--	--



				<p>ensure that infrastructure is located in the lowest flood risk areas where possible. Where elements of the scheme are situated within areas of higher risk, appropriate flood resilience and mitigation measures have been incorporated, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) and substation sites have been positioned outside the 1% AEP + Climate Change flood extents where possible, ensuring long-term resilience. Where• infrastructure must be located in flood-prone areas, appropriate mitigation measures such as raising electrical equipment above predicted flood levels have been incorporated.• The design ensures that there will be no loss of floodplain storage, with any potential floodplain loss assessed and compensated for where necessary, following level-for-level and volume-for-volume principles in accordance with national policy.• Access tracks in flood- prone areas will be designed to be permeable or raised where required to avoid obstruction to flood flows. <p>Surface Water Drainage and Runoff Management</p> <p>A site-wide Drainage Strategy has been developed to ensure that surface water runoff is appropriately managed and does not increase flood risk off- site.</p>
--	--	--	--	---



				<p>Paneled Areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Research by Cook and McCuen (2013) has demonstrated that solar panels do not significantly alter runoff generation when vegetative cover is maintained.• The transition from agricultural fields to solar-paneled areas with semi-improved grassland or meadow planting will not increase runoff.• The reintroduction of natural land cover beneath the panels will improve infiltration, reduce soil erosion, and ensure that surface water flows remain consistent with pre- development conditions. <p>Other Infrastructure (BESS, Substations, and Access Routes):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The BESS and substations will be covered by site-specific drainage strategies to ensure that runoff is attenuated to greenfield rates.• The drainage strategy for the BESS includes SuDS measures such as bunding, attenuation, and pollution control to prevent increased surface water runoff or contamination risks.• Access tracks will be designed using permeable materials to maintain infiltration and prevent increased runoff. <p>These measures ensure that surface water</p>
--	--	--	--	---



				<p>runoff from all aspects of the site is effectively managed, with no increase in surface water runoff rates or volumes, and therefore will not have a detrimental impact over the existing situation.</p> <p>The Drainage Strategy and FRA [EN010170/APP/GH6.3.10.1] will continue to be reviewed in consultation with the Environment Agency and the Lead Local Flood Authority to ensure that mitigation measures remain aligned with best practices and regulatory requirements.</p> <p>Cable Route and Watercourse Crossings</p> <p>The Scheme includes a Cable Route Search Area, which will cross various watercourses. The design and construction of these crossings have been considered to avoid adverse impacts on flood risk and hydrology.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Where feasible, Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD) will be used to install cables beneath watercourses, minimising disturbance and avoiding potential flood risk impacts.• Where HDD is not the preferred option, the appropriate Environmental Permit or Land Drainage Consent will be sought to ensure compliance with regulatory requirements and to implement alternative mitigation measures as necessary. <p>These measures ensure that the installation of the cable route does not contribute to increased flood risk or adversely impact existing drainage</p>
--	--	--	--	--



				<p>networks.</p> <p>Chapter 7: Climate Change and Long-Term Resilience</p> <p>Chapter 7: Climate Change [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.7] of the Environmental Statement assesses the potential impacts of the Green Hill Solar Scheme on climate change during construction, operation, and decommissioning.</p> <p>A 75-year assessment timeframe has been applied, using the upper-end allowance for the 2080s epoch as a sensitivity test. The flood risk assessment considers the potential for increased rainfall intensity and river flows due to climate change, ensuring that mitigation measures remain effective over the scheme’s lifetime.</p> <p>The drainage strategy [EN010170/APP/GH6.3.10.1] incorporates SuDS measures to manage the potential for increased surface water runoff and flash flooding due to more frequent extreme weather events. These measures ensure that runoff remains at or below existing greenfield rates, preventing increased flood risk both on-site and off-site.</p> <p>The Scheme’s infrastructure, including the BESS and substations, has been designed to be flood-resilient, with the BESS site positioned outside the 1% AEP + Climate Change flood extents where possible.</p> <p>Where necessary, additional mitigation measures such as raising infrastructure above</p>
--	--	--	--	---



				<p>predicted flood levels and implementing pollution control measures have been included to manage climate-related risks effectively. With these measures in place, the scheme remains fully compliant with national policy and best practice, ensuring long-term flood resilience while preventing any increase in off- site flood risk.</p>
	<p><u>Site infrastructure – general flood risk</u></p>		<p>Respondents raised concerns about the impact of Scheme infrastructure on run-off levels.</p> <p>There was a general perception that infrastructure, particularly solar panels and below ground mounts, would increase soil erosion and run-off, thereby increasing local flood risk.</p> <p>Respondents generally felt that solar panels would directly increase run-off. Changes to the topography and permeability of the land due to the Scheme was also expected to increase the area’s susceptibility to flooding. The change from ploughed fields to compacted ground was a leading concern.</p> <p>Many respondents suggested that Scheme infrastructure, including solar panels, would introduce more impermeable surfaces and increase flood risk, particularly on low lying areas of the sites.</p> <p>A few respondents suggested that site infrastructure, particularly the BESS, should</p>	<p>Chapter 10: Hydrology, Flood Risk and Drainage [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.10] of the Environmental Statement assesses the potential environmental effects of the Green Hill Solar Scheme on local hydrology during construction, operation, and decommissioning. This chapter covers two key areas:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Flood Risk – how the scheme has been assessed and designed to remain resilient to flood risk from all sources. 2. Drainage – how surface water runoff from the scheme is managed to ensure no off-site impacts. <p>Flood Risk Assessment and Mitigation</p> <p>A Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) [EN010170/APP/GH6.3.10.1] has been undertaken to assess flood risk to the site from all sources, including fluvial, surface water, and groundwater flooding. The Environment Agency’s Flood Map for Planning identifies the majority of the site within Flood Zone 1, with some areas of Green Hill D, E, F, the BESS, and the Cable Route Search Area (CRSA) encroaching into Flood Zone 3.</p>



		<p>be raised off the ground or removed in places, to mitigate the likelihood of a flood event during its operation.</p> <p>Others suggested that development should be directed to Flood Zone 1 as a priority.</p>	<p>The sequential approach has been applied to ensure that infrastructure is located in the lowest flood risk areas where possible. Where elements of the scheme are situated within areas of higher risk, appropriate flood resilience and mitigation measures have been incorporated, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) and substation sites have been positioned outside the 1% AEP + Climate Change flood extents where possible, ensuring long-term resilience. Where infrastructure must be located in flood-prone areas, appropriate mitigation measures such as raising electrical equipment above predicted flood levels have been incorporated.• The design ensures that there will be no loss of floodplain storage, with any potential floodplain loss assessed and compensated for where necessary, following level-for-level and volume-for-volume principles in accordance with national policy.• Access tracks in flood- prone areas will be designed to be permeable or raised where required to avoid obstruction to flood flows. <p>Surface Water Drainage and Runoff Management</p> <p>A site-wide Drainage Strategy has been developed to ensure that surface water runoff is appropriately managed and does not increase flood risk off- site.</p>
--	--	--	---



				<p>Paneled Areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Research by Cook and McCuen (2013) has demonstrated that solar panels do not significantly alter runoff generation when vegetative cover is maintained.• The transition from agricultural fields to solar-paneled areas with semi-improved grassland or meadow planting will not increase runoff.• The reintroduction of natural land cover beneath the panels will improve infiltration, reduce soil erosion, and ensure that surface water flows remain consistent with pre- development conditions. <p>Other Infrastructure (BESS, Substations, and Access Routes):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The BESS and substations will be covered by site-specific drainage strategies to ensure that runoff is attenuated to greenfield rates.• The drainage strategy for the BESS includes SuDS measures such as bunding, attenuation, and pollution control to prevent increased surface water runoff or contamination risks.• Access tracks will be designed using permeable materials to maintain infiltration and prevent increased runoff. <p>These measures ensure that surface water runoff from all aspects of the site is effectively</p>
--	--	--	--	--



				<p>managed, with no increase in surface water runoff rates or volumes, and therefore will not have a detrimental impact over the existing situation.</p> <p>The Drainage Strategy and FRA [EN010170/APP/GH6.3.10.1] will continue to be reviewed in consultation with the Environment Agency and the Lead Local Flood Authority to ensure that mitigation measures remain aligned with best practices and regulatory requirements.</p> <p>Cable Route and Watercourse Crossings</p> <p>The scheme includes a Cable Route Search Area, which will cross various watercourses. The design and construction of these crossings have been considered to avoid adverse impacts on flood risk and hydrology.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Where feasible, Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD) will be used to install cables beneath watercourses, minimising disturbance and avoiding potential flood risk impacts.• Where HDD is not the preferred option, the appropriate Environmental Permit or Land Drainage Consent will be sought to ensure compliance with regulatory requirements and to implement alternative mitigation measures as necessary. <p>These measures ensure that the installation of the cable route does not contribute to increased flood risk or adversely impact existing drainage</p>
--	--	--	--	---



				<p>networks.</p> <p>Chapter 7: Climate Change and Long-Term Resilience</p> <p>Chapter 7: Climate Change [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.7] of the Environmental Statement assesses the potential impacts of the Green Hill Solar Scheme on climate change during construction, operation, and decommissioning.</p> <p>A 75-year assessment timeframe has been applied, using the upper-end allowance for the 2080s epoch as a sensitivity test. The flood risk assessment considers the potential for increased rainfall intensity and river flows due to climate change, ensuring that mitigation measures remain effective over the scheme’s lifetime.</p> <p>The drainage strategy incorporates SuDS measures to manage the potential for increased surface water runoff and flash flooding due to more frequent extreme weather events. These measures ensure that runoff remains at or below existing greenfield rates, preventing increased flood risk both on-site and off-site.</p> <p>The scheme’s infrastructure, including the BESS and substations, has been designed to be flood-resilient, with the BESS site positioned outside the 1% AEP + Climate Change flood extents where possible. Where necessary, additional mitigation measures such as raising infrastructure above predicted flood levels and implementing pollution control measures have been included to manage climate-related risks</p>
--	--	--	--	--



				<p>effectively.</p> <p>With these measures in place, the scheme remains fully compliant with national policy and best practice, ensuring long-term flood resilience while preventing any increase in off- site flood risk.</p>
	<p><u>Site infrastructure – BESS / Substation flood risk</u></p>		<p>The location of the potential Battery Energy Storage Systems (BESS) site within Flood Zone 3 was a leading cause of concern for respondents.</p> <p>Respondents stated that the proposed Green Hill BESS site had recently experienced severe flooding with no access to control the flow.</p> <p>Respondents raised concern about the role flooding may have in exacerbating the impact of BESS and the Substation on the local environment. High levels of concern was expressed towards the possibility of flood water and run-off becoming contaminated with toxic metals and pollutants from the BESS and Substation area. Respondents were particularly concerned about the contamination of Whiston Brook, Grendon Brook and the River Nene.</p> <p>Many respondents expressed concern about the possibility of toxic and contaminated run-off and flood water leaching into local watercourses, wetlands and the water table.</p>	<p>Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.10]</p> <p>Flood risk to the BESS and substation sites has been assessed in detail in Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement, supported by the Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy [Appendix 10.1 and Annexes [EN010170/APP/GH6.3.10.1]].</p> <p>Site-specific hydraulic modelling of Grendon Brook, the River Nene, and the adjacent ordinary watercourse has been undertaken. The model confirms that the BESS site lies outside the 1% AEP + climate change flood extent, with flood depths remaining below 0.3 m in all relevant events. Equipment at the BESS will be raised by a minimum of 150 mm above ground level to ensure resilience.</p> <p>Surface water runoff from the BESS and substation areas is managed through a site-specific Drainage Strategy, which includes lined, permeable SuDS features with gravel subbase. These systems attenuate flows to greenfield rates and provide containment in the event of firewater or other pollutants entering the drainage system.</p>



		<p>The impact of contaminated flood waters on Special Protection Areas (SPAs), Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and Ramsar sites was another priority concern for respondents.</p> <p>Concern was also raised about the impact of increased speeds of run-off from BESS into local watercourses.</p> <p>Many respondents felt that further flood and fire mitigation measures, including sufficiently high attenuation bunds, were required for the BESS site. Some expressed concern about how the emergency services might access a BESS fire during a flood event.</p>	<p>The OBSSMP [EN010170/APP/GH7.7] outlines the additional pollution prevention measures in place for the BESS. This includes sealed drainage infrastructure and self-actuating valves to isolate the drainage system during a fire. Any potentially contaminated surface water or firewater will be contained within the BESS compound and either removed offsite or tested and treated prior to discharge. These measures are intended to prevent uncontrolled release to nearby watercourses, including Grendon Brook, Whiston Brook, or the River Nene.</p> <p>Access tracks will be designed to maintain connectivity during a flood event where required, supporting operational safety and emergency response. The overall design of the BESS and substation areas has been informed by consultation with the Environment Agency and Lead Local Flood Authority. These stakeholders have not raised objections to the proposed measures.</p> <p>The Applicant considers that, with the mitigation and drainage measures proposed, the BESS and substation infrastructure is appropriately flood resilient and does not increase flood risk or pollution risk off site.</p>
	<u>Cable Corridor flood risk</u>	<p>Respondents felt there was a lack of information given about the construction and operation of the Cable Corridor which includes some areas of Flood Zone 2 and 3 around the River Nene. Whilst it was acknowledged that the Cable Corridor is yet to be finalised, further information was requested about how the Applicant would</p>	<p>Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.10]</p> <p>The proposed cable route will be confirmed at detailed design stage and is currently defined as a Cable Route Search Area. This area intersects several mapped Flood Zones, including areas of</p>



			<p>consider flood risk and watercourse crossings.</p>	<p>Flood Zone 2 and Flood Zone 3 associated with the River Nene and its tributaries. These areas have been assessed in the Flood Risk Assessment and are also considered in Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement.</p> <p>The approach to flood risk and watercourse crossings along the cable route follows a clear mitigation hierarchy. Where feasible, Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD) will be used to install cables beneath watercourses, avoiding open cut crossings and minimising disturbance to existing watercourses and their floodplains. This method avoids surface disruption and reduces any impact on flood conveyance or fluvial flood risk.</p> <p>Where HDD is not suitable, watercourse crossings will require either an Environmental Permit from the Environment Agency or Land Drainage Consent from the Lead Local Flood Authority. These consents will ensure that detailed construction methods, flood risk impacts, and any necessary mitigation measures are appropriately secured at the consenting stage.</p> <p>Any sections of the cable route within Flood Zones 2 or 3 will be designed so that cable installation does not increase land levels or obstruct floodplain function. No above- ground permanent infrastructure is proposed in these areas, and construction access will be managed to avoid increasing flood risk during works.</p> <p>The approach to the cable corridor has been</p>
--	--	--	---	--



				developed in consultation with the Environment Agency and Lead Local Flood Authority. The Applicant considers that, with the proposed approach and future permitting requirements, the cable route will not increase flood risk and can be delivered in accordance with relevant policy and regulatory requirements.
	<u>Removal of natural mitigation - impact on flood risk</u>		<p>Many respondents felt that any removals of natural flood mitigators over the lifespan of the Scheme, including absorbent ground, woodlands, trees and hedgerows, would impact natural drainage routes and exacerbate local flood risk.</p> <p>The inclusion of ecological buffers, including grasslands and wildflowers, was encouraged. However, many respondents did not feel confident that planting would be resilient enough to mitigate against future severe flooding events.</p>	<p>Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.10]</p> <p>Flood risk from all sources has been assessed in Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement and the supporting Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy [Appendix 10.1 and Annexes] [EN010170/APP/GH6.3.10.1]. The assessment confirms that the Scheme will not increase flood risk either on site or downstream and that surface water runoff will be effectively managed. Panelled areas will not be hard surfaced. Solar panels will be mounted on raised supports with wide row spacing to allow vegetation to be retained and re-established beneath and between arrays. The existing land use will transition from arable agriculture to semi-improved grassland and meadow planting, which improves soil condition and supports infiltration.</p> <p>The Drainage Strategy confirms that the reintroduction of managed grassland beneath panels will help reduce runoff and soil erosion. Runoff from these areas will remain at greenfield rates. This is supported by research including Cook and McCuen (2013), which shows that runoff from solar developments on permeable, vegetated soils is no greater than from pre-development conditions.</p>



				<p>Vegetation management will be carried out using mechanical methods. The use of light equipment and seasonal operations (e.g. scarifying and reseeded) will restore soil structure, prevent compaction, and maintain infiltration capacity throughout the operational lifespan of the Scheme. These methods are detailed in the submitted Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy Cover Report and form part of the embedded approach to runoff control.</p> <p>Where trees or hedgerows are removed to facilitate infrastructure or access, appropriate compensatory planting is included. This includes species-rich grassland, wildflower margins and hedgerow restoration around field edges, which provide ecological and hydrological benefits. Setbacks from watercourses are incorporated to preserve overland flow paths and reduce erosion.</p> <p>Overall, the approach to surface water drainage is based on maintaining and enhancing natural infiltration rather than engineered drainage. These measures have been reviewed by the Environment Agency and Lead Local Flood Authority, with no objections raised. The Scheme has therefore been designed to ensure that flood risk is not increased and that natural mitigation functions are retained and strengthened where possible.</p>
	<u>Importance of building flood mitigation into the Scheme</u>		Respondents stated that mitigation measures included focused on protecting the Scheme's infrastructure as opposed to local environments and communities. As a	Chapters 7 and 10 of the Environmental Statement [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.7, GH6.2.10] Flood risk across the Scheme has been



		<p>result, respondents requested additional flood mitigation and defence measures.</p> <p>Respondents felt that the Scheme should build additional mitigation measures into the design to protect both the local community and environment from flood events and its cumulative impact.</p> <p>Some felt that local councils had not sufficiently addressed recent flood events. As a result, the need for new mitigation measures was emphasised across the feedback.</p> <p>It was suggested that retention ponds should be included in mitigation measures to protect local communities.</p> <p>A minimum 9 metres buffer was recommended to be maintained between the edge of the watercourse for maintenance access.</p> <p>Many respondents emphasised the importance of the Applicant supporting local communities to establish effective flood protection and mitigation measures, to help protect residential properties. Current mitigation measures proposed by the Applicant were deemed insufficient compared to the flood risk.</p> <p>Some suggested that the Applicant could fund local drainage improvements as part of community benefit and social value initiatives.</p>	<p>assessed from all sources, including fluvial, surface water and groundwater. The submitted Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy [Appendix 10.1 and supporting Annexes] [EN010170/APP/GH6.3.10.1] confirm that flood risk will not be increased either on-site or off-site. This is supported by site-specific analysis using EA flood mapping (including NaFRA2), hydraulic modelling where appropriate, and topographical and soil data.</p> <p>Attenuation features such as basins or ponds are not proposed within the solar panelled areas. These areas are not being hard surfaced and will remain vegetated throughout operation. The layout has been designed so that solar panels are installed on raised supports, allowing grassland and wildflower planting to be established and maintained beneath and between rows. This design maintains permeability and supports natural infiltration of rainfall.</p> <p>The land use in these areas will transition from intensively managed arable farmland to semi-improved grassland or meadow. This change is expected to improve soil condition and reduce surface compaction, which in turn supports slower overland flow and enhances infiltration. The Drainage Strategy confirms that surface water runoff rates from these areas will remain at or below greenfield levels.</p> <p>This approach is supported by research including Cook and McCuen (2013), which found</p>
--	--	--	---



		<p>It was noted that proposed water and flood mitigation measures may not be adequate in preventing the exacerbation of flood risk for residential properties at Lower End, particularly along Blackmile Lane, Grendon.</p> <p>Others expressed concern about the possibility of increased flood risk for properties in the Yardley Hastings flood catchment area. Respondents felt that the Scheme would result in a more frequent and severe risk.</p> <p>Respondents expressed concern about the resilience of existing ditches and drainage systems. It was noted that the systems regularly block.</p> <p>Some respondents noted that the existing urban drainage systems in the locality are unable to cope with flooding events. It was suggested that the Applicant demonstrate how any changes to the flow of water would be mitigated without impacting residential properties.</p> <p>Extensive sustainable drainage systems were encouraged.</p>	<p>that solar panel installations over permeable, vegetated soils do not result in increased surface water runoff. Based on this evidence, attenuation is not required for panelled areas, and no engineered drainage features such as ponds or basins are proposed.</p> <p>The Scheme is a time-limited development. Land beneath the panels is expected to revert to agricultural use following decommissioning. Installing permanent attenuation infrastructure would require excavation, potential import of stone or lining materials, and long-term modification of the soil structure. This would not only conflict with the intended reversion to agricultural use, but also run counter to the Scheme's wider climate objectives by introducing unnecessary embodied carbon and land disturbance. The current drainage approach is considered proportionate and aligned with the low-impact design intent of the Scheme.</p> <p>Where impermeable infrastructure is proposed, such as the BESS and substations, additional measures have been included. These features are included in response to the nature and scale of the infrastructure proposed in those areas, where runoff volumes are more concentrated and pollution containment is a priority. SuDS features for these elements include lined gravel subbases, bunding, attenuation and isolation valves to ensure surface water is controlled and does not pose a pollution or flood risk.</p> <p>Drainage is managed at source across the</p>
--	--	--	--



				<p>Scheme. No discharge is proposed to existing public sewer networks or watercourses, and exceedance routes are embedded into the layout to manage extreme events. Buffer zones of 8–9 metres have been retained around watercourses to allow maintenance access and preserve flow routes in accordance with Environment Agency and LLFA guidance.</p> <p>Specific areas raised during consultation, including Lower End and Blackmile Lane in Grendon, and the Yardley Hastings catchment, have been reviewed. No infrastructure is proposed within these areas.</p> <p>The cable route, which may pass nearby, will use trenchless methods such as Horizontal Directional Drilling where required to avoid disruption to watercourses and surface flows. The scheme will not alter existing flood flow paths in these areas.</p> <p>The Scheme has been assessed over a 75-year lifetime using the upper-end climate change allowances for the 2080s epoch. Drainage measures are designed to remain effective under increased rainfall and runoff scenarios. No objections have been raised by the Environment Agency or LLFA regarding the proposed drainage approach, and the Scheme is considered compliant with applicable national and local policy.</p> <p>The Applicant acknowledges feedback encouraging wider community flood resilience</p>
--	--	--	--	---



				measures. While this lies outside the scope of the FRA and Drainage Strategy, options for delivering wider social value are being explored separately through the community benefit process.
--	--	--	--	--

Property



Issue	Sub- issue	User IDs	Summary	Applicant's Response
Property	Proximity to residential property	467 391 33 347 421 435 204 205 220 223 228 235 236 246 260 261 264 271 277 280 292 33 313 315 319 320 326 327 332 340 467 333 389 33 251	<p>Impact on local communities: Respondents felt that the solar farm would degrade the landscape and quality of life for local residents, especially in rural areas like Mears Ashby.</p> <p>Some expressed concern that the construction of the project would result in increased noise pollution, dust and a loss of privacy for residents of Mears Ashby during the construction of the Project.</p> <p>Many felt that the construction phase could lead to disruption, including increased traffic, noise, and blight, all of which would diminish the area's appeal, impact property values, and reduce tourism.</p> <p>Concern was raised that property values could be reduced as a result of the projects visual and environmental impact.</p>	<p>Impact on local communities: Chapter 8: Landscape and Visual Impact [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.8] of the Environmental Statement set outs the ways in which the Applicant has considered the potential visual and landscape impacts to local residents and visitors, potential effects associated with the panels and associated infrastructure.</p> <p>The Applicant has set out a series of mitigation and landscape management improvements to improve biodiversity in its Landscape and Ecological Management Plan [EN010170/APP/GH7.4].</p> <p>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 results of these assessments, along with proposed mitigations, are presented in the Environmental Statement. The Applicant does not consider that the Scheme will result in any loss of value to neighbouring properties. However, in the event that such losses can be demonstrated then compensation may be payable in circumstances where properties meet the criteria set out in legislation relating to compulsory acquisition and the compensation code.</p> <p>Chapter 16: Air Quality [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.16] of the Environmental Statement assesses the effects of the Scheme on air quality during the construction, operation and decommissioning</p>



		397 398 33 409 424 198 33 231 240 242 247 33 257 258 261 280 290 33 332 337 106 33 358 359 365 376 397 409 33 422 424 33 33 455 233 240 271		<p>phases as a result of construction dust emissions, vehicle emissions, non-road mobile machinery emissions and BESS fire emissions. Mitigation measures have been proposed where required.</p> <p>Chapter 14 (Noise and Vibration [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.14]) of the Environmental Statement evaluates the likely significant effects of the Scheme on nearby noise and vibration sensitive receptors during construction, operation and decommissioning. The aim of this assessment is to predict the levels of noise and assess these against relevant guidelines, and where necessary, identify any required mitigation measures to make effects acceptable.</p> <p>Chapter 13 (Transport and Access [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.13]) of the Environmental Statement details the Applicant's consideration of the effects of increased traffic levels during construction.</p> <p>Chapter 18: Human Health [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.18] of the Environmental Statement assesses the potential for physical and mental health impacts from the construction phase (including noise and vibration, air quality, and highway safety) against human health receptors in the most likely affected areas around the Scheme. Where required, the Applicant is committed to providing suitable mitigation measures, secured through the DCO documentation.</p>
--	--	---	--	---



		275		
		280		
		318		
		337		
		457		
		33		
		280		
		33		
		33		
		233		
		260		
		341		
		398		
		424		
		264		
		300		
		337		
		33		
		33		
		468		
		33		
		233		
		264		
		286		
		301		
		321		
		33		
		367		
		368		
		467		
		264		
		292		
		304		
		341		
		358		
		382		
		409		



		424 457 454 355 410 241 33 457		
			<p><u>Impact on Property and Land:</u> Many residents expressed concern about the proposed cable route cutting through private property and gardens, causing significant disruption.</p> <p>Some felt plans were vague and communication with landowners was lacking which created confusion and distress.</p> <p>Concern was expressed that construction could affect drainage systems, farming land, and wildlife habitats.</p> <p>Some expressed concern that properties may be devalued due to proximity to the proposed cable corridor.</p> <p>Some expressed safety concerns about the proximity of the Project to residential areas, including from noise pollution, glare and possible fire from the battery storage technology.</p> <p>Many felt that proximity of the proposed panels to local villages and roads would affect both residents and wildlife, with requests for the project to be relocated away</p>	<p><u>Impact on Property and Land:</u> The Applicant notes this comment and acknowledges this as a concern for residents within the Cable Route Search Area for PEIR.</p> <p>Throughout the pre- application stage the Applicant has sought to consult with local residents likely to be directly affected by the cable routing. Those who are affected by the Cable Route Corridor submitted for the DCO application have been directly engaged with to agree Heads of Terms and to ensure disruption to private gardens and access to property are minimised.</p> <p>Assessment of potential effects to neighbouring properties, along with proposed mitigations, are presented in the Environmental Statement. The Applicant is confident that there is no empirical evidence to suggest that solar farms adversely affect nearby property values.</p> <p>Chapter 15 (Glint and Glare [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.15]) of the Environmental Statement describes the baseline conditions, glint and glare guidelines, methodology, and the potential glint and glare effects from the Scheme with regard to road safety, residential amenity, aviation activity,</p>



		<p>from these areas.</p> <p>There is frustration over the lack of tangible benefits for the local community.</p> <p>Respondents questioned whether there will be any improvements to infrastructure or services and expresses concern that the project would primarily benefit the project promoters rather than the local population.</p> <p>Some highlighted that proximity of the proposals to existing pipelines, which they felt increased the risk of accidents.</p> <p>The proposed Battery Fire Safety Management Plan is insufficient to address fire risks, especially considering potential flooding in the area.</p> <p>Concern was expressed that increased traffic from construction, including HGV vehicles, could damage local infrastructure, disrupt daily life, and raise road safety concerns, particularly near schools and residential areas.</p> <p>Some suggested that the proposed access roads, such as the narrow Station Road bridge, may not be suitable for heavy traffic and flood risks could prevent emergency access.</p> <p>Respondents expressed fear a loss of their rural way of life, with some expressing concerns about the psychological and physical impact on communities.</p>	<p>and infrastructure.</p> <p>The Applicant has proposed embedded mitigation in the form of vegetation to significantly reduce the visibility of the reflective area to receptors such as residential properties and roads. Once implemented, this mitigation will obstruct the reflecting panels from view, resulting in any effects being considered low or negligible.</p> <p>Outline Battery Storage Safety Management Plan [EN010170/APP/GH7.7] As part of the BSSMP to be prepared prior to construction of the BESS, 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.</p> <p>Chapter 18: Human Health [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.18] in the Environmental Statement also states the Northamptonshire Fire and Rescue Service are to be consulted as statutory consultees to the Scheme, and as targeted consultees for the agreement of the Outline Battery Fire Safety Management Plan. NFRS can advise on the fire safety protocols and concerns regarding fire safety risks.</p> <p>Chapter 13 (Transport and Access [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.13]) of the Environmental Statement details the Applicant's consideration of the effects of increased traffic levels during construction. The Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN010170/APP/GH7.9] also considers road users</p>
--	--	--	--



			<p>Some suggested that the project, particularly due to its size, could harm both the local community and mental health of those living nearby.</p> <p>Concern was expressed that the Project may significantly affect visual amenity for nearby residential properties, with concerns about reduced property values.</p> <p>Some noted that proposed mitigation measures, such as removing panels from sensitive areas and planting hedgerows, may take years to have an effect and may not fully mitigate the impact, particularly on heritage sites and cultural assets.</p> <p>Long-term visual impacts are expected to remain significant despite proposed mitigation strategies.</p> <p>Residential properties like New Lodge Farm, Tithe Farm, and others along Highfield Road will face significant visual disturbance during construction and operation, affecting residents' quality of life and possibly reducing the value of these properties.</p> <p>The solar farm will disrupt views from various residential areas, particularly Grendon and Easton Maudit, with both villages surrounded by panels on multiple sides.</p> <p>It was suggested that Easton Maudit with its historic church, will suffer irreversible visual damage as a result of the Project.</p>	<p>safety and how to reduce traffic impacts from the development. The Applicant notes that mitigation measures are summarised in the Transport Assessment , the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN010170/APP/GH7.9]</p> <p>Mitigation measures associated with transport and access are summarised in the Transport Assessment (Section 8) the Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) [EN010170/APP/GH7.9], presented as Appendix 13.1 to Chapter 13: Transport and Access [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.13] of the Environmental Statement.</p> <p>Station Road is already used by HGV traffic associated with the aggregates site. the CTMP will control traffic to occur outside of peak periods. If flooded, the CTMP would have a mechanism so that routes could be temporarily changed with the approval of the local authorities for instances such as flooding/accidents etc on the HGV route or the site operation will need to halt.</p> <p>The assessment of socio- economic effects [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.17] acknowledges that benefits (such as economic effects and energy production) from the Scheme are likely to be felt over a wider area than the immediate adverse impacts. Efforts to provide specific benefits in locally impacted communities are set out in the OSSCEP [EN010170/APP/GH7.8] (for employment and economy), in the OLEMP [EN010170/APP/GH7.4] (for landscape and ecological improvements) and through the provision of community benefits such as new permissive access routes, or through the community benefit fund (separate to the DCO</p>
--	--	--	---	---



			<p>process).</p> <p>The Applicant acknowledges there will always be some impact on community feeling towards changes in their surroundings, and the potential this has for mental health impacts from this type of development. The areas most immediately affected have assessed in ES Chapter 18: Human Health [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.18], and the Applicant is committed to ensuring sufficient mitigation measures are put in place to minimise these.</p> <p>Chapter 8: Landscape and Visual Impact [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.8] of the Environmental Statement set outs the ways in which the Applicant has considered the potential visual and landscape impacts to local residents and visitors, potential effects associated with the panels and associated infrastructure. The Applicant notes that the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.8] considers both the landscape and visual effects of the Scheme independently to ensure both the impacts and effects on the fabric of the landscape are taken into account as well as the views and visibility.</p> <p>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 results of these assessments, along with proposed mitigations, are presented in the Environmental Statement.</p>
--	--	--	--



				<p>Chapter 12: Cultural Heritage [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.12], supported by the heritage statement in Appendix 12.1, considers impacts on heritage assets including in direct impacts (i.e. to their setting). The assessment includes assets within Easton Maudit and Grendon such as Listed Churches.</p> <p>Proposed screening will largely see the enhancement of hedgerow and while impacts may occur for the Scheme duration they would be reversed following decommissioning.</p> <p>Chapter 14 (Noise and Vibration [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.14]) of the Environmental Statement evaluates the likely significant effects of the Scheme on nearby noise and vibration sensitive receptors during construction, operation and decommissioning. The aim of this assessment is to predict the levels of noise and assess these against relevant guidelines, and where necessary, identify any required mitigation measures to make effects acceptable.</p> <p>Easton Maudit Protected Wildflower verges are on the outside edge of existing hedgerows, with all proposed hedgerow planting being on the inside edge.</p> <p>Both fields have been allocated for ecological mitigation rather than PV solar, and no new accesses through Grendon Verge Protected Wildflower verges or Easton Maudit Protected Wildflower verges are required. Thus, these features will not be impacted.</p>
	Financial compensation in relation to property	136 33	Local Economy and Farming	Local Economy and Farming



	Impact on property values	220 33 297 301 304 376 422 414 258 280 33 365 376 33 419 33 33 280 33 223 317 390 397 418 33 106 220 33 278 301 335 370 414 431 421 290	<p>Impact on Farmers: The proposal will disrupt local farming, especially for tenant farmers who may lose their land. The loss of income without compensation was highlighted as a major concern.</p> <p>Concerns about the conversion of productive farmland into the development, with some suggestion that little consideration has been given to the long-term consequences on local agriculture.</p> <p>Questions were raised about how farmers and property owners will be compensated for lost land, income, and property devaluation.</p>	<p>A full assessment of the economic impact of the Scheme is presented in Chapter 17: Socio-Economics, Tourism and Recreation [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.17] of the Environmental Statement, with quantitative results for numbers of employment opportunities anticipated vs. agricultural sector jobs lost. Whilst agricultural tenancies on land included within the Scheme are expected to be terminated, these are limited and owner-occupied landholdings are expected to be able to continue in agricultural practice where they have other land still available for agricultural uses, supported by the ground rent from the solar development on land they own.</p> <p>A farming report [EN010170/APP/GH7.27] has also been prepared and sets out an assessment of the potential effects of the proposed works on agricultural land, soils and farm businesses.</p> <p>Landowners of the Sites will be paid annual rent for the lifetime of the Scheme.</p> <p>Landowners within the Cable Route Corridor will be paid an industry standard rate for the cable agreement and will be compensated for any lost income, including any crop loss in line with the Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors (RICS) guidance and statutory legislation.</p> <p>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 results of these assessments, along</p>
--	---------------------------	--	---	---



		370 258 343 468 467 355 370 264 265 290 33 390 398 426 241 301 468		<p>with proposed mitigations, are presented in the Environmental Statement.</p> <p>The Applicant does not consider that the Scheme will result in any loss of value to neighbouring properties. However, in the event that such losses can be demonstrated then compensation may be payable in circumstances where properties meet the criteria set out in legislation relating to compulsory acquisition and the compensation code.</p>
			<p><u>Community and Social Impact</u></p> <p>Lack of Community Benefits: Some suggested that the proposal does not seem to offer any tangible benefits to local communities, such as new services, infrastructure, or compensation for disruption.</p>	<p>The Applicant is proposing a community benefit fund and is considering a range of options for how this could operate. We will consider all feedback as we develop plans for the fund.</p> <p>The assessment of socio- economic effects acknowledges that benefits (such as economic effects and energy production) from the Scheme are likely to be felt over a wider area than the immediate adverse impacts. Efforts to provide specific benefits in locally impacted communities are set out in the OSSCEP [EN010170/APP/GH7.8] (for employment and economy), in the OLEMP [EN010170/APP/GH7.4] (for landscape and ecological improvements) and through the provision of community benefits such as new permissive access routes, or through the community benefit fund (separate to the DCO</p>



				process).
			<p><u>Economic Concerns</u></p> <p>Corporate Profits vs. Local Losses: Some criticism was raised that the project will benefit distant corporations and shareholders, while local communities face the negative consequences without receiving any direct financial benefits.</p>	<p>The Applicant is proposing a community benefit fund and is considering a range of options for how this could operate. We will consider all feedback as we develop plans for the fund.</p> <p>The Applicant is committed to ensuring that communities benefit from the Scheme including by receiving direct funding to important causes in the local area. During the development of the proposals for Green Hill Solar Farm, we have consulted on community benefits and, based on feedback, will determine how best to distribute funding. The Scheme will also generate business rates that are paid to the local authority.</p> <p>The assessment of socio- economic effects acknowledges that benefits (such as economic effects and energy production) from the Scheme are likely to be felt over a wider area than the immediate adverse impacts. Efforts to provide specific benefits in locally impacted communities are set out in the OSSCEP [EN010170/APP/GH7.8] (for employment and economy), in the OLEMP [EN010170/APP/GH7.4] (for landscape and ecological improvements) and through the provision of community benefits such as new permissive access routes, or through the community benefit fund (separate to the DCO process).</p>
			<p><u>Government Subsidies</u></p> <p>One respondent claimed the cost of renewable energy through taxes and government subsidies, both when the energy is produced</p>	<p>The most recent round of CfD allocations will pay solar farms £50.07/MWh, compared to an average wholesale price in the last year of over £80/MWh.</p>



			and when it's not, is a burden on tax payers.	<p>The Contracts for Difference (CfD) scheme is the main form of government financial support that is available to solar farms, as well as other forms of generation. The scheme supports investment in new electricity generation and is intended to secure a reliable, secure supply at affordable prices.</p> <p>It is delivered through the government-owned Low Carbon Contracts Company (LCCC), which signs 15- year contracts with generators. These contracts secure the long-term price of electricity exported from a generator by setting a fixed price for its electricity: if the wholesale price drops below the agreed price the LCCC would make up the difference; however, if the wholesale price of electricity exceeds the agreed price the generator would return the difference to the LCCC. The most recent assessment of the CFD scheme found that it would save consumers around £9 billion up to 2050. It is yet to be decided whether Green Hill Solar Farm will make an application to the CfD scheme.</p>
			<p><u>Property Value and Compensation</u></p> <p>There's no assessment of the potential impact on property values, nor any offer of compensation for affected homeowners.</p>	<p>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 results of these assessments, along with proposed mitigations, are presented in the Environmental Statement.</p> <p>The Applicant does not consider that the Scheme will result in any loss of value to neighbouring properties. However, in the event that such losses</p>



				can be demonstrated then compensation may be payable in circumstances where properties meet the criteria set out in legislation relating to compulsory acquisition and the compensation code.
			<u>Financial Guarantee for Decommissioning</u>	
			To ensure proper decommissioning and land restoration, a financial bond equivalent to the cost of restoration should be established by the developers.	The Applicant has committed to putting a decommissioning bond or insurance policy in place to ensure that decommissioning costs will be fully covered.
	Loss of amenity/ enjoyment	255 33 220 229 299 33 361 370 146 326 33 33 236 251 328 397 398 409 446 355 240 358 398 233 260 341	National and local ecological sites, including ancient woodlands, rare species habitats, and watercourses, are at risk of habitat fragmentation, pollution, and significant degradation due to construction activities. Some felt that the proposed mitigation measures to protect ecological sites, like buffer zones, are inadequate.	The mitigation associated with the Scheme is included in the Landscape and Ecology Mitigation & Enhancement Measures forming part of the LVIA with details shown on Figures 8.16.1 to 8.16.10 and Section 8.8 of Chapter 8: Landscape and Visual Impact [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.8] of the Environmental Statement. The landscape measures also include the preparation of a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) [EN010170/APP/GH7.4] which prescribes how the landscape and ecology mitigation measures identified and proposed would be implemented and managed to ensure the effectiveness and certainty in achieving the objectives. Chapter 16: Air Quality[EN010170/APP/GH6.2.16] of the Environmental Statement assesses the effects of the Scheme on air quality during the onstruction, operation and decommissioning phases as a result of construction dust emissions, vehicle emissions, non-road mobile machinery emissions and BESS fire emissions. Mitigation measures have been proposed where required.



		398 424 233 284 33 323 355 211 33 220 236 256 260 263 267 268 303 305 314 341 397 398 409 424 33		
			<u>Landscape and Visual Impact</u> The development will negatively impact the visual amenity of nearby properties, including those on Highfield Road, New Lodge Farm, and Tithe Farm. The report claims mitigation measures (e.g. non-intrusive concrete feet) are premature and may not effectively reduce visual impacts.	Landscape and Visual Impact: Chapter 8: Landscape and Visual Impact [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.8] of the Environmental Statement set outs the ways in which the Applicant has considered the potential visual and landscape impacts to local residents and visitors, potential effects associated with the panels and associated Infrastructure. The Applicant notes that the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) considers both the



				<p>landscape and visual effects of the Scheme independently to ensure both the impacts and effects on the fabric of the landscape are taken into account as well as the views and visibility.</p> <p>As outlined within the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, a total of 64 viewpoints covering the Study Areas for the Sites and the Cable Route Corridor have been included within the assessment including: VP14 - Highfield Road; and VP6 - Tithe Farm car park. A series of receptors have been considered within the landscape and visual impact assessment including Highfield Lodge, New Lodge Farm and Tithe Farm.</p> <p>During construction a significant effect has been assessed for Highfield Lodge and New Lodge Farm. However, by operation year 15, a non significant effect has been assessed as mitigation planting would have established and screened views of the site.</p>
			<p>Long-term visual effects on heritage sites (e.g., Grendon Hall, Easton Maudit Church) are expected to persist despite proposed mitigation, including planting, which will take decades to mature.</p> <p>Respondents drew attention to the fact that any significant changes to the quality and character of local watercourses would directly impact the accessibility and enjoyment of recreational activities and local wildlife.</p>	<p>Chapter 12: Cultural Heritage [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.12], supported by the heritage statement in Appendix 12.1, considers impacts on heritage assets including in directs impacts (i.e. to their setting). The assessment includes assets within Easton Maudit and Grendon such as Listed Churches.</p> <p>Proposed screening will largely see the enhancement of hedgerow and while impacts may occur for the Scheme duration they would be reversed following decommissioning.</p>
			<p><u>Equine and Tourism Impact</u></p> <p>Respondents felt the solar farm's glare would</p>	<p>Equine and Tourism Impact: Chapter 15 Glint and</p>



			<p>disturb horses, and the project would negatively affect local tourism, heritage, and cultural assets, including public rights of way.</p>	<p>Glare [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.15] considers potential impacts towards horses, reflections towards users along bridleways could be experienced under certain conditions (typically when the sun is low in the sky beyond the panels).</p> <p>It is noted that existing and proposed screening will likely obstruct the line of sight between the solar panels and users of bridleways. 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.</p> <p>Accordingly, glint and glare effects from the Scheme are predicted to be not significant.</p> <p>Chapter 17 (Socio- Economics and Tourism and Recreation [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.17]) of the Environmental Statement considers environmental effects arising as a result of the Scheme, in relation to tourism and accessibility and desirability of recreational facilities. This includes a detailed assessment of the likely impacts from the Scheme on the tourism economy and on individual tourism and recreation facilities and assets in the Scheme's Zone of Influence. This will account for potential impacts on public rights of way, impacts on tourism and visitor destinations, potential impact equestrian businesses and any other on tourism-dependent businesses in the areas immediately impacted by the Scheme. The OCEMP [EN010170/APP/GH7.1] commits to targeted construction mitigation measures such as offsets from roads, PROWs, and selective removal of parts of the Scheme to ensure impacts on the landscape</p>
--	--	--	--	---



			as an assets for the desirability of the area for tourism is minimised.
--	--	--	---

Land Parcels



Issue	Sub- issue	User IDs	Summary	Applicant's Response
Green Hill A.2	Socio-economic, Tourism and Recreation	(Q4) 313 146 387 33 (Q6) 236 328 33 (Q11) 313	NOTE - The respondents provided their feedback on Green Hill A and Green Hill A.2 - and therefore the concerns for Green Hill A.2 are similar to that for Green Hill A. Respondents commented that recreational activities, including horse-riding, bird-watching, walking, dog- walking, jogging and cycling, that take place on Newland Lane and Green Lane and expressed concern that they may be impacted.	Chapter 17: Socio-Economics, Tourism and Recreation [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.17] of the Environmental Statement considers environmental effects arising as a result of the Scheme, in relation to topics including population health, tourism and accessibility and desirability of recreational facilities. This involves considering the amenity value of the existing footpath network.
	Transport and Access	33 178 (Q12) 313 323 371 372 394 423 446 467	Respondents raised concerns about the proximity of the A43 road to Green Hill A.2 and associated turning movements at the access point A.2-1. Respondents claimed that the additional traffic and manoeuvres by HGVs will cause 'considerable problems'	Both sites utilise existing access points. The access points will be widened to ensure HGVs are able to access each site. Swept path vehicle analysis has been undertaken to ensure the movements of larger vehicles. Visibility splays have been tested in accordance with recorded vehicle speeds. Broughton Road is accessed via a roundabout from the A43 with a right turn lane in place at Kettering Road. The majority of construction traffic movements will take place outside of highway peak hours.
	Ecology and Biodiversity	468 (Q13) 446 355 (Q20) 355 (EA) (230) (543) (584) (591)	Concern was expressed by some that the impact of the proposal on local biodiversity would threaten the already declining rates of Skylarks and nesting of birds such as Red Kites and other wildlife such as Golden Plover and geese.	Chapter 9: Ecology and Biodiversity [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.9] of the Environmental Statement considers the potential impacts and mitigation measures regarding the Scheme and wildlife. This has been informed through detailed breeding and wintering bird surveys. Impacts on ground-nesting birds have been mitigated through retention of undeveloped fields, managed to enhance the number of birds they can support. In combination with creation of



		(Q4) 273 318 321 349 146 387 (Q9) 321 349 384 423 (Q11)		enhanced foraging habitat, adverse effects have been reduced. Impacts on wintering golden plover and lapwing associated with the Upper Nene Valley Gravel Pits SPA have been considered separately, and mitigation provided for losses of Functionally Linked Land. Provisions have been made for other species to persist in the operational Scheme and the majority of species will benefit from the enhanced habitats provided by the Scheme, relative to the baseline arable habitats.
Green Hill B	Transport and Access	298 318 321 349 384 384 33 (Q12) 321 352 446 178 467 (Q4) 196 222 237 246 273 313 319 146 387	<p>Respondents raised concerns regarding the impact the scheme will have on the local community in Holcot, a small traditional village.</p> <p>Impact on local traffic – Respondents claimed construction traffic will further congest the roads surrounding the village of Holcot and Mawsley. Some noted that the A14, A43, A508 and A45 already become busy during peak travel times</p> <p>The access routes meet on Brixworth Road as it goes across Pitsford Reservoir and into Holcot. This causeway is already a very busy 'rat-run' route for all manner of vehicles short-cutting between the A43 and the A14/A508.</p> <p>The movement of HGV vehicles on narrow, village roads will lead to traffic. Respondents also claimed HGVs will ignore the weight limit set on village roads, which will cause significant issues.</p>	<p>Mitigation measures associated with transport and access are summarised in the Transport Assessment (Section 8) the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (OCTMP)[EN010170/APP/GH7.9], presented as Appendix 13.1 to Chapter 13: Transport and Access [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.13] of the Environmental Statement a 'gridlock' point, with narrow village streets and right angle cross roads, which make turning of HGV vehicles impossible.</p> <p>The village has minimal lighting, therefore, HGV movements in the village during rush hour will be a risk to pedestrian safety and buildings</p>



		408 33 384 457	The roads in Holcot/ A43 are not suitable for construction traffic. The centre of Holcot is	
Green Hill C	Socio-Economics, Tourism and Recreation	(Q11) 308 319 384 384 389 384 33 (Q12) 356 358 389 33 33 467 33 468 (Q13) 389 (Q16) 410 Q4) 196 204	<p>Based on the feedback received during the public consultation, several concerns regarding the impact the scheme would have in the local villages of Mears Ashby and Earls Barton.</p> <p>Potential health implications residing within proximity to solar panels and infrastructure on adults and children – impacting their general well- being.</p> <p>Respondents felt Mears Ashby would be disproportionately affected by the scheme, as it proposes to encircle 60% of the village, taking good arable land out of use.</p> <p>One respondent felt the site CF9 proposed for BESS (Battery Energy and Storage Scheme) is a concern due to its proximity to Hardwick Lodge Meadow SSSI, Sywell Aerodrome and the farm complex and residence at Wood Lodge.</p>	<p>Chapter 17: Socio-Economics, Tourism and Recreation [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.17] of the Environmental Statement considers environmental effects arising as a result of the Scheme, in relation to topics including population health, tourism and accessibility and desirability of recreational facilities. This involves considering the amenity value of the existing footpath network.</p> <p>An ecological desk study has identified all designated sites for ecology and biodiversity, such as SSSIs, within set radii of the Scheme. Chapter 9 of the Environmental Statement: Ecology & Biodiversity [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.9] characterizes impacts and mitigation accordingly.</p>
	Noise and Vibration	222 237 246 273 313 146 387 402 403	Impact on school admissions in Mears Ashby during the construction phase – outdoor classrooms are affected by construction noise and dust pollution.	<p>Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.14] of the Environmental Statement evaluates the likely significant effects of the Scheme on nearby noise and vibration sensitive receptors during construction, operation and decommissioning. The typical noise level across the overall duration of the construction programme will likely be limited to a low-magnitude impact. Notwithstanding this,</p>



		408 33		where possible reasonable steps will be taken to mitigate and minimise the effects.
	Landscape and Visual	384 454 457 (Q7) 361 33 178 (Q11) 240 308 319 384 384 384	The visual impact of Green Hill C will destroy the visual amenity around Sywell Aerodrome and the locality, particularly for those travelling along the Wellingborough Road in Sywell. One respondent requested that the proceeds from the lease of the land should be split between the landowner and the local village as the villagers will be most impacted by the scheme	The LVIA has undertaken an assessment of the significance of the effect [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.8] to the landscape and visual receptors at four stages of the Scheme (construction, operation (Year 1), operation (Year 15), and decommissioning). This process systematically and transparently assesses the likely significant effects of the Scheme taking into account of embedded mitigation at each of the four stages. The Applicant is proposing a community benefit fund and is considering a range of options for how this could operate. We will consider all feedback as we develop plans for the fund.
	Ecology and Biodiversity	(Q12) 356 358 33 33 467 (Q13) 308	Impact on local wildlife that nest very close to Green Hill C and the use of HGVs on country roads will further exacerbate the impact. One respondent requested the use of the existing local roads into Mears Ashby - Highfield Road, Wilby Road, Glebe Road and Earls Barton Road should be prohibited.	Impacts on ground-nesting birds have been mitigated through retention of undeveloped fields, managed to enhance the number of birds they can support. In combination with creation of enhanced foraging habitat, adverse effects have been reduced.
	Glint and Glare	(Q15) 308 Q4) 196 204 222 231 237 246 313 353 146 387	The glint and glare will affect living spaces and impact driving around the country roads and onto nearby residential properties. Access to Green Hill C, located at the brow of a hill on a bend, will make the junction dangerous as it currently has poor visibility.	Chapter 15: Glint and Glare [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.15] of the Environmental Statement describes the baseline conditions, glint and glare guidelines, methodology, and the potential glint and glare effects from the Scheme with regard to road safety, residential amenity, aviation activity, and railway operations and infrastructure. Public Rights of Way have not been included within the assessment because they are receptors with “low” sensitivity which means the receptor is tolerant to change without detrimental effect and is of low or local importance.



Green Hill D	Landscape and Visual Impact	395 402 403 408 33 384 454 457 178 (Q5) 395 396 457 (Q6) 395 396 454 (Q7) 237 246 33 454 33 178 (Q11) 240	<p>Feedback regarding Green Hill D was provided with feedback to Green Hills C and E.</p> <p>This section provides a summary of the respondents' concerns related to Green Hill D. Respondents felt the Scheme would cause a material detriment to the local landscape and residents from Hill Top Farm.</p> <p>The scheme would visually impact the local Sywell Country Park, from the changes in the countryside and surrounding farmland.</p> <p>Green Hill D in Mears Ashby currently serves as a small green belt between Wellingborough and Northampton, and it would be regarded as unfortunate if it was negatively impacted by the scheme.</p> <p>The loss of green space in Green Hill D would impact the well-being of local residents and those travelling through the area.</p>	<p>Chapter 8: Landscape and Visual Impact [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.8] of the Environmental Statement set outs the ways in which the Applicant has considered the potential visual and landscape impacts to local residents and visitors, potential effects associated with the panels and associated infrastructure. The Applicant notes that the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) considers both the landscape and visual effects of the Scheme independently to ensure both the impacts and effects on the fabric of the landscape are taken into account as well as the views and visibility to Sywell Country Park.</p> <p>The Applicant acknowledges the Scheme will have some impact on the rural character and therefore on rural community identity and has assessed this in ES Chapter 18: Human Health [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.18]. The Scheme design commits to ensuring mitigation measures are put in place to minimise this impact through offsetting from residential areas, PROWs, roads, and through landscape planting to reduce long- term impacts on the visual character of the areas affected.</p>
	Ecology and Biodiversity	246 319 384 384 395 396 384 Q4) 196 204	<p>Respondents were concerned about the impact of owls nesting very close to Green Hill D. Respondents felt Green Hill C, D, and E completely dominate the village of Mears Ashby and requested this be considered.</p> <p>Respondents raised concerns about the flock of water birds from the protected areas in Pitsford. Respondents were concerned the</p>	<p>Detailed bird surveys have been conducted to assess use of the Sites by birds, including waterbirds which may be associated with nearby reservoirs. Use of the open fields by such species was very limited. Several owl species were recorded by the surveys, and such species would be expected to persist in the operational Scheme. The grassland habitats provide enhanced foraging habitat for owl species, and bespoke nesting boxes will be installed for</p>



		<p>222 237 246 273 313 146 387 402 403 408 33 384 454 457 (Q7) 361</p>	<p>scheme would affect their food supply as they would not land on fields with solar panels.</p> <p>One respondent expressed concerns about deer in Green Hills C, D, and E and requested that the mitigation plans take into consideration deer grazing.</p>	<p>species including barn owl, to provide additional nesting opportunities.</p> <p>Deer may be temporarily displaced during construction, but would be expected to utilise the operational Scheme by feeding in retained fields and boundary habitats. Deer may also access the solar PV fields by undermining or jumping over boundary fencing.</p> <p>Chapter 9: Ecology and Biodiversity [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.9] of the Environmental Statement considers the potential impacts and mitigation measures regarding the Scheme and wildlife.</p>
	Transport and Access	<p>33 178 (Q11) 240 308 319 384 384 384 (Q12) 356 454 (Q14) 246 (Q16) 219 410 Q4) 196 211</p>	<p>Respondents requested the access to Green Hill D and E during the construction phase access to Site D in the north- east section of Site E from the water tower across Highfield Road.</p> <p>Respondents claimed the roads within Mears Ashby are not suitable for construction traffic. Mears Ashby Road, which many pedestrians use to reach the local farm shop and Sywell Country Park, is unpleasant due to high traffic volume, speed, and 'reckless' driving. Highway Road B is very narrow and will be hazardous with frequent HGV traffic.</p> <p>Major roads out of Mears Ashby will experience significant disruption, especially during peak times. Solar panels are considered unattractive, and it will be hard to properly screen the proposed area.should avoid A4500 and have HGVs go through the</p>	<p>Chapter 13 Transport and Access [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.13] of the Environmental Statement notes that Construction vehicle trips will be coordinated to avoid movement during peak hours. This will be secured through the Outline</p> <p>Construction Traffic Management Plan [EN010170/APP/GH7.9].</p> <p>Access to Green Hill E is via Highfield Road and Wilby Road crossing and a second access from Mears Ashby Road. There are no plans to route construction traffic through the village of Mears Ashby.</p> <p>Construction traffic will be spread out throughout the day, and will be coordinated, where possible, to avoid the network peak hours. Therefore, the effect of construction traffic on the Strategic Road Network (SRN) within the local proximity of the Site</p>



		280 300 312 314 320 314 332 354 146 387 402 (Q5) 146 (Q6) 236 328 146 (Q7) 337 146 33 (Q9) 146 385 (Q11) 146 33 33 (Q12) 320 354 364	middle of Green Hill E. Access to the north part of the site would cross the Wilby Road with	will be limited. Construction vehicles will avoid travel during the network peak hours where possible. Therefore, deliveries will be scheduled for between 09:30 and 16:30 where possible. Construction worker shifts will be scheduled so that workers are not traveling during the network peak hours of 08:00-09:00 and 17:00-18:00. The OCTMP will limit construction movements to largely occur outside of peak periods (0800 to 0900 and 1700 to 1800). Measures such as banksmen and traffic marshals will be used. Access to Green Hill E is via Highfield Road and Wilby Road crossing and a second access from Mears Ashby Road. There are no plans to route construction traffic through the village of Mears Ashby. The Applicant acknowledges the Scheme will have some impact on the rural character and therefore on rural community identity and has assessed this in ES Chapter 18: Human Health [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.18] . The Scheme design commits to ensuring mitigation measures are put in place to minimise this impact through offsetting from residential areas, PROWs, roads, and through landscape planting to reduce long- term impacts on the visual character of the areas affected.
	Cultural Heritage	397 33 33 424 33	Respondents raised concern on the potential impact on Green Hill D, which contains several sites of archaeological importance	See [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.12] : Impact assessment will be undertaken across all areas of the Order Limits where there is a potential for significant effects on buried archaeology, including solar arrays, and areas within the cable



		467 33		route, once this has been refined.
	Hydrology Flood Drainage	33 33 33 33 33 468 (Q13) 314 314 342 (Q15) 219 227 227 393 Q4) 229 235 264 333 146 387 33	One respondent raised concern about the impact waterlogging (as a result of heavy rain and lack of drainage) would have on soil erosion and flooding on the site.	Chapter 10: Hydrology, Flood Risk and Drainage [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.10] It is acknowledged that watercourses across the Application Site vary in their source and potential designation, and may include both artificial land drains and naturally occurring spring fed watercourses. Every effort has been made to identify and consider all watercourses within the Flood Risk Assessment [EN010170/APP/GH6.3.10.1] and Environmental Statement, but given the size and complexity of the site, it is possible that some smaller features may not have been captured. Appropriate easements and buffers have been applied throughout, and mitigation has been developed based on the sensitivity of the environment rather than how the features are labelled. This approach has been applied consistently across the site.
Green Hill E	Transport and Access	459 (Q5) 146 (Q6) 235 236 328 146 (Q7) 146 33 ((q9) 235	Feedback regarding Green Hill E was provided with feedback to Green Hills C and D. This section refers to the concerns about Green Hill E. The concerns raised were: Access concerns – the proposed access off the A4500 already experiences heavy traffic due to large lorries turning in and out of the Whitehouse Industrial Estate, making the junction	Mitigation measures associated with transport and access are summarised in the Transport Assessment (Section 8) the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (OCTMP) [EN010170/APP/GH7.9] , presented as Appendix 13.1 to Chapter 13: Transport and Access [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.13] of the Environmental Statement



		146 (Q11) 146 33 (Q12) 364 467 (Q13) 342 q3) 136 397 (q4) 211	dangerous. The lorries spill sand, cement and aggregates, creating slippery conditions and blocking drains, which lead to frequent flooding. Traffic and safety - A second junction on the A4500 near Packwood Crescent would increase danger for drivers turning right into the Wickets Estate due to speeding vehicles and difficult driving conditions. Footpaths alongside Green Hill E are frequently used for recreational activities. The scheme would threaten the pleasant experience of using the footpaths.	The proposed access points to Green Hill E avoid this location. No new access is proposed in this location. A management scheme will be put in place to minimise impacts on PRoWs. In addition, new permissive paths are proposed across Green Hill E which will enhance the routes in this location.
	Agricultural Circumstances	215 236 245 280 292 313 314 318 327 328 314 333 337 346 353 358 366 371 29 379 385 392 393	Food security – the respondents felt the land should be used for producing food and should remain for agricultural use.	Detailed Agricultural Land Classification surveys (ALC) have been undertaken to identify the grade of the land within the Sites and are reported in Chapter 20: Agriculture Circumstances [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.20] of the Environmental Statement and associated Appendix 20.1 (Agricultural Circumstances) [EN010170/APP/GH6.3.20.1]. The utilised agricultural area (UAA) in the UK was 16.8 million hectares 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. In addition, the land is not being entirely removed from farming, as sheep grazing may still take place on most of the Sites, allowing it to continue contributing to food production. Furthermore, soil health is expected to improve over the Scheme's 60-year lifespan as the land transitions away from intensive arable farming.



	Noise and Vibration	397 398 400 402 410 33 417 423 446 457 467 468 (Q5) 229 (Q6) 232 236	Environmental Impact – from the potential noise from inverters, transformers and switchgear affecting nearby Earls Barton. Additionally, the glint and glare from the solar panels could create further hazards for drivers on the A4500.	Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.14] of the Environmental Statement evaluates the likely significant effects of the Scheme on nearby noise and vibration sensitive receptors during construction, operation and decommissioning. This chapter sets out the findings of the assessments undertaken regarding potential noise emissions from inverters, transformers. During the operational phase of the Scheme, no additional mitigation measures for the scheme are considered to be required given that no significant adverse effects are expected. The site layout has been developed to minimise noise and vibration effects at sensitive receptor locations.
	Socio-Economics, Tourism and Recreation	242 328 333 358 397 398 409 423 424 (Q7) 105 211 33	Respondents felt the scheme was disrespectful to the local communities. There is scepticism that the development would provide sufficient benefit to the local community to justify its impact.	The Applicant acknowledges that benefits (such as economic effects and energy production) from the Scheme are likely to be felt over a wider area than the immediate adverse impacts. Efforts to provide specific benefits in locally impacted communities are set out in the OSSCEP [EN010170/APP/GH7.8] (for employment and economy), in the OLEMP [EN010170/APP/GH7.4] (for landscape and ecological improvements) and through the provision of community benefits such as new permissive paths, or through the community benefit fund (separate to the DCO process).
	Alternatives and Design Evolution	214 236 245 299 323 328 342	Location of the scheme: Green Hill E is too close to Mears Ashby. Respondents requested that the size be reduced by moving it six fields further east towards Wilby. Respondents felt the Scheme was too big and too close to residential villages in	Construction routes are identified that avoid travel through Mears Ashby, avoiding the village school. These routes are generally in locations where there are limited numbers of pedestrians and cyclists.



		358 361 146 397 398 400 409 424 446 355 33 (Q8) 33 235 468 (Q9) 233 325 366 385 398 409 424 (Q11)	Green Hill E. One respondent requested the panels in EF1, EF7, EF8 EF10, EF13, EF33 and CF6 be removed so it is not imposing on local housing in Mears Ashby.	The Outline CTMP [EN010170/APP/GH7.9] defines construction routes and will direct HGV movements away from Mears Ashby. Chapter 8: Landscape and Visual Impact [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.8] of the Environmental Statement set outs the ways in which the Applicant has considered the potential visual and landscape impacts to local residents and visitors, potential effects associated with the panels and associated infrastructure. The Applicant notes that the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) considers both the landscape and visual effects of the Scheme independently to ensure both the impacts and effects on the fabric of the landscape are taken into account as well as the views and visibility. The Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (OLEMP) [EN010170/APP/GH7.4] show where solar panels have been removed from fields within Green Hill E.
	Cultural Heritage	242 264 294 398 409 435 (Q12) 217 233	Conservation - Areas EF22, EF13, EF10 affect the views of Mears Ashby village, which is a conservation area. It is too close to the village, and solar panels in these fields should be removed. One respondent expressed concern about the Scheme's impact on the stone field barns on EF15 and EF28 as these positively contribute to the character and heritage of the countryside in Green Hill E.	Chapter 12: Cultural Heritage [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.12], supported by the heritage statement in Appendix 12.1, considers impacts on heritage and conservation areas. As shown in the Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (OLEMP) [EN010170/APP/GH7.4] the stone field barns are to remain in situ.
	Ecology and Biodiversity	264 314 314 354	Location of the Sites – The scattered locations of the sites across the scheme would damage the environment and cause numerous issues in the local areas.	Details of the process are set out in Appendix 5.1: Site Selection Assessment of the Environmental Statement [EN010170/APP/GH6.3.5.1]. Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution)[



		364 397 398 409 33		EN010170/APP/GH6.2.5] of the Environmental Statement explains in further detail the alternatives that were considered and the design evolution process for the Scheme
Green Hill F	Alternatives and Design Evolution	424 33 (Q13) 236 264 328 467 (Q14) 236 (Q15) 227 227 232 290 136 393 397	Feedback about Green Hill F centred on the impact of the Scheme on Easton Maudit. Impact on Local Villages: The solar farm would significantly disrupt the rural character of Easton Maudit, Bozeat, and the surrounding areas. It would negatively affect residents' quality of life, heritage sites, views, wildlife, and local businesses, particularly stables and farms. Alternative Solutions: Some propose alternative locations for solar farms, such as on non-agricultural or commercial land, to balance energy security with food security. Respondents also suggest scaling down the project to gain local support.	Details of the process are set out in Appendix 5.1: Site Selection Assessment of the Environmental Statement [EN010170/APP/GH6.3.5.1]. Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution)[EN010170/APP/GH6.2.5] of the Environmental Statement explains in further detail the alternatives that were considered and the design evolution process for the Scheme. Impacts to Easton Maudit, Bozeat and the surrounding areas have been assessed and mitigation measures proposed throughout the Environmental Statement
	Ecology and Biodiversity	398 406 409 424 (Q16) 233 418 (Q20) 207 224 333 359 397 406 384	Environmental Concerns: Wildlife, including roe deer, bats, badgers, and birds, would be adversely affected. There is a risk of pollution to local rivers, particularly from construction and fire hazards at the BESS.	Chapter 9: Ecology and Biodiversity [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.9] of the Environmental Statement considers the potential impacts and mitigation measures regarding the Scheme and wildlife. Measures to retain and enhance habitat for different species have been designed into the Scheme. Pollution impacts will be mitigated through adherence to measures detailed in the OCEMP [EN010170/APP/GH7.1] for construction. As part of the BSSMP to be prepared prior to construction of the BESS, the Applicant will take into account the latest good practices for



		424 435 468 Q3) 409 (Q4)		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. [EN010170/APP/GH7.7] and the OOEMP . [EN010170/APP/GH7.2].
	Hydrology Flood Drainage	33 194 201 202 206 33 207 208 209 33 33 33 131 212 213 217 218 219 228 232 234	Flooding and Traffic Issues: Local flooding risks are a major concern, with inadequate assessment of the impact of the solar farm on water runoff. The narrow, flood-prone roads used for construction are unsuitable for heavy traffic, posing safety risks to residents and schoolchildren.	Chapter 10: Hydrology Flood Drainage [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.10] of the Environmental Statement sets out the likely significant environmental effects of the Scheme on the local hydrology during its construction, operation and decommissioning phases. The Applicant notes that a Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy [EN010170/APP/GH6.3.10.1] has been produced for each of the solar Site which demonstrate that flood risk will not be exacerbated as a result of their installation and is likely to provide betterment over the existing surface water regime due to the reintroduction of natural land cover beneath the panels. Where additional infrastructure is proposed (e.g. battery sites), additional Drainage Strategies have been produced which indicate how sustainable drainage systems will be provided on-Site to attenuate any increased runoff to greenfield rates.
	Cultural Heritage	239 241 242 251 254 278 284 289 290 298	Community Opposition: There is a lack of local support for the project, with some feeling the consultation process has been unfair. The project's scale, particularly in Green Hill F, would drastically change the landscape and harm the local community's heritage and environment.	The Applicant acknowledges these comments but remains confident in the level of consultation undertaken and information presented throughout the pre-application stage, as described in the Consultation Report [EN010170/APP/GH5.1]. As part of the pre-application consultation, the Applicant hosted five early engagement



		305 106 33 357 359 189 33 369 33 375 381 383 391 393 33 33 121		workshops with local stakeholders and community groups to present early concept and design ideas for the Scheme. During the public consultation, the Applicant held four consultation events and three virtual webinars. In addition, the Applicant presented detailed information on the Scheme through the PEIR, and a Non- Technical Summary online and at free to use Local Information Points as well as telephone and email contact for the project team to aid accessibility and understanding of the Scheme. Chapter 12: Cultural Heritage [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.12], supported by the heritage statement in Appendix 12.1, considers impacts on heritage and conservation areas.
Green Hill G	Net Zero	406 460 (Q5) 300 332 378 33 33 33 430 432 (Q6) 211 213 226 239 242	Feedback from respondents expressed support for the Green Hill Solar Farm but raised several concerns. Solar energy and the proposed BESS are seen as essential for grid decarbonisation, especially to handle evening peak demand.	The applicant notes these comments. The Clean Power 2030 Action Plan includes a definition of government's Clean Power target. The UK government's Clean Power target means that, in a typical weather year: Clean sources produce at least as much power as Great Britain consumes in total (in 2023, clean sources produced 56% of GB consumption; and Clean sources produce at least 95% of Great Britain's generation (in 2023, clean sourced produced 60% of GB generation). The Scheme will generate low carbon power to support the UK to meet its Clean Power target.
	Agricultural land	247 251 257 264	Loss of agricultural land and its impact on local food production, along with the potential environmental hazards from BESS, especially during a fire.	Detailed Agricultural Land Classification surveys (ALC) have been undertaken to identify the grade of the land within the Sites and are reported in Chapter 20: Agriculture Circumstances



		265 268 277 313 363 189 369 370 387 390 404 406 408 410 33 33 418 33 33 447 (Q7) 105		<p>[EN010170/APP/GH6.2.20] of the Environmental Statement and associated Appendix 20.1 (Agricultural Circumstances).</p> <p>The utilised agricultural area (UAA) in the UK was 16.8 million hectares 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. In addition, the land is not being entirely removed from farming, as sheep grazing may still take place on most of the Sites, allowing it to continue contributing to food production. Furthermore, soil health is expected to improve over the Scheme's 60-year lifespan as the land transitions away from intensive arable farming.</p> <p>There is an Outline Battery Storage Safety Management Plan [EN010170/APP/GH7.7] in the event of a fire to mitigate risks.</p>
	Landscape and Visual	33 217 219 223 238 239 241 254 257 260 33 265 266	<p>The project could disrupt the visual appeal of the countryside, especially near popular footpaths and public views. There are also concerns about accessibility and the impact on local infrastructure.</p> <p>Positive aspects include a proposed 15m buffer around the site and vehicle access that avoids public footpaths, as well as a suggestion to plant trees and hedgerows to reduce visual impact, especially near footpaths in Green Hill G.</p>	<p>The LVIA has undertaken an assessment [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.8] of the significance of the effect to the landscape and visual receptors at four stages of the Scheme (construction, operation (Year 1), operation (Year 15), and decommissioning). This process systematically and transparently assesses the likely significant effects of the Scheme taking into account of embedded mitigation at each of the four stages. Please refer to the Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (OLEMP) [EN010170/APP/GH7.4] for proposed tree planting.</p>
	Major Accidents and Disasters	268 270	Safety concerns due to proximity to major accident hazard sites and pipelines, with a	Chapter 23: Major Accidents and Disasters [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.23] further considers the



		275 276 277 281 285 286 292 297 300 305 312	request for detailed risk assessments.	BESS fire risk. The Outline Battery Storage Safety Management Plan [EN010170/APP/GH7.7] has been prepared. As part of the BSSMP to be prepared prior to construction of the BESS, 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.
	Transport and access	315 318 347 365 367	Traffic congestion from construction and maintenance could be dangerous on narrow country roads, posing risks to pedestrians, especially children.	The outline CTMP [EN010170/APP/GH7.9] sets out a range of measures to manage construction traffic. It also commits to liaison with the relevant highway authorities.
	Glint and Glare	376 382 33 404 420 415 446 384 384 355 (Q8) 355 (Q9) 303 397 33 (Q11)	Glint and glare from the panels could affect residents' quality of life, and the visual impact would harm the rural landscape and activities like walking and horse riding.	The impact of Glint and Glare towards residential amenity is assessed within the Glint and Glare Chapter [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.15]. It is noted that the reflection intensity for solar panels is similar to common outdoor sources of solar reflection (e.g. still water or car windows). Therefore, solar panel glare is likely to be comparable to that from common outdoor sources whilst navigating the natural and built environment on a regular basis. The landscape mitigation measures will seek to provide new planting to mitigate the potential impacts and effects of glint and glare towards residential dwellings, which will include new native hedgerows and tree cover, and this will also include their management and maintenance.
	Hydrology Flood Drainage	223 269 (Q12 + (Q20))	Flooding risks in Lavendon and nearby areas would be exacerbated by the solar farm. Respondents requested a need for proper mitigation, like retention ponds. The scheme	A Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy [EN010170/APP/GH6.3.10.1] for Lavendon has been produced which demonstrates that flood risk will not be exacerbated as a result of their



		466	might increase surface runoff, worsen flood risks, and potentially disrupt local wildlife habitats.	installation and is likely to provide betterment over the existing surface water regime due to the reintroduction of natural land cover beneath the panels.
	Cultural Heritage		The detriment of the significance of historical sites around Green Hill G (potential archaeological remains) requires further consideration.	Chapter 12: Cultural Heritage [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.12], supported by the heritage statement in Appendix 12.1, considers impacts on heritage and conservation areas. Archaeological evaluation (the results of which can be found in Appendices 12.3 to 12.5) has been used to identify an archaeological mitigation strategy (Appendix 12.6), which will mitigate against any adverse effects to archaeological assets
	Noise and Vibration		Respondents felt Green Hill G is too close to Lavendon (600m, below the UK guideline of 500m), with concerns about noise pollution from the solar panels and equipment, as well as visual impact. A larger buffer zone is suggested.	Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.14] of the Environmental Statement evaluates the likely significant effects of the Scheme on nearby noise and vibration sensitive receptors during construction, operation and decommissioning. This chapter sets out the findings of the assessments undertaken regarding potential noise emissions from inverters, transformers. During the operational phase of the Scheme, no additional mitigation measures for the scheme are considered to be required given that no significant adverse effects are expected. The site layout has been developed to minimise noise and vibration effects at sensitive receptor locations. The LVIA has undertaken an assessment of the significance of the effect [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.8] to the landscape and visual receptors at four stages of the Scheme (construction, operation (Year 1), operation (Year 15), and



				decommissioning). This process systematically and transparently assesses the likely significant effects of the Scheme taking into account of embedded mitigation at each of the four stages.
Green Hill BESS	Ecology and Biodiversity		<p>The objections focus on the proposed Green Hill BESS locations, citing several environmental, safety, and social concerns.</p> <p>Wildlife and environmental impact: The development threatens local wildlife, including deer, bats, badgers, and fish, as well as the destruction of habitats and wildlife corridors. There are concerns about pollution in the River Nene, fire risks at the BESS, and long-term habitat disruption with no proper mitigation strategies.</p>	<p>Chapter 9: Ecology and Biodiversity [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.9] of the Environmental Statement considers the potential impacts and mitigation measures regarding the Scheme and wildlife. Measures to retain and enhance habitat for different species have been designed into the Scheme. Pollution impacts will be mitigated through adherence to measures detailed in the OCEMP [EN010170/APP/GH7.1] for construction.</p> <p>The Outline Battery Storage Safety Management Plan [EN010170/APP/GH7.7] has been prepared. As part of the BSSMP to be prepared prior to construction of the BESS, 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.</p>
	Health and safety		<p>BESS safety: The BESS, which carry a high risk of fire due to thermal runaway, could pose serious dangers to local communities, especially considering existing BESS infrastructure nearby.</p>	<p>Chapter 23: Major Accidents and Disasters [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.23] further considers the BESS fire risk.</p> <p>The Outline Battery Storage Safety Management Plan [EN010170/APP/GH7.7] has been prepared. As part of the BSSMP to be prepared prior to construction of the BESS, 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</p>



				world.
	Cumulative impact		Cumulative impact of Developments: There is concern about the saturation of solar farms in the area, which are already contributing significantly to renewable energy targets.	Please refer to Chapter 25: Cumulative Effects [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.25] of the ES.
	Socioeconomic and tourism		<p>Tourism: The project could harm local tourism by impacting historical sites, footpaths, and public views.</p> <p>Social and economic impact: The project could harm local businesses, including tourism- related ones, and restrict access to outdoor activities like walking, cycling, and horse riding, negatively impacting mental health and quality of life.</p> <p>Impact on local communities: The project would negatively affect local residents, such as those at Oakfield, an adult care facility, due to noise, glare, and loss of activities like horse riding and farming.</p> <p>Livery stables in the area would also suffer as horses are affected by the glare from solar panels. The development could also harm tourism, impacting historical sites, footpaths, and views.</p>	<p>Impacts on tourism, visitor attractions, and businesses dependent on visitor spending are assessed in Chapter 17: Socio- Economics, Tourism and Recreation [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.17] and its supporting appendix [EN010170/APP/GH6.3.17.1]. These consider the experience for users, accessibility, changes to visual aspect, and what this may mean for enjoyment of use and their ongoing desirability for use.</p> <p>Chapter 18: Human Health [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.18] considers both the physical and mental health implication of the Scheme on all residents and visitors to the local area and considers the importance of community culture and how the Scheme impacts upon sense of place, and the ability to continue health and wellbeing benefits from access to open space and PRoWs.</p> <p>The assessment also specifically assesses the impact of the Scheme on mental health and wellbeing, and the continues ability for facilities to provide care at Oakfield adult care facility, and at The Seeds of Change at the Acorn Centre (equine-centred therapy centre for children and young people).</p>
	Cultural Heritage		Cultural and Heritage Concerns: The project is located near numerous cultural and historical landmarks, and construction traffic could lead to structural damage. The	Chapter 12: Cultural Heritage [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.12], supported by the heritage statement in Appendix 12.1, considers impacts on heritage and conservation areas.



			visual impact of the setting of these heritage sites is also a major concern.	
	Noise and vibration		Noise Pollution: There are fears of constant noise from the BESS and solar arrays, which could harm the health and well-being of residents, especially in the quiet rural area of Grendon. The noise is expected to affect both residents and wildlife, including those using public footpaths and other rights of way.	Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.14] of the Environmental Statement evaluates the likely significant effects of the Scheme on nearby noise and vibration sensitive receptors during construction, operation and decommissioning. This chapter sets out the findings of the assessments undertaken regarding potential noise emissions from inverters, transformers. During the operational phase of the Scheme, no additional mitigation measures for the scheme are considered to be required given that no significant adverse effects are expected. The site layout has been developed to minimise noise and vibration effects at sensitive receptor locations.
	Hydrology and flood risk		Flooding and traffic: The proposal does not adequately address the flood risks, particularly in areas that have experienced significant flooding. The construction would increase traffic on already congested roads, posing a danger to pedestrians, cyclists, and residents.	Chapter 10: Hydrology Flood Drainage [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.10] of the Environmental Statement sets out the likely significant environmental effects of the Scheme on the local hydrology during its construction, operation and decommissioning phases. The Applicant notes that a Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy [EN010170/APP/GH6.3.10.1] has been produced for each of the solar Sites which demonstrate that flood risk will not be exacerbated as a result of their installation and is likely to provide betterment over the existing surface water regime due to the reintroduction of natural land cover beneath the panels.
General and Unspecified	Cumulative Impact		The feedback strongly opposes the proposed solar farm development on agricultural land, particularly in Northamptonshire, citing concerns over environmental, social, and	The utilised agricultural area (UAA) in the UK was 16.8 million hectares in 2024. The agricultural land taken for the Scheme represents less than 0.01% of the UAA and is not expected to have a



		<p>economic impacts. Key points include:</p> <p>Loss of agricultural land: The use of high-quality agricultural land for solar farms is seen as detrimental to food production and security, especially in light of the increasing reliance on food imports.</p> <p>National implications: There is a broader concern about the lack of a national strategy for managing the loss of agricultural land to solar developments and how it could affect UK food security and farming livelihoods.</p> <p>Excessive scale: The project is seen as too large for the area, impacting surrounding villages, especially Mears Ashby and Easton Maudit, and threatening to dominate the local landscape. The scale is described as disproportionate and incompatible with the rural setting, potentially transforming the area into an industrial zone.</p> <p>Disruption to local communities: The construction and maintenance of large solar farms would disrupt rural communities, affecting leisure activities, businesses, and local infrastructure. There are also concerns about increased traffic, noise, and the impact on property values.</p> <p>Scale and feasibility: The massive size of the proposal is criticised for being disproportionate, with concerns about the lack of comprehensive planning, contingency measures, and long-term sustainability of the solar farm.</p>	<p>significant impact on national food production and security. In addition, the land is not being entirely removed from farming, as sheep grazing may still take place on most of the Sites, allowing it to continue contributing to food production. Furthermore, soil health is expected to improve over the Scheme's 60-year lifespan as the land transitions away from intensive arable farming.</p> <p>Chapter 9: Ecology and Biodiversity [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.9] of the Environmental Statement considers the potential impacts and mitigation measures regarding the Scheme and wildlife.</p> <p>Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.14] of the Environmental Statement evaluates the likely significant effects of the Scheme on nearby noise and vibration sensitive receptors during construction, operation and decommissioning.</p> <p>The Applicant is committed to ensuring that communities benefit from the Scheme including by receiving direct funding to important causes in the local area. During the development of the proposals for Green Hill Solar Farm, we have consulted on community benefits and, based on feedback, will determine how best to distribute funding. The Scheme will also generate business rates that are paid to the local authority. The Scheme provides landscape mitigation that seeks to enhance the public footpath and provide permissive paths, which is aimed to benefit the community as a whole as well as tourists, visiting</p>
--	--	--	---



		<p>Economic and financial concerns: The development is seen as primarily benefiting landowners and investors, while residents gain no clear benefits, such as lower electricity bills. There is scepticism about whether the energy output justifies the environmental and social costs.</p> <p>Technological flexibility: The idea of adapting to new technologies is viewed as unrealistic, particularly with current limitations in solar technology, and driven by profit motives rather than genuine environmental progress.</p> <p>Concerns about the lack of guarantees for energy security, proper management, and ongoing maintenance.</p>	walkers, local residents and ornithologists
	Ecology and Biodiversity	Impact on wildlife and environment: The development threatens local wildlife, ecosystems, and nature reserves, and concerns are raised about the long-term environmental consequences, such as increased flooding risks.	Please refer to Section 9.6: Baseline Conditions of Chapter 9: Ecology and Biodiversity [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.9] for full details of the ecological receptors that have been identified and assessed.
	Socio-economic, Tourism and Recreation	Local impact: The development is expected to negatively affect local air quality, traffic, noise, and health, though specifics on mitigating these impacts are lacking.	Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.14] of the Environmental Statement evaluates the likely significant effects of the Scheme on nearby noise and vibration sensitive receptors during construction, operation and decommissioning.
	Hydrology Flood Risk	Flood risk: The area has already experienced severe flooding, and the development is expected to exacerbate this problem, especially near key watercourses and communities. The project is seen as	Chapter 10: Hydrology Flood Drainage [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.10] of the Environmental Statement sets out the likely significant environmental effects of the Scheme on the local hydrology during its construction,



			increasing flood risks, not mitigating them	operation and decommissioning phases. The Applicant notes that a Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy [EN010170/APP/GH6.3.10.1] has been produced for each of the solar Site which demonstrate that flood risk will not be exacerbated as a result of their installation and is likely to provide betterment over the existing surface water regime due to the reintroduction of natural land cover beneath the panels.
	Transport and Access		<p>Negative impacts on mental health, well-being, and daily travel for residents due to construction noise, road disruptions, and inadequate transport links.</p> <p>Impact on local traffic – Respondents felt the use of village/ country roads for construction traffic will further exacerbate the poor state of the road and traffic.</p> <p>Public Rights of Way: While the principle of keeping walking routes open is agreeable, the contributor fears that the views and experience of the countryside will be ruined.</p>	<p>Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.14] of the Environmental Statement evaluates the likely significant effects of the Scheme on nearby noise and vibration sensitive receptors during construction, operation and decommissioning.</p> <p>The Applicant confirms that Chapter 18: Human Health [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.18] assesses the likely effects of the Scheme on the mental health and wellbeing of the existing resident population in relation to both noise and transport connectivity and safety impacts.</p> <p>The Applicant is cognisant of the importance of the PRoW network for local community for physical and mental health and wellbeing. As a result, the impact of the Scheme on the direct desirability and use of PRoWs is assessed in Chapter 17: Socio-Economics, Tourism and Recreation [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.17] of the Environmental Statement, while the resultant impacts on health and wellbeing are assessed under the heading “open space, leisure and play” in Chapter 18: Human Health</p>



				<p>[EN010170/APP/GH6.2.18]. The Applicant has committed to mitigation of adverse impacts on PROWs, and through enhancement measures such as planting, offsetting from PROWs to onsite infrastructure, and the provision of new permissive paths. These are set out in the OPROWPPMP [EN010170/APP/GH7.10], which is secured by requirement in the draft DCO [EN010170/APP/GH3.1].</p>
--	--	--	--	--

Soils



Issue	Sub- issue	User IDs	Summary	Applicant's Response
Soils	Potential iimpact of site infrastructures on soils	214 33 256 286 397 233 277 280 289 287 328 372 397 148 222 239 264 33 326 328 332 346 372 29 391 397 398 409 129 421 423 424 427 435 285	<p>Respondents raised concerns about the impact of site infrastructure, particularly solar panels, below ground infrastructure and BESS, on the profile, quality and microbiome of the soil.</p> <p>Respondents associated the proposed new infrastructure with a general reduction of sunlight access to the soil and its microbiome.</p> <p>High levels of respondents concerned about flood risk referenced the impact increased run-off and soil compaction would have on risk levels.</p> <p>A few respondents suggested that the resulting excess water would travel quickly towards residential areas, particularly down Highfield Road.</p> <p>Respondents did not feel confident that the proposed mitigation measures would counteract soil compaction across the Scheme.</p> <p>The change in land use was also a concern for respondents. It was referenced in regard to soil contamination by respondents.</p> <p>Respondents also expressed concerns that flooding around the BESS would transfer heavy metals, contaminants and pollutants into the water table via the soil.</p> <p>A few respondents also raised concerns about the potential soil</p>	<p>Potential impact of site infrastructures on soils</p> <p>Detailed Agricultural Land Classification surveys (ALC) have been undertaken to identify the grade of the land within the Sites, soil mitigation measures and an Outline Soil Management Plan have also been developed.</p> <p>All are reported in Chapter 20: Agriculture Circumstances [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.20] of The Environmental Statement and associated Appendix 20.1 (Agricultural Circumstances).</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Sites, allowing it to continue contributing to food production. Furthermore, soil health is expected to improve over the Scheme's 60-year lifespan as the land transitions away from intensive arable farming.</p> <p>The Scheme will be temporary with no permanent loss of agricultural land extent or quality. In addition, some agricultural land may be retained during the operational phase, such as with pasture grazed by sheep, for example.</p> <p>Chapter 20: Agriculture Circumstances [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.20] of the Environmental Statement concludes that the 60 year lifetime of the project will</p>



		307 341 372 423 446 328 366 466 318 239 342 409 410 422 424 33 355 366 384 457	contamination from inadequate processing and disposal methods of BESS infrastructures.	<p>facilitate a recovery in topsoil organic matter. This will enhance soil health and potentially ALC grades.</p> <p>A farming report [EN010170/APP/GH7.27] has also been prepared and sets out an assessment of the potential effects of the proposed works on agricultural land, soils and farm businesses.</p> <p>Chapter 10: Hydrology, Flood Risk and Drainage [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.10] of the Environmental Statement sets out the likely significant environmental effects of the Scheme on the local hydrology during its construction, operation and decommissioning phases.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that a Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy has been produced for each of the solar Sites.</p> <p>Consultation Report: Appendix 10.1 [EN010170/APP/GH6.3.10.1] which demonstrate that flood risk will not be exacerbated as a result of their installation and is likely to provide betterment over the existing surface water regime due to the reintroduction of natural land cover beneath the panels. Where additional infrastructure is proposed (e.g. battery sites), additional Drainage Strategies have been produced which indicate how sustainable drainage systems will be provided on-Site to attenuate any increased runoff to greenfield rates.</p> <p>The Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy [EN010170/APP/GH6.3.10.1] has been developed to assess surface water flood risk from the ordinary watercourse known as “Field Drain” which runs through the BESS site.</p>
--	--	---	--	--



				<p>This distinction is now clearly reflected in Annex J and the Environmental Statement. Embedded mitigation includes setting finished floor levels of BESS equipment above modelled flood levels and use of sealed drainage designs with self-actuating valves. As such, the Proposed Development will be resilient to flooding and will not increase flood risk elsewhere. The DCO Application is also supported by an Outline Battery Storage Safety Management Plan which details key fire safety provisions for the BESS proposed to be installed at Green Hill Solar Farm (Green Hill BESS and Green Hill C) including measures to reduce BESS failure risks and mitigate credible failure incident scenarios.</p> <p>As part of the BSSMP to be prepared prior to construction of the BESS, 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.</p> <p>Identification of landfill sites in relation to the Cable Route Corridor and BESS have been identified within the Baseline Conditions section and discussed in Chapter 22:Ground Conditions and Contamination [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.22].</p> <p>Chapter 22: Ground Conditions and Contamination [EN010170/AAP/GH6.2.22] of the Environmental Statement assesses potential soil pollution from site infrastructure, with particular</p>
--	--	--	--	---



				<p>focus on the BESS. It evaluates impacts on key receptors including construction workers, controlled waters, future site use and the built environment, and ecology and sensitive land uses. Identified pollution sources include historical landfill areas, fuel and chemical spills, faulty batteries, fire-related risks (e.g. ash and extinguishing water), HDD methods, and unexploded ordnance.</p> <p>Mitigation measures outlined include a Discovery Strategy, Spill Response Plan, use of durable materials for cables, fully housed contained systems, Emergency Response Plan, Battery Safety Management Plan, regular inspections and maintenance, and munitions clearance.</p>
	Cumulative Impact	<p>214 33 256 286 397 233 277 280 289 287 328 372 397 148 222 239 264 33 326</p>	<p>Respondents did not feel confident that the profile of the soil would be protected during the construction, operation and decommissioning phases of the Scheme.</p> <p>Many respondents felt that the current proposals did not adequately mitigate against the potential for soil pollution, contamination, compaction, and long term degradation. Concern was expressed for both on-site soils, and nearby soils in local SSSIs, SPAs, Ramsars and nature reserves.</p> <p>It was noted that the soil acts as a cornerstone for local wildlife, habitats and vegetation. Thus, it was felt that any reduction in the quality and diversity of the soil profile may negatively impact local flora and fauna.</p> <p>There is concern that there will be significant</p>	<p>Cumulative impact Chapter 9: Ecology and Biodiversity [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.G] of the Environmental Statement considers the potential impacts and mitigations regarding the Scheme and designated sites.</p> <p>An outline Soil Management Plan has been prepared to set out the soil management strategy, approach and key measures during construction, operation and decommissioning stages. The outline Soil Management Plan [EN010170/APP/GH7.6] will be further developed into a detailed Soil Management Plan along with the results of Soil Resource Survey to be conducted at the Cable route, ALC survey conducted and evolved design. This will minimise the impact on soils.</p> <p>At the end of the Scheme's 60 year lifetime, it will be fully decommissioned. This will be secured by a</p>



		<p>328 costs associated with re-generating fertile and 332 productive soil upon the Scheme's 346 decommissioning.</p> <p>372</p> <p>29 Respondents noted that 66% of the soil is 391 graded as 1,2 or 3a.</p> <p>397</p> <p>398 Respondents did not feel confident that the 409 Applicant would cover these costs to return 129 the soil to these gradings.</p> <p>421</p> <p>423 Further details on how the Applicant would 424 restore, and where possible, improve the soil 427 by the end of the Scheme's lifespan, was 435 requested by many respondents.</p> <p>285</p> <p>307 Some interpreted the possibility to improve 341 soil quality over the 60 year lifespan of the 372 Scheme, as an indication that there would be 423 some level of initial degradation the soil would 446 need time to recover from.</p> <p>328</p> <p>366 Many respondents expressed concerns about 466 the status of the land upon decommissioning. 318 There is an expectation that the sites will 239 become classified as brownfield, with a 342 possible degradation in soil quality 409 contributing to this.</p> <p>410</p> <p>422 Respondents raised concerns about the 424 cumulative impact of below-ground 33 infrastructure, particularly cabling, might have 355 on soil character and quality. This was a key 366 concern associated with the decommissioning 384 of the Scheme.</p> <p>457</p> <p>Respondents felt there was no evidence that upon decommissioning, the land and soil</p>	<p>Requirement in the Development Consent Order (DCO). The solar panels, infrastructure, substations, and energy storage will be removed and recycled or disposed of according to good practice and market conditions at that time. As part of the decommissioning process, the land will be returned to its existing agricultural uses.</p> <p>An Outline Decommissioning Statement [EN010170/APP/GH7.3] supports this DCO Application which seeks to provide a clear and consistent approach to the control of decommissioning activities within the Order limits.</p>
--	--	--	---



			would return to agricultural use. It was noted that arable soil is a complex living habitat that may require additional nutrients and maintenance to support any reintroduction to agricultural use.	
	Construction		<p>Some respondents expressed concerns about the impact of the construction period on the soil.</p> <p>Concerns referenced the potential compaction, erosion and contamination of soil.</p> <p>A few respondents suggested that construction vehicles may transfer soil from the sites onto local roads. It was noted that this would negatively impact the land and also increase the risk of a road traffic accident. Access to Green Hill A was referenced as an example of a risk area.</p> <p>There are concerns that the construction of the Scheme will remove topsoil.</p> <p>Further information about the character of the 'permeable tracks' proposed for construction access, and any potential impact this may have on the soils has been requested.</p>	<p>The OCTMP [EN010170/APP/GH7.G] details that construction routes must be used unless otherwise agreed by the relevant highway authority.</p> <p>OCTMP commits to a pre- commencement road survey and remedial measures to correct any damage caused by the development.</p>
	Soil quality improvement		<p>Respondents did not feel confident that the Scheme would improve on-site soil quality, due to the complexity of existing ecological conditions and the possible impact of the Scheme across its lifespan.</p> <p>However, respondents did acknowledge the Applicant's aspirations to improve soil quality to honour the Scheme's design principles.</p>	<p>Soil quality improvements</p> <p>The conversion of land currently under arable production to grassland (land between and under the solar panels) during the operation phase has potential benefits in relation to soil health.</p> <p>Cessation of cultivation will remove disturbance effects on the soils and, along with the grassland</p>



			<p>Respondents noted that independent quantitative assessments can, and should, be used to measure soil quality over the course of the Scheme's life.</p> <p>Respondents welcomed a commitment from the Applicant to monitoring, maintaining and preserving soil health across the lifespan of the Scheme. A detailed and transparent soil management plan was encouraged.</p>	<p>vegetation, may result in an increase in soil organic carbon, better soil structure, increased infiltration and enhanced soil microbial populations. This is supported by research from Defra which showed that conversion of tillage land to permanent pasture had soil organic carbon (especially in the land between solar panels) and wider environmental benefits.</p> <p>As such, there would be a potential beneficial impact on soils and agricultural land although it should be noted the extent of benefits will depend on the actual land use during operation (for example high levels of grazing will limit the potential for beneficial effects).</p> <p>A Outline Soil Management Plan (OSMP) [EN010170/APP/GH7.6] supports this DCO Application, the OSMP sets out the strategy, approach, methodology and guidance of soil mitigation, and the key requirements for developing a Detailed Soil Management Plan (DSMP) pre-construction for soil handling during the construction, operation and decommissioning phases in line with national policy and industry guidance in relation to soil resources protection.</p>
	Site maintenance		<p>Respondents raised concerns about the potential use of chemicals as a means of vegetation maintenance and infrastructure cleaning across the sites. It was noted that 60 years of spraying would negatively impact the soil and potentially cause the land to be re-classified as brownfield upon decommissioning.</p> <p>Information about the method and frequency</p>	<p>Site maintenance</p> <p>The Solar PV Panels would be cleaned using water only. No chemical cleaning products would be used, with stubborn dirt brushed or wiped off the panels. Please refer to Chapter 4: Scheme Description [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.4] for further details.</p> <p>The landscape measures also include the preparation of an Outline Landscape and</p>



		<p>of cleaning activities across the Scheme has been requested by respondents. Respondents emphasised the importance of making space for sustainable drainage systems across the Scheme, to protect the soil and encourage drainage via infiltration.</p>	<p>Environmental Management Plan (OLEMP) [EN010170/APP/GH7.4] which prescribes how the landscape and ecology mitigation measures identified and proposed would be implemented and managed to ensure the effectiveness and certainty in achieving the objectives.</p> <p>The Scheme would not use chemicals as a means of vegetation maintenance, unless significant extents of injurious weeds become prevalent which cannot be treated through non-chemical means. In this scenario, any herbicides used would be targeted and non- residual. Where meadows are proposed, the cessation of fertilisation and herbicide spraying can result in an increase in soil health.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that a Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy [EN010170/APP/GH6.3.10.1] has been produced for each of the solar Sites which demonstrate that flood risk will not be exacerbated as a result of their installation and is likely to provide betterment over the existing surface water regime due to the reintroduction of natural land cover beneath the panels. Where additional infrastructure is proposed (e.g. battery sites), additional Drainage Strategies have been produced which indicate how sustainable drainage systems will be provided on-Site to attenuate any increased runoff to greenfield rates.</p>
	Ongoing survey work	<p>A respondent expressed discontent with ongoing archaeological surveys on their land. They raised concerns that the ground and soil</p>	<p>Ongoing survey work</p> <p>Work undertaken on site followed industry</p>



			would take several years to recover from the trenching works.	<p>standards. The excavation period for each trench was relatively short and top soil and subsoils were stockpiled along the trenches without and machine tracking that could result in potential soil structure damage. As such we would not expect the soils to take several years to recover from the trenching works.</p> <p>The Applicant has agreed to pay landowners reasonable crop loss compensation for the archaeological surveys undertaken.</p> <p>An outline Soil Management Plan EN010170/APP/GH7.6] has also been prepared to protect soils.</p>
--	--	--	---	---

Watercourses & Contamination



Issue	Sub- issue	User IDs	Summary	Applicant's Response
Watercourses	Hydrology	263 335 33 397 398 409 256 286 297 327 346 366 398 468 359 409 423 424 207 236 242 333 397 398 409 423 424 236 257 328 397 446 346	<p>Respondents raised concerns about the Scheme's overall impact on watercourses.</p> <p>Respondents frequently referenced concerns regarding the potential impact of the Scheme on watercourses whilst discussing the topography of the site, local flood risk, mitigation, and the importance of sustainable drainage systems.</p> <p>Respondents did not feel that the site selection process had adequately considered the proximity of The River Nene to the Scheme.</p> <p>A few respondents expressed concern that the Cable Corridor would be routed beneath The River Nene. Concern was expressed about the potential risk the construction and maintenance of this route would have on the River. Some suggested this route should be disregarded.</p> <p>It was noted that local watercourses are already at capacity. Recent severe flooding around The River Nene was a key driver of concern regarding the potential impact of the Scheme on watercourses.</p> <p>A respondent also noted that a driver of the recent flooding was the run-off from fields from Warrington to Easton Maudit and Grendon.</p>	<p>Chapter 10: Hydrology Flood Drainage [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.10] of the Environmental Statement sets out the likely significant environmental effects of the Scheme on the local hydrology during its construction, operation and decommissioning phases.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that a Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy [EN010170/APP/GH6.3.10.1] has been produced for each of the solar Site which demonstrate that flood risk will not be exacerbated as a result of their installation and is likely to provide betterment over the existing surface water regime due to the reintroduction of natural land cover beneath the panels. Where additional infrastructure is proposed (e.g. battery sites), additional Drainage Strategies have been produced which indicate how sustainable drainage systems will be provided on-Site to attenuate any increased runoff to greenfield rates.</p> <p>The potential effect of the cable route on flood risk has been assessed and any associated mitigation presented in Chapter 10: Hydrology ,Flood Risk and Drainage [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.10] .</p> <p>The Scheme will not have a detrimental impact on surface water runoff. Where hard standing is proposed this will be managed through local sustainable drainage system proposals considered in Section 5.0 (Drainage Strategy) of the Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy and</p>



		351 397 400 410 420 424 233 341 424 463		throughout the supporting Annexes. Chapter 10: Hydrology, Flood Drainage [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.10] of the Environmental Statement supported by Annex B – 10.1.1: Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy – Cable Route. The Applicant initially presented a cable route search corridor, which has been refined through engagement and consultation with landowners.
	Impact of flooding on infrastructure	382 397 398 207 265 333 424 467 33 286 256 397 409 435 264 131 297 327 346 351 358 366 397	Several respondents expressed concern about the potential impact of site infrastructure, including solar panels, may have on surface water run-off levels. There is an assumption that impermeable infrastructure will directly increase run-off into local watercourses. There is concern that any substantial changes to the routes and channels of local rivers, wetlands and waterways will have negative long-term impacts, including increased flood risk. Many respondents did not feel that the current proposals adequately mitigate against the potential impact of the Scheme on SSSIs, SPAs, Ramsars sites, and local wetlands, ponds and conservation areas. Increased buffers and the removal of infrastructure adjacent to these areas were suggested as a minimum.	Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy [EN010170/APP/GH6.3.10.1]. These systems are designed to contain runoff and prevent outflow to surrounding land or infrastructure, including AWS assets. Should future design work identify a requirement for any connection to AWS infrastructure, the Applicant would engage with AWS accordingly. Protection of AWS assets will be secured through the provisions of the DCO, including standard protective provisions for statutory undertakers. The Applicant notes AWS's position with respect to consultation on the final Drainage Strategy and will consider this further at the relevant stage. Please refer to the updated Chapter 3: The Development Site [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.3] of the ES. Further details on the locality of the Scheme in relation to Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), SPAs, and Ramsar sites are outlined in Chapter 9: Ecology and Biodiversity [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.9].



	Existing pressure on local water resource	398 400 468 409 423 424 435 207 236 242 268 307 333 351 397 398 409	<p>Some respondents questioned how the Applicant intended to utilise local water resources in the event of a Scheme fire. Some concern was raised about the potential impact this additional use would have on local residential properties and businesses. A few respondents suggested that the Scheme's use of local water resources may create local shortages.</p> <p>Some respondents raised concerns that a potential contamination or fire event may harm drinking water supplies in the local area. A few respondents noted that there is a general water shortage for abstraction across the area. There was concern that the Scheme would add additional pressures.</p>	Firewater arising from the BESS infrastructure is proposed to be managed on-site through bunded and lined drainage systems with self-actuating shut-off valves, as detailed in Annex J of the Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy [EN010170/APP/GH6.3.10.1] . These systems are designed to contain runoff and prevent outflow to surrounding land or infrastructure, including AWS assets.
	Contamination of watercourses	423 424 236 242 245 328 337 361 366 397 409 424 468 318 337 233 241	<p>Respondents did not feel confident that the design of the Scheme would effectively protect local watercourses from contamination and pollution.</p> <p>Respondents associated new infrastructure with an increased likelihood of water contamination.</p> <p>The potential impact of toxic, polluted or contaminated flood water, fire water, and run-off from the proposed BESS and substation was a leading concern. Respondents raised concerns about the short and long-term impacts of toxic discharge entering the watercourses, including contamination of the water table.</p> <p>A few respondents expressed concern that</p>	<p>The Applicant is continuing to consider how best to monitor and report on potential leakage risk as part of the final drainage and pollution control design, which will be secured through the DCO. These measures will be developed further at the detailed design stage and secured through the outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (OCEMP) [EN010170/APP/GH7.1] and outline Operational Environmental Management Plan [EN010170/APP/GH7.2] (OOEMP), as appropriate.</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to engage with the relevant statutory authorities to agree suitable safeguards, and notes that the proposed mitigation has been designed to minimise the potential for environmental effects on nearby sensitive receptors, including the River Nene.</p>



		<p>276 potentially polluted and contaminated water</p> <p>286 from Green Hill BESS would run into the</p> <p>391 Sywell Reservoir.</p> <p>409</p> <p>424 Further information about the clean roof</p> <p>428 drainage of Green Hill BESS to the nearest</p> <p>232 surface water drainage feature, was</p> <p>293 requested.</p> <p>306</p> <p>468 Respondents did not feel confident that there</p> <p>366 would be a low pollution risk for run-off from</p> <p>467 Green Hill BESS. Further information about</p> <p>207 how the treatment and release of fire water</p> <p>424 would be managed, was requested.</p> <p>Some concern was raised about the potential</p> <p>for watercourse pollution from solar panels</p> <p>and other site infrastructure. Respondents did</p> <p>not feel confident that the Applicant's</p> <p>assessments had acknowledged the potential</p> <p>increase in speed and volume of surface</p> <p>water run-off from solar panel mounts and</p> <p>compacted ground.</p> <p>Respondents expressed concern about the</p> <p>potential for chemicals from site infrastructure</p> <p>to leach into local waterways and</p> <p>watercourses.</p> <p>Some suggested that heavy rainfall may</p> <p>contribute to this risk.</p>	
	<p>Technology impact on</p> <p>watercourses</p> <p>Alternative technologies –</p> <p>less impact on</p> <p>watercourses</p>	<p>Some respondents suggested that</p> <p>alternative renewable energy technologies,</p> <p>such as onshore wind turbines, have less of</p> <p>a negative impact on watercourses, lakes</p> <p>and floodplains when compared to solar</p> <p>farms.</p>	<p>The Applicant has followed a step-by step site</p> <p>selection process which confirms the location of</p> <p>the Scheme is suitable for a large scale solar</p> <p>farm. This has included the avoidance of sensitive</p> <p>landscape and environmental designations in</p> <p>confirming site suitability and consideration of</p>



			<p>alternative sites. Details of the process are set out in Appendix 5.1: Site Selection Assessment of the Environmental Statement [EN010170/APP/GH6.3.5.1] Please also refer to Chapter 5: Alternatives and Design Evolution of the ES [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.5].</p>
	Mitigation	<p>Mitigation on impact on local watercourses</p> <p>Many respondents did not feel that the proposed mitigation measures, to protect and reduce the impact of the Scheme on watercourses, were sufficient.</p> <p>Some respondents attributed this sense of inadequacy with the Applicant's use of out-of-date surface water simulation data. It was suggested that the Applicant consult with the Environment Agency with specific regard to recent local flooding events.</p> <p>Further sustainable drainage solutions were requested.</p> <p>Further details about how the Applicant would effectively manage surface water, particularly in zones of high flood risk, were requested. It was noted that mitigation measures should be applied to mitigate risk across the entire Nene catchment, including upstream of Billing Aquadrome, and all the tributaries (i.e. Grendon Brook, Wootton Brook, Dallington Brook, and Bugbrooke Brook).</p>	<p>The Applicant has assessed the influences of ground conditions and contamination on and resulting from the Scheme in Chapter 22: Ground Conditions [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.22] of the Environmental Statement.</p> <p>Please refer to Chapter 10: Hydrology, Flood Risk and Drainage [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.10] presents the assessment of likely significant effects on hydrology, flood risk and drainage.</p> <p>The baseline for the assessment has been informed by the Environment Agencies online flood map (latest updated March 2025) and where necessary site specific modelling has been carried out.</p> <p>The Environment Agency has been consulted on the Scheme.</p> <p>Section 10.7 of ES Chapter 10, includes the use of permeable surfacing for access tracks, the retention of vegetated groundcover across panelled areas, and the sequential location of critical infrastructure within Flood Zone 1. The implementation of suitable planting (such as a wildflower or grass mix) so the underlying ground cover is strengthened.</p>



		<p>Additional nature-based surface water reduction solutions were welcomed. Respondents recommended any new planting around watercourses be as diverse as possible.</p> <p>Suggestions included the inclusion of grasslands and marginal vegetation.</p> <p>Clarification on the size of buffer zones (metres) around all watercourses, including Main Rivers and Ordinary Watercourses, was requested.</p> <p>It was noted that any fencing should not hinder the direction and rate of water flow.</p>	<p>These features reduce runoff generation and help maintain the existing surface water regime.</p> <p>Sufficient space for SuDS has been provided across the Sites and are further detailed in Chapter 10: Hydrology, Flood Risk and Drainage [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.10]. It is considered that the Application Site will remain largely permeable following development (with the proposed solar panels being raised).</p> <p>A minimum 8 metres buffer has been maintained from all Main Rivers and Ordinary Watercourses in accordance with Environment Agency guidance. This buffer has been increased to 9 metres where required by local policy, including for Ordinary Watercourses within the jurisdiction of North and West Northamptonshire Councils and Milton Keynes City Council. There are no Internal Drainage Board (IDB) watercourses within the site.</p> <p>Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement considers the potential for cumulative effects with other developments, including in relation to downstream flood risk and water quality.</p>
Contamination		<p>General concern</p> <p>Many respondents viewed the change in land use, and additions of site infrastructure, as direct contamination of agricultural land.</p> <p>A few respondents expressed concerns about the potential impact Scheme pollutants would have on local bee populations.</p>	<p>The Applicant has assessed the influences of ground conditions and contamination on and resulting from the Scheme in Chapter 22: Ground Conditions [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.22] of the Environmental Statement.</p> <p>Outline Battery Storage Safety Management Plan [EN010170/APP/GH7.7] As part of the BSSMP to be prepared prior to construction of the BESS, the</p>



		<p>General concern about the impact of any potential pollution and contamination on the natural environment, ecosystem and biodiversity levels was expressed by many respondents.</p> <p>Many respondents raised concerns about the presence of hazardous and toxic materials on site infrastructure and Green Hill BESS. There is an assumption that toxic substances will leach into watercourses, soil and ground, and ecosystems.</p> <p>High levels of concern was directed towards the environmental and human health consequences of a potential Green Hill BESS fire event.</p> <p>Respondents did not feel confident that any contamination from a fire event would be contained.</p> <p>Some respondents expressed concerns that the processing and disposal activities associated with Green Hill BESS could contaminate the surrounding air, soil and water.</p> <p>Respondents expressed concern about the possibility of below ground contamination from any underground cables. Some associated the installation of cables with the permanent degradation of the ground.</p> <p>Respondents did not feel confident that the soil conditions would be maintained or improved from existing levels. There is an assumption that soils will be contaminated</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>Chapter 18: Human Health [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.18] in the Environmental Statement also states the Northamptonshire Fire and Rescue Service are to be consulted as statutory consultees to the Scheme, and as targeted consultees for the agreement of the Outline Battery Fire Safety Management Plan. NFRS can advise on the fire safety protocols and concerns regarding fire safety risks. Resultant human health impacts from contamination to groundwater and watercourses as a result of construction disturbance and runoff, and potential for contamination for firewater, are also considered in ES Chapter 18: Human Health, cross-referencing the assessment results in Chapter 10 and Chapter 22 [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.10 and 6.2.22].</p> <p>Chapter 16: Air Quality [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.16] of the Environmental Statement will include an Air Quality assessment that will assess dust, noise and chemical risks and will meet the requirements of the Infrastructure Planning Regulations 2017 – (The EIA Regulations).</p> <p>Chapter 12: Cultural Heritage</p>
--	--	---	---



			<p>across the Scheme, which may result in a re-classification of the land as brownfield upon decommissioning.</p> <p>High levels of concern was expressed about the possibility of the contamination of local SSSIs, SPAs, Ramsars, wetlands and conservation areas close to the Scheme. Some raised concerns about the long-term impacts, including habitat degradation and loss of wildlife, a contamination event may cause.</p> <p>Respondents associated any water run-off from the Scheme with the pollution and contamination of wildlife areas, watercourses and land.</p>	<p>[EN010170/APP/GH6.2.12] of the Environmental Statement presents an assessment of the effects of the Scheme on cultural heritage and archaeological receptors. This includes an assessment of the Scheme's effect on heritage, historic landscape and archaeology arising from likely impacts alongside proposed appropriate mitigation. The assessment identifies and evaluates heritage assets within and surrounding the Study Area and assesses how the Scheme may potentially affect those heritage assets.</p>
Habitats	Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)		<p>Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) concern</p> <p>Respondents questioned how potential contamination events would impact the BNG ambitions of the Scheme.</p>	<p>The Applicant notes that Appendix 9.13 to Chapter 9: Ecology and Biodiversity [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.9] of the Environmental Statement provides the Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Assessment [EN010170/APP/GH6.3.9.13] for the Scheme. This assesses the change in biodiversity value, in terms of numerical units, to watercourses within the Scheme. The assessment shows how the Scheme will likely result in a net percentage gain in Watercourse Units of approximately 16.16%. BNG is separate to general protection measures for watercourses both within the Scheme and off-Site, which are detailed in the Environmental Statement; and the OCEMP [EN010170/APP/GH7.1] for construction works and OLEMP [EN010170/APP/GH7.4] for operational works.</p> <p>The mass reversion of the land within the Scheme to permanent grassland, as opposed to</p>



				<p>current intensive agriculture will result in a significant reduction in the use of chemicals. Farming requires the use of significant quantities of fertilisers, herbicides and pesticides, which may leach into watercourses and degrade their quality.</p> <p>Furthermore, arable farming also entails regular ploughing, which exposes the soil to erosion; airborne dust and soil runoff contaminates watercourses. The degree of soil and dust deposition would be expected to significantly reduce within the operational Scheme. Impacts on wildlife from contaminants will also be reduced and invertebrates populations in particular would be expected to be significantly higher within the operational Scheme due to the availability of enhanced habitat and reduction in the application of toxic pesticides.</p> <p>Impacts on designated sites, habitats and species near to Green Hill BESS will be mitigated through the implementation of embedded mitigation measures to minimise the likelihood and severity of battery fire. The risk of a fire will be moderated through a fire risk management plan, and measures to mitigate impacts in the event of a fire are detailed within an Outline Battery Safety Management Plan and the OEMP.</p> <p>The Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment [EN010170/APP/GH6.3.9.13] commits the developer to delivery of the specified habitats in their associated habitat conditions. Monitoring will assess the condition of habitats against the BNG criteria, with remedial actions implemented should damage be recorded, such as in the scenario of a</p>
--	--	--	--	---



			contamination event.
	Mitigation	<p>Mitigation / buffers</p> <p>Respondents felt that the proposed buffers and mitigation measures against environmental contamination were insufficient. Some suggested that mitigation measures focused on protecting the Scheme, and had not been designed to protect lives, residential properties, or the natural environment.</p> <p>Respondents did not feel confident in the proposed mitigation water systems. There is concern that leakages will contaminate the surrounding land and water.</p> <p>Further information about how the Scheme would isolate contamination events was requested.</p>	<p>The Scheme has been designed to include wide buffers from watercourses, proportionate to their importance, to protect these features from environmental contamination and thereby protect aquatic habitats and species. Effects on ecology and biodiversity are Biodiversity [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.9] of the Environmental Statement.</p> <p>The BESS compounds will include sealed and bunded drainage systems with impermeable linings and self-actuating shut-off valves to isolate and contain any firewater or contaminated runoff, as detailed in Annex J [EN010170/APP/GH6.3.10.11] of the Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy. These measures are designed to prevent discharge to surrounding land and watercourses, including the River Nene.</p>
Socio-economic	Socio-economic concern	<p>Several respondents raised concern about the potential short and long-term impact that contaminated air and water from Green Hill BESS may have on local properties and businesses.</p> <p>A few respondents expressed concern about the potential impact of contaminated air being carried by the prevailing wind towards residential properties and settlements. Respondents did not feel confident that the Applicant would be able to contain this in an air contamination event.</p> <p>Respondents expressed concern about the</p>	<p>Chapter 17: Socio-Economics, Tourism and Recreation [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.17] of the Environmental Statement assesses impacts on the accessibility, desirability and use of public rights of way (PRoWs), open spaces, formal and informal recreation facilities in the countryside in Section 17.8 of the chapter. Opportunities to improve connectivity within the project area have been provided through new permissive paths on six of the nine Sites. Opportunities to develop green infrastructure have been set out through the landscape and ecological proposals as set out in the OLEMP [EN010170/APP/GH7.4], which is secured by Requirement in the Draft DCO [EN010170/APP/GH3.1].</p>



			<p>impact any disruptions to PRowWs would have on recreational and tourist use. Any contamination of routes resulting in environmental degradation has the potential to reduce visitors to the area. It was noted that PRowWs intersecting proposed construction routes would be the most vulnerable to contamination.</p>	
Operations	Maintenance/operation contamination		<p>Concern was raised about the potential contamination of the land and water supply as a result of any site infrastructure chemical cleaning processes.</p>	<p>The BESS compounds will include sealed and bunded drainage systems with impermeable linings and self-actuating shut-off valves to isolate and contain any firewater or contaminated runoff, as detailed in Annex J [EN010170/APP/GH6.3.10.11] of the Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy. These measures are designed to prevent discharge to surrounding land and watercourses, including the River Nene.</p> <p>Please also refer to Chapter 22: Ground Conditions and Contamination [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.22]</p>
	Construction contamination		<p>Many respondents expressed concerns about the impact of construction activities on the local environment and ecosystem. There is an assumption that activities, including vehicle movements and the installation of site infrastructure, will pollute the immediate and particularly during the construction period, to reduce land and water contamination from waste.</p> <p>A few respondents raised concerns about the potential vulnerability of local heritage and archaeological sites to contamination over the lifespan of the Scheme.surrounding areas. Others are concerned that sediment,</p>	<p>The Construction Traffic Management Plan considers road users' safety and how to reduce traffic impacts from the Scheme. The Applicant notes the local highway network that makes up the construction vehicle routes to the Site will be managed in accordance with the Construction Traffic Management Plan to ensure appropriate use by the vehicle numbers forecast over a temporary period. The aim of the Construction Traffic Management Plan is to minimise the effects of construction traffic on the local highway network</p> <p>The Applicant has ensured that prior to the</p>



		<p>dust, silt, and any chemical spillages will contaminate the site and trigger environmental degradation.</p> <p>Respondents suggested that all construction vehicles should be subject to wheel washing to avoid the transfer of mud and general contamination of all public roads.</p> <p>A respondent also suggested that litter picking should be in action across the Scheme,</p>	<p>commencement of any phase of development a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) will be submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority, and this will be secured by the Requirements in the DCO. The CEMP for each phase will be in accordance with the Outline CEMP which will be submitted as part of the DCO application.</p> <p>Recycling and waste measures will be implemented by the Applicant and outlined within the CEMP, in line with industry good practice measures the CEMP will include provisions to maintain site tidiness such as the requirement for clearly labelled waste receptacles.</p>
Impact on existing watercourses	Impact on the River Nene	<p>Respondents frequently cited the proximity of the Scheme to The River Nene, and its location on the Nene flood plain, in contamination concerns. Others referenced general lakes, rivers, brooks, streams and tributaries, in their concerns about the impact of the Scheme on watercourses.</p> <p>A few respondents raised concerns about the potential impact of processing and disposing of site infrastructures, on watercourses. The processing and disposal of BESS infrastructure was a leading concern.</p> <p>A few respondents questioned how the Applicant would remove foul or wastewater from the sites to protect local watercourses. Generally, respondents expressed concern about the cumulative impact of the Scheme on local water quality, and the potential impact a reduction in quality would have on</p>	<p>Where the corridor crosses the River Nene and tributaries near the SPA, the cable will be laid via HDD to avoid impacts to the watercourse and its associated riparian habitats.</p> <p>The Applicant confirms that the impact on the recreational use of the Upper Nene Valley Gravel Pits SPA and Ramsar site has been assessed in Chapter 17: Socio-economics, Tourism and Recreation [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.17], by means of the specific receptors at Grendon Lakes, Summer Leys, and any PRoWs that cross through or between these areas. Landscape planting has been provided on site where practicable to reduce views into the BESS site.</p> <p>The BESS compounds will include sealed and bunded drainage systems with impermeable linings and self-actuating shut-off valves to isolate and contain any firewater or contaminated runoff, as</p>



			humans, flora and fauna.	<p>detailed in Annex J [EN010170/APP/GH6.3.10.11] of the Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy. These measures are designed to prevent discharge to surrounding land and watercourses, including the River Nene.</p> <p>The Applicant is continuing to consider how best to monitor and report on potential leakage risk as part of the final drainage and pollution control design, which will be secured through the DCO. These measures will be developed further at the detailed design stage and secured through the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) and Operational Environmental Management Plan (OEMP), as appropriate.</p> <p>The Applicant will continue to engage with the relevant statutory authorities to agree suitable safeguards, and notes that the proposed mitigation has been designed to minimise the potential for environmental effects on nearby sensitive receptors, including the River Nene.</p>
	Mitigation on impact on local watercourses		<p>Many respondents did not feel that the proposed mitigation measures, to protect and reduce the impact of the Scheme on watercourses, were sufficient.</p> <p>Some respondents attributed this sense of Further details about how the Applicant would effectively manage surface water, particularly in zones of high flood risk, were requested. It was noted that mitigation measures should be applied to mitigate risk across the entire Nene catchment, including upstream of Billing Aquadrome, and all the tributaries (i.e.</p>	<p>Please refer to Chapter 10: Hydrology, Flood Risk and Drainage [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.10] presents the assessment of likely significant effects on hydrology, flood risk and drainage.</p> <p>The baseline for the assessment has been informed by the Environment Agencies online flood map (latest updated March 2025) and where necessary site specific modelling has been carried out.</p> <p>The Environment Agency has been consulted on the Scheme.</p>



		<p>Grendon Brook, Wootton Brook, Dallington Brook, and Bugbrooke Brook).</p> <p>Additional nature-based surface water reduction solutions were welcomed. Respondents recommended any new planting around watercourses be as diverse as possible.</p> <p>Suggestions included the inclusion of grasslands and marginal vegetation.</p> <p>Clarification on the size of buffer zones (metres) around all watercourses, including Main Rivers and Ordinary Watercourses, was requested.</p> <p>It was noted that any fencing should not hinder the direction and rate of water flow.inadequacy with the Applicant's use of out-of-date surface water simulation data. It was suggested that the Applicant consult with the Environment Agency with specific regard to recent local flooding events.</p> <p>Further sustainable drainage solutions were requested.</p>	<p>Section 10.7 of ES Chapter 10, includes the use of permeable surfacing for access tracks, the retention of vegetated groundcover across panelled areas, and the sequential location of critical infrastructure within Flood Zone 1. The implementation of suitable planting (such as a wildflower or grass mix) so the underlying ground cover is strengthened.</p> <p>These features reduce runoff generation and help maintain the existing surface water regime.</p> <p>Sufficient space for SuDS has been provided across the Sites and are further detailed in Chapter 10: Hydrology, Flood Risk and Drainage [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.10]. It is considered that the Application Site will remain largely permeable following development (with the proposed solar panels being raised).</p> <p>A minimum 8 metres buffer has been maintained from all Main Rivers and Ordinary Watercourses in accordance with Environment Agency guidance. This buffer has been increased to 9 metres where required by local policy, including for Ordinary Watercourses within the jurisdiction of North and West Northamptonshire Councils and Milton Keynes City Council. There are no Internal Drainage Board (IDB) watercourses within the site.</p> <p>Chapter 10 of the Environmental Statement considers the potential for cumulative effects with other developments, including in relation to downstream flood risk and water quality.</p>
--	--	--	---



	Construction impact on watercourses		<p>A few respondents raised concerns about the impact of construction activities, particularly vehicle movements, at watercourse crossing points. Some suggested that potential contamination and disruption would negatively impact local wildlife, including otters and water voles.</p> <p>Others expressed concern about the potential impact of increased silt movements and potential chemical spillage or hazardous waste spillage from construction activities on watercourses.</p> <p>Respondents felt that the proposed pollution control measures and emergency response plans were inadequate.</p>	<p>Resultant human health impacts from contamination to groundwater and watercourses as a result of construction disturbance and runoff, and potential for contamination for firewater, are considered in ES Chapter 18: Human Health [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.18], cross-referencing the assessment results in Chapter 10 and Chapter 22 [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.10 and 6.2.22].</p>
--	-------------------------------------	--	--	--

Needs Case



Issue	Sub- issue	User IDs	Summary	Applicant's Response
Needs case	Site selection (size)	225 263 270 319 330 340 33 33 368 146 33 397 398 410 425 426 33 148 224 228 245 246 33 257 280 291 294 136 320 326 330 367 383	<p>Visual impact and loss of countryside</p> <p>Respondents felt the Scheme was too large, and that it would completely alter the surrounding countryside and landscape and impact those seeking to enjoy the beauty of the surrounding countryside.</p> <p>Some responded that the site would be the size of Heathrow Airport, and that it was too large to be built in the area.</p> <p>This included concerns that views from public footpaths towards Easton Maudit, Grendon, Strixton, Castle Ashby and Yardley Hastings would be impacted. The height of the solar panels was also a factor that many respondents believed would contribute to the visual impact, as well as the inadequacy of buffer zones.</p> <p>Many felt that the land on the site should be retained for agricultural use, and therefore opposed the Scheme, given that this has historically been its traditional land use. Many respondents drew attention to the impact that the size of the Scheme would have on biodiversity, including through loss of habitats and the food chain.</p>	<p>Visual impact and loss of countryside</p> <p>The effects associated with the panels and associated infrastructure such as fencing and cameras, and substation and battery storage are presented in Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.8] of the Environmental Statement.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the comments around the size of the Scheme.</p> <p>A Statement of Need [EN010170/APP/GH7.12] has been submitted as part of the with its application which demonstrates that a significant capacity of low carbon solar generation is urgently needed in the UK, and that the Scheme will, if consented, provide an essential progression to meeting the governmental objectives of delivering sustainable development to enable decarbonisation.</p> <p>Large-scale solar schemes in the UK are efficient in comparison to other technologies in terms of the energy they generate over their lifetime on a per unit area basis. Solar technology can generate more energy per hectare of land than growing crops for energy. By following good design principles, solar schemes can generate a similar amount of energy per hectare of land as onshore wind. The Scheme also provides benefits such as Biodiversity Net Gain and the creation of permissive paths.</p>



		414 198 33 218 223 228 235 241 251 282 287 292 33 304 309 315 320 340 342 33 367 381 382 408 419 420 446 447 453 33 457 458 460 463 33		<p>The Applicant notes that the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) considers both the landscape and visual effects of the Scheme independently to ensure both the impacts and effects on the fabric of the landscape are taken into account as well as the views and visibility. The assessment includes a suite of viewpoints that cover a wide range of visual receptors, including public locations such as transport routes, public rights of way, and residential properties. These viewpoints have been discussed and agreed with the competent authority.</p> <p>The mitigation associated with the Scheme is included in the Landscape and Ecology Mitigation & Enhancement Measures forming part of the LVIA with details shown on Figures 8.16.1 to 8.16.10 and Section 8.8 of Chapter 8: Landscape and Visual Impact [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.8] of the Environmental Statement.</p> <p>The landscape measures also include the preparation of an Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (OLEMP) [EN010170/APP/GH7.4] which prescribes how the landscape and ecology mitigation measures identified and proposed would be implemented and managed to ensure the effectiveness and certainty in achieving the objectives.</p> <p>This mitigation has been informed by feedback received and visits undertaken by the Applicant's</p>
--	--	--	--	--



		196 105		landscape consultants throughout the surrounding landscape to satisfy themselves that the extent of embedded and secondary mitigation is appropriate to mitigate the effects of the Scheme on the nearby properties.
		198 199 33 202 204 207 210 131 212 217 218 246 262 264 33 271 280 286 287 294 295 299 300 326 327 333 33 33 346 106 33 357		<p>Regarding the heights of the solar panels, the Environmental Statement employs a maximum design scenario approach reflecting the principle of the 'Rochdale Envelope'. This approach allows for a project to be assessed on the basis of maximum project design parameters for example, the worst-case scenario in order to provide flexibility and take advantage of technological improvements, assessing all potentially significant effects (positive or adverse) within the EIA process and reported in the Environmental Statement. Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.8]) of the Environmental Statement, clearly sets out the details of the design elements including extents and parameters, such as heights and locations that have been used in the assessment.</p> <p>Chapter 17: Socio-Economics, Tourism and Recreation [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.17] of the Environmental Statement considers environmental effects arising as a result of the Scheme, in relation to topics including population health, tourism and accessibility and desirability of recreational facilities. This involves considering the amenity value of the existing footpath network.</p> <p>Regarding potential impacts to habitats and local wildlife, these are assessed and presented in</p>



		358 359 364 189 33 368 369 370 33 371 377 29 379 381 383 391 393 397 33 33 121 406 408 33 427 33 33 446 454 355 456 457 460 468 199		<p>Chapter 9 (Ecology and Biodiversity) [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.9] of the Environmental Statement.</p> <p>Appendix 9.13 shows how the Scheme will likely result in 70.68% in Habitat Units; 18.55% in hedgerow Units; and 16.16% in Watercourse Units. All three elements exceed the minimum 10% and will lead to a substantial biodiversity net gain which will be significant for the local area given the large size of the Scheme.</p> <p>The Biodiversity Net Gain assessment [EN010170/APP/GH6.3.9.13] report also sets out how these calculations are based on the measures set out in the Outline LEMP which will be legally secured under a requirement of the DCO for the life of the Scheme (approximately 60 years) and so ensure that objectives are met and increase the reliability of these projections.</p>
			<p>Impact on nearby villages</p> <p>Respondents highlighted that the size of the Scheme would mean that thousands of local residents and their lives will be affected. There was concern from residents that Easton Maudit and Mears Ashby would be completely surrounded by solar panels. In particular, residents highlighted that the majority of Mears Ashby is within a conservation area, with many historical sites, including a Mediaeval Church, and 28 listed buildings.</p>	<p>The Applicant confirms that consideration of the potential impacts of the Scheme on the mental health and wellbeing of the existing resident population has also been included in the assessment of human health effects in Chapter 18: Human Health [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.18] of the Environmental Statement.</p>



		220 240 242 280 291	Respondents noted that other solar farm schemes are frequently located near industrial areas rather than rural communities.	
		304 306 368 369 370 33 371 377 29 379 381 383 391 393 397 33 33 121 406 408 33 427 33 33 446 454 355 456 457 460	<p>Access points</p> <p>Because of the size of the Scheme, many residents felt, there would be too many access points. There were also concerns regarding the amount of site traffic required to build a site of this scale</p>	<p>Access points</p> <p>Chapter 13 (Transport and Access [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.13]) of the Environmental Statement details the Applicant's consideration of the effects of increased traffic levels during construction.</p> <p>Access points have been assessed through consideration of the factors such as, the nature of the highway from which access may be taken. This includes the wider connections through to the Strategic Road Network and consideration of road widths and posted speed limits. The ability to utilise existing points of access was also considered as preferable in the first instance. Technical considerations such as achieving suitable visibility, and swept path vehicle analysis has also been assessed.</p> <p>Alongside the consideration of direct access points to each Site, the routes on the highway that vehicle movements associated with the Scheme has been considered. Routes have been considered that are suitable for HGV movements. More sensitive routes through villages have been avoided where possible.</p> <p>Section 13.7 summarises the likely effects associated with the movement of vehicles during</p>



		468 199 220 240 242 280 291		the construction phase.
		304 306 307 309 310 320 324 328 335 33 351 33 366 368 376 377	Health A few residents raised concerns over the impact of a large solar farm on the health of those occupying nearby homes. Some respondents were concerned regarding the impact of the size of the Scheme on their mental health, as they feared it would limit their ability to enjoy the countryside.	Health The Applicant acknowledges there will always be some impact on mental health from this type of development in the areas most immediately affected and has assessed this in ES Chapter 18: Human Health [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.18]. This covers community identity, access to the countryside, open space and recreation, and mental wellbeing as a response to physical environmental changes (dust, noise etc.). The Scheme therefore commits to ensuring sufficient mitigation measures are put in place to minimise these.
		388 391 33 408 414 416 33 33 463	Weather Some residents raised concerns that the size of the Scheme will increase heat or affect weather in the area.	Weather There is limited evidence to support this statement. 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.
		196 199 33	Energy generation Residents felt that, based on the size of the Scheme, the amount of energy generated	Energy generation The Applicant disagrees with this statement. Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy EN-1 (as designated)



		131 242 252 273 280 310 311 326 328 334 338 351 352 367 368 370 380 388 393 400 33 196 202 217 220 223 225 227 228 241 246 252 33 266 267	<p>compared to the amount of land taken up by solar panels was inadequate.</p> <p>A few residents also expressed disappointment that they had not been offered any compensation in the form of reduced or no energy cost for the disruption caused over decades of construction, maintenance, and the industrialization of their local environment.</p>	<p>sets out the Government's view that a diverse mix of electricity infrastructure is needed to come forward to deliver a secure, reliable, affordable and net zero consistent energy system during the transition to 2050, and that such a system, in 2050, is likely to be composed predominantly of wind and solar [Paras 3.3.19 & 3.3.20].</p> <p>The draft revised Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy EN-1 (April 2025) states that that the UK has huge potential for solar power and that solar energy is at the heart of the Clean Power 2030 Mission [Paras 2.10.1 & 2.10.2].</p> <p>However, Paragraphs 3.2.6 to 3.2.8 of National Policy Statement (NPS) EN-1 confirm that the Secretary of State (SoS) should assess all applications for development consent for the types of infrastructure covered by the NPS (including solar) on the basis that: 1. Need is established; 2. That the need is urgent; and 3. Substantial weight should be given to this need when considering applications for development consent. The Secretary of State is not required to consider separately the specific contribution of any individual project to satisfying the need established in this NPS.</p> <p>Large-scale solar schemes in the UK are efficient in comparison to other technologies in terms of the energy they generate over their lifetime on a per unit area basis. Solar technology can generate more energy per hectare of land than growing crops for energy. By following good design</p>
--	--	---	---	---



		268 273 275 277 281 282 285 292 297 298 299 300 311 314 315 317 318 314 333 336 342 346 358 364 33 366 367 368 372 375 376 382 383 397 398		<p>principles, solar schemes can generate a similar amount of energy per hectare of land as onshore wind.</p> <p>The inclusion of battery storage as part of the scheme also increases the utility of the scheme in meeting energy demand.</p> <p>A Statement of Need [EN010170/APP/GH7.12] has been submitted as part of the application which demonstrates that a significant capacity of low carbon solar generation is urgently needed in the UK, and that the Scheme will, if consented, provide an essential progression to meeting the governmental objectives of delivering sustainable development to enable decarbonisation. The Applicant intends to make available a community benefit fund and has consulted on the uses to which this could be put.</p>
			<p>Impact of size on ability to provide feedback</p> <p>Some residents felt that the distribution of the Scheme over such a large area was an attempt to make the size of the site ambiguous.</p> <p>Furthermore, a few residents felt that the size of the site meant that residents' concerns would only be noted on local sites, rather than across the entire Scheme.</p>	<p>Impact of size on ability to provide feedback</p> <p>The Applicant's site selection process, including a search for sites, has been undertaken and presented as part of Appendix 5.1 (Site Selection Assessment) of the Environmental Statement. Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.5]) of the Environmental Statement explains in further detail the alternatives that were considered and the design evolution process for the Scheme.</p>
			Tourism	Tourism



		404 408 409 33 414 415 424 33 415 33 446 376 415	Chapter 17 (Socio-Economics, Tourism and Recreation) of the Environmental Statement [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.17] considers potential effects to tourism, both in respect of impacts on the use and desirability of tourism destinations, and on the potential impacts to visitor spending and the tourism-dependent economy. Local facilities including horse riding schools and Sywell Aerodrome as a recreational aviation centre have specifically been assessed.	Chapter 17 (Socio-Economics, Tourism and Recreation) of the Environmental Statement [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.17] considers potential effects to tourism, both in respect of impacts on the use and desirability of tourism destinations, and on the potential impacts to visitor spending and the tourism-dependent economy. Local facilities including horse riding schools and Sywell Aerodrome as a recreational aviation centre have specifically been assessed.
	Site selection (general)	454 458 459 460 33 199 228 33 282 289 265 314 318 323 328 33 358 376 384 385 33 406	Use of agricultural land and food security A point made repeatedly by respondents was that the proposed site was going to be an unnecessary use of good quality agricultural land. Several responses made reference to Best and Most Versatile land (BMV) which outlines quality of land for use for agriculture. Many made the point that the proposed site sat on land with a BMV 1-3a, which is deemed as good quality. Therefore respondents felt that the land should not be used for the solar farm development but instead for production of food. Food security was also an important point to those responding to the consultation, and some felt that food security was in fact as important as energy security.	Use of agricultural land and food security Detailed Agricultural Land Classification surveys (ALC) have been undertaken to identify the grade of the land within the Sites and are reported in Chapter 20: Agriculture Circumstances [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.20] of the Environmental Statement and associated Appendix 20.1 (Agricultural Circumstances). The utilised agricultural area (UAA) in the UK was 16.8 million hectares 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. In addition, the land is not being entirely removed from farming, as sheep grazing may still take place on most of the Sites, allowing it to continue contributing to food production. Furthermore, soil health is expected to improve over the Scheme's 60-year lifespan as the land transitions away from intensive arable farming.



	Cultural Heritage	<p>384 417 418 435 355 355 240 273 341 33 376 388 397 33 404 414 419 376 33 228 33 200 233 334 199 228 240 252 256 266 277 300 309 332</p>	<p>Environmental and heritage impact</p> <p>Many felt that the chosen site was not appropriate due to the potential environmental impact. Flooding was of particular worry, as it was observed by many that the proposed site would be on a flood plain. It was noted that flooding had become a frequent issue in recent years and appeared to be happening with greater regularity.</p> <p>Many felt that the chosen site was out of context with its surroundings, as locations such as Grendon is a designated conservation village, along with Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), heritage sites, numerous listed buildings and the internationally-renowned Waendel Walk.</p> <p>It was also felt that the site was inappropriate due to its proximity to village communities. Residents of Mears Ashby, Easton Mordit and Bozeat expressed alarm at the prospect of being surrounded by the proposed development.</p>	<p>Environmental and heritage impact</p> <p>Chapter 12: Cultural Heritage [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.12] of the Environmental Statement presents an assessment of the effects of the Scheme on cultural heritage and archaeological receptors. This includes an assessment of the Scheme's effect on heritage, historic landscape and archaeology arising from likely impacts alongside proposed appropriate mitigation.</p> <p>The assessment identifies and evaluates heritage assets within and surrounding the Study Area and assesses how the Scheme may potentially affect those heritage assets.</p> <p>Please refer to the Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy [EN010170/APP/GH6.3.10.1]. Details of the process are set out in Appendix 5.1: Site Selection Assessment of the Environmental Statement. Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.5]) of the Environmental Statement explains in further detail the alternatives that were considered and the design evolution process for the Scheme. Areas like Grendon Conservation and heritage sites have been considered in the heritage statement [EN010170/APP/GH6.3.12.1] and the Waendel Walk has been considered in Chapter 17: Socio-economics [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.17].</p>
--	-------------------	--	---	--



	Alternative sites	334 339 33 106 362 368 377 381 382 385 392 414 33	Alternative sites A common theme to emerge from the feedback was the suggestion that brownfield sites and existing infrastructure should be used as an alternative to agricultural land. Sites next to motorways and main roads (on the A509 near Irchester Country Park and the A428 near Denton), industrial buildings and car parks were suggested, as was making solar panels on new builds mandatory.	Alternative sites Details of the process are set out in Appendix 5.1: Site Selection Assessment of the Environmental Statement. Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.5]) of the Environmental Statement explains in further detail the alternatives that were considered and the design evolution process for the Scheme
	Alternative technologies	447 454 106 105 33 211 213 214 227 228 235 236 263 33 272 273 33 276 277 280 285 300	Alternative forms of clean energy Many people expressed support for clean forms of energy, however alternative sources were felt to be more appropriate in this country, such as nuclear and wind, as well as Government subsidies for domestic solar panels.	Alternative forms of clean energy Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy EN-1 (as designated) sets out the Government's view that a diverse mix of electricity infrastructure is needed to come forward to deliver a secure, reliable, affordable and net zero consistent energy system during the transition to 2050, and that such a system, in 2050, is likely to be composed predominantly of wind and solar [Paras 3.3.19 & 3.3.20]. The draft revised Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy EN-1 (April 2025) states that the UK has huge potential for solar power and that solar energy is at the heart of the Clean Power 2030 Mission [Paras 2.10.1 & 2.10.2]. The Applicant will submit a Statement of Need with its application. The Statement will show that



		33 307 311 318 322 328 340 344 106 351 33 359 365 33 366		developments with the proven ability to achieve carbon savings comfortably within the next decade, such as this solar and storage Scheme, are critical to meet the urgent need for new low-carbon generation assets to deliver Clean Power; that new onshore wind and/or nuclear capacity is unlikely to deliver within comparable timescales. The Applicant agrees that domestic solar should also be pursued, but 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 this scheme.
		373 382 384 384 397 398 406 408 384 33 417 421 425 33 428 435 446 384 33 106	<p>General suggested alternative locations for solar / objection to use of agricultural land</p> <p>Developing solar technology in the 'right' place was a leading concern for the majority of respondents.</p> <p>Many respondents were generally in favour of solar, but objected to the proposed locations of the Scheme due to its location on agricultural land. There is a general consensus that solar and associated infrastructure should be incorporated onto existing infrastructure, including new build houses, rooftops, car parks, schools, shopping centres, warehouses and brownfield sites.</p> <p>Respondents felt that the use of these</p>	<p>General suggested alternative locations for solar / objection to use of agricultural land</p> <p>Details of the process are set out in Appendix 5.1: Site Selection Assessment of the Environmental Statement. Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.5]) of the Environmental Statement explains in further detail the alternatives that were considered and the design evolution process for the Scheme.</p> <p>Detailed Agricultural Land Classification surveys (ALC) have been undertaken to identify the grade of the land within the Sites and are reported in Chapter 20: Agriculture Circumstances [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.20] of the Environmental Statement and associated Appendix</p>



		<p>355 alternative locations would also mitigate the 465 potential visual and environmental impact of 355 solar technologies. 105</p> <p>33 Other suggested solar panels should be 236 included on all public buildings (i.e. town 254 halls, council offices, libraries and leisure 263 facilities). It was suggested that electricity 33 generated within the built environment would 276 be close to the point of use therefore 280 minimising transmission and distribution 297 losses. 308</p> <p>316 Several respondents also objected to the siting 323 of solar developments next to sites of 328 archaeological, cultural, environmental, and 351 historical significance. 361</p> <p>389 One respondent suggested locations of solar 408 development should be determined by central 384 government in consultation with local 411 government and landowners and 417 subsequently handed over to developers 427 through tender processes. 432</p> <p>384 A high number of respondents associated the 384 Scheme with an 'industrialisation' of the 33 countryside. 105</p> <p>198 Respondents frequently referenced solar 33 panels, BESS, substation, and cabling in their 131 comments. 218 33 238</p>	<p>20.1 (Agricultural Circumstances).</p> <p>The effects associated with the panels and associated infrastructure such as fencing and cameras, and substation and battery storage are presented in Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.8] of the Environmental Statement.</p> <p>Details of the process are set out in Appendix 5.1: Site Selection Assessment of the Environmental Statement. Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.5]) of the Environmental Statement explains in further detail the alternatives that were considered and the design evolution process for the Scheme.</p> <p>Please refer to Chapter 6: Energy Need, Legislative Context and Energy Policy [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.6].</p>
--	--	--	---



		254 258 259 266	Solar development on brownfield was not perceived to contribute to any further industrialisation of the alternative sites.	
		268 285 290 297 33 311 316 338 33 33 33 346 351 356 361 372 383 398 33 402 420 424 33 429 355 456 457 465 355 466	<p>Smaller, community- led solar sites</p> <p>Others supported the notion of a solar farm, but felt that it should be located on smaller, more controlled, community orientated sites. Community-led solar farms on contained sites were also suggested as an alternative to the Scheme. This approach was not considered to harm the character and landscape of a local community, in comparison to the Scheme.</p>	<p>Selection Assessment of the Environmental Statement. Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.5]) of the Environmental Statement explains in further detail the alternatives that were considered and the design evolution process for the Scheme.</p> <p>The Applicant will submit a Statement of Need as part of its application. The Statement will describe the requirement for large-scale solar schemes to connect to electricity networks, and the benefits of those schemes making use of existing and available infrastructure and connections. The Scheme proposes to connect to the National Electricity Transmission Scheme (NETS) to bring forward a project of a scale which will make a considerable contribution to the urgent need for new low-carbon energy infrastructure. The connection of smaller, individual schemes would not make use of the NETS and would therefore not make use of that existing and available infrastructure. Further, very many smaller schemes would be required to bring forward the same scale of benefits as would be delivered by the scheme.</p>



		105 33 210 33 33 213 218 148 122 232 236 238 240 241 254 33	Reduced risk associated with alternative locations Respondents also felt that the use of alternative sites would reduce the potential risks to harm humans and animals. Smaller sites, such as the use of domestic and commercial rooftops were associated with a reduced risk for environmental harm.	Selection Assessment of the Environmental Statement. Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.5]) of the Environmental Statement explains in further detail the alternatives that were considered and the design evolution process for the Scheme. The Applicant agrees that domestic solar should also be pursued, but 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 this scheme.
		266 33 270 277 279 290 295 297 298 299 33 33 327 333 338 339	Domestic solar Respondents generally accepted that there is space for solar development in the UK. Many respondents felt confident that the use of domestic solar would adequately support the clean energy transition. A high number of respondents questioned why domestic solar installations were not mandated for new build houses and housing developments.	Selection Assessment of the Environmental Statement. Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.5]) of the Environmental Statement explains in further detail the alternatives that were considered and the design evolution process for the Scheme. The Applicant agrees that domestic solar should also be pursued, but 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 this scheme.
		33 33 350	Northamptonshire / Milton Keynes specific alternative locations	Selection Assessment of the Environmental Statement. Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.5])



		<p>106 351 352 357 358 189 369 370 372 146 379 381 384 387 388 392 419 424 428 430 33 33 384 376 397 424 376 456 466 196 206 253 281 306 306</p> <p>It was noted that Northamptonshire and Milton Keynes possess a high number of warehouses and factories. Respondents questioned why this roof space was not being utilised for solar technologies and small scale batteries.</p> <p>New distribution centres, supermarket and airport car parks, major highways, roads, railways, and the land beside motorways were also put forward as appropriate alternatives for solar development. Some felt that the lack of development in these locations represented a missed opportunity for solar development.</p> <p>The Brackmills Industrial Estate was referenced as an example of an alternative location with flat roofed warehouses available for solar development.</p> <p>Some respondents requested further clarification around why the current site has been chosen and further information about alternative brownfield land being sought, including the Grendon site. Castle Ashby Compton Estates, Deer Park Farm, land further east towards Wilby and land North East towards Park Farm in Wellingborough were proposed as alternative sites to the sites under consideration in Easton Maudit. One respondent suggested that land labelled Green Hill E is unreasonably close to Mears Ashby and should be reconsidered.</p> <p>One respondent also requested that the</p>	<p>of the Environmental Statement explains in further detail the alternatives that were considered and the design evolution process for the Scheme.</p> <p>The Applicant agrees that domestic / rooftop solar should also be pursued, but domestic / rooftop 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 this scheme.</p>
--	--	--	---



		307 33 362 368 414 33 459 33 33 33 33 33 33 33 460 461 462 463 233 33 384 33 436 33 376 453 355 455 468 33 33 82 105 106 121	Scheme clarifies the minimum size of land parcels that it targeted as part of its selection process.	
--	--	--	--	--



		122		
		129		
		131		
		136		
		146		
		148		
		189		
		196		
		198		
		199		
		202		
		204		
		205		
		207		
		208		
		209		
		210		
		211		
		212		
		213		
		217		
		218		
		220		
		223		
		224		
		227		
		232		
		233		
		236		
		237		
		238		
		239		
		240		
		241		
		242		



		246		
		247		
		251		
		252		
		254		
		255		
		257		
		260		
		262		
		263		
		264		
		265		
		266		
		268		
		269		
		270		
		271		
		273		
		274		
		275		
		276		
		277		
		280		
		281		
		282		
		285		
		286		
		287		
		292		
		294		
		295		
		297		
		299		
		300		
		301		



		302		
		304		
		305		
		307		
		308		
		311		
		312		
		313		
		314		
		315		
		318		
		320		
		321		
		323		
		324		
		326		
		327		
		328		
		330		
		333		
		334		
		335		
		336		
		337		
		338		
		340		
		341		
		342		
		343		
		344		
		346		
		347		
		349		
		352		
		354		



		355		
		357		
		358		
		359		
		363		
		364		
		365		
		366		
		367		
		368		
		369		
		370		
		371		
		373		
		374		
		376		
		377		
		378		
		379		
		380		
		381		
		382		
		383		
		384		
		387		
		391		
		393		
		397		
		398		
		400		
		403		
		404		
		406		
		408		
		409		



		410 411 414 415 418 419 420 423 424 425 426 427 430 432 435 446 454 455 456 457 458 459 460 461 462 463 464 465 467 33 196 105 198 204 208		
--	--	--	--	--



		210 211 131 212 214 217 218 220 148 224 229 230 33 105 198 213 214 216 217 220 148 33 224 228 233 240 241 245 255 256 257 263 264 265 266		
--	--	---	--	--



		33 268 270 273 274 278 280 285 287 289 291 292 297 299 301 302 307 308 312 314 82 316 318 319 326 314 332 336 345 346 106 351 353 358 360		
--	--	---	--	--



		368 369 373 374 379 384 386 388 389 391 392 393 394 398 400 403 406 410 414 415 420 425 428 432 434 435 415 446 384 415 106 355 455 457 460		
--	--	---	--	--



		465 467 468 199 200 33 211 217 220 227 229 33 122 233 236 237 247 254 33 255 256 263 266 270 272 274 276 278 291 291 136 328 330 337 33		
--	--	---	--	--



		344 349 361 33 33 366 368 378 33 391 397 398 400 406 33 414 417 419 420 424 33 429 432 431 33 446 355 455 458 468 33 105 198 33 213		
--	--	---	--	--



		214 216 217 220 148 33 33 224 228 233 33 240 241 245 33 255 256 257 263 264 265 266 267 33 268 268 270 273 274 33 278 280 285 287 289		
--	--	---	--	--



		291 292 297 299 33 301 302		
		33 307 308 33 312 314 82 316 318 319 321 326 314 332 388 389 391 392 393 394 398 400 403 406 410 414 33	Additional power generation Respondents were concerned that solar and wind cannot solely replace more traditional forms of power generation. Many respondents suggested nuclear as a good alternative to generate enough power needed to meet demand. Respondents suggested a range of diverse power generation should be used such as wind, solar, nuclear, hydropower, biomass, tidal, hydro-electricity and geothermal.	Noted. Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy EN-1 (as designated) sets out the Government's view that a diverse mix of electricity infrastructure is needed to come forward to deliver a secure, reliable, affordable and net zero consistent energy system during the transition to 2050, and that such a system, in 2050, is likely to be composed predominantly of wind and solar [Paras 3.3.19 & 3.3.20]. The draft revised Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy EN-1 (April 2025) states that that the UK has huge potential for solar power and that solar energy is at the heart of the Clean Power 2030 Mission [Paras 2.10.1 & 2.10.2]. The government's Clean Power 2030 Action Plan sets out capacity ranges for key technologies for 2030 and 2035. The capacity range (which represents the capacity government seeks to prioritise for connection), for solar generation is currently 45-47 GW by 2030 and 45-69GW by 2035.



		415 419 420 422 33 336 33 33 345 346 106 351 33 353 358 360 33 33 368 369 33 373 374 379 384 384 386 388 389 391 392 393 394 398		
--	--	---	--	--



		400 403 406 410 414 33 415 419 420 422 33		
		425 33 33 428 432 434 435 415 33 33 33 33 446 33 384 384 33 415 353 33 106 355 455	Energy use Some respondents were concerned that energy produced would be sold internationally, rather than locally and within the UK.	<p>The Clean Power 2030 Action Plan includes a definition of government's Clean Power target. The UK government's Clean Power target means that, in a typical weather year: Clean sources produce at least as much power as Great Britain consumes in total (in 2023, clean sources produced 56% of GB consumption; and Clean sources produce at least 95% of Great Britain's generation (in 2023, clean sourced produced 60% of GB generation.</p> <p>The Scheme will generate low carbon power to support the UK to meet its Clean Power target.</p>



		457 460 465 355 467 468 33 207 33 246 256 260 33 268 33 280 287 330 333 359 376 33 384 397 384 33 415 435 415 33 33 446 33 384 376		
--	--	--	--	--



		415 456 194 208 211 122 233 33 274 321 410 457 33 202 208 220 238 239 269 287 294 33 365 387 393 417 33 370 384 384 402 33 266 276 276		
--	--	--	--	--



		457 233 233 349 372 384 384 384 465 205 105 33 214 238 239 251 254 260 273 286 297 305 410 415 420 423 432 415 33 33 33 415 196 198 212		
--	--	---	--	--



		268 277 349 370 382 384 384 387 384 418 198 209 239 252 257 262 268 274 287 321 328 332 106 421 33 33 33 105 33 212 218 223 238 239 241		
--	--	---	--	--



		252 33 257 260 265 33 267 268 270 277 278 279 291 33 301 33 304 307 318 319 321 336 350 352 357 33 370 372 388 392 33 357 455 458 460		
--	--	---	--	--



		461 462 465 466 196 105 198 204 33 208 210 211 33 33 131 212 214 217 218 220 148 224 229 33 230 122 232 234 33 236 240 245 251 254 33		
--	--	---	--	--



		257 259 260 33 269 271 273 274 275 280 282 287 291 294 298 300 33 301 303 33 305 311 312 313 315 317 319 321 322 323 324 327 328 331 333		
--	--	--	--	--



		335 339 33 345 347 33 352 356 358 359 361 189 33 366 368 369 379 384 384 387 388 389 391 392 397 400 33 402 403 121 406 409 384 410 411		
--	--	---	--	--



		33 129 33 415 419 33 424 426 33 33 428 430 431 432 431 434 415 33 384 384 415 33 33 458 459 462		
	Cumulative impact	129 146 196 201 209 213 217 224 225	Proximity to current and proposed energy infrastructure Respondents expressed concern that the proposed development was close to existing and proposed energy infrastructure, such as the BESS at Grendon Lakes, smaller scale solar farms at Irchester and Doddington, as well as the Burton Wold wind farm. In addition,	<p>The effects associated with the panels and associated infrastructure such as fencing and cameras, and substation and battery storage are presented in Chapter 8 (Landscape and Visual Impact) [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.8] of the Environmental Statement.</p> <p>Outline Battery Storage Safety Management Plan [EN010170/APP/GH7.7] As part of the BSSMP to</p>



		<p>227 proposals for farms at Wellingborough and 232 Kingsthorpe were also highlighted. Concerns 233 also focused on the cumulative impact of 236 multiple construction phases; with noise, 239 vibration and pollution frequently referenced 242 as high risk impacts. A regional cumulative 245 assessment of the potential impacts of new 253 planning applications on the local ecosystem 257 was 263 suggested. 264 280 284 285 290 292 298 300 301 304 307 311 312 314</p>	<p>be prepared prior to construction of the BESS, 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.16: Air Quality [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.16] will also assess emissions generated in the event of a BESS fire during the operational phase.</p> <p>Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.14] of the Environmental Statement evaluates the likely significant effects of the Scheme on nearby noise and vibration sensitive receptors during construction, operation and decommissioning.</p> <p>Please refer to Chapter 25: Cumulative effects [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.25] where other construction phases are considered.</p>
		<p>315 Cumulative impact on the environment 317 327 The perceived threat of BESS fire event on 333 wetlands, watercourses and soils was a closely 337 associated concern. 339 340 Tight management and control over water in 341 and out of the BESS area to protect local 342 ecology was suggested. The impact on the 343 country to produce food was also raised, with 344</p>	<p>Cumulative impact on the environment</p> <p>The Outline Battery Storage Safety Management Plan [EN010170/APP/GH7.7]. As part of the BSSMP to be prepared prior to construction of the BESS, 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.</p>



		346 351 354 361 33 367 368 373 376 378 380 382 384 391	many contributors suggesting that with the prevalence of solar farms and other renewable energy sites, the amount of available good-quality agricultural land was diminishing.	<p>The land used for the Scheme makes up only a negligible proportion of the agricultural land in the UK used for food production.</p> <p>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. In addition, the land is not being entirely removed from farming, as sheep grazing may still take place on most of the Sites, allowing it to continue contributing to food production</p>
		397 398 343 344 346 351 354 361 33 367 368 373 376 378 380	<p>Proximity to other developments</p> <p>Several contributors highlighted that there had been a surge in other forms of development, such as housing and industrial developments.</p> <p>Respondents noted that a large number of industrial estates had been built within the last 20 years, adding to the feeling that a rural region was quickly becoming industrialised and the landscape was being permanently altered.</p>	<p>Please refer to Chapter 25: Cumulative effects [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.25] where other developments are considered.</p>
	Alternative technologies	382 384 391 397 398 400	<p>Use of alternative renewable Technologies</p> <p>Respondents shared that they were unsure that solar could work alone and did not see it as a viable replacement, suggesting the use</p>	<p>The Applicant's site selection process, including a search for sites, has been undertaken and presented as part of Appendix 5.1 (Site Selection Assessment) of the Environmental Statement. Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.5]) of the</p>



		<p>402 of alternative technologies instead. The</p> <p>408 problems with solar were cited to be that it</p> <p>33 was less productive, less reliable, less</p> <p>409 effective, not aesthetically pleasing, has an</p> <p>410 effect on biodiversity, and caused</p> <p>417 environmental damaged in communities.</p> <p>419</p> <p>424 Many also cited that the UK's location and</p> <p>33 climate to be an important reason as to why</p> <p>33 we cannot rely on solar. Respondents</p> <p>33 suggested that the northern hemisphere is not</p> <p>446 suited to solar energy production, and that</p> <p>453 even the weeks of sunlight in summer would</p> <p>454 not produce enough energy. It was argued to</p> <p>455 be crucial that renewable energy sources are</p> <p>457 selected based on geographical suitability.</p> <p>463 Respondents had concerns that due to</p> <p>465 climate change, a lack of sunshine, overcast</p> <p>467 weather, and the UK's topography, the scope</p> <p>33 for solar would be limited.</p> <p>33</p> <p>33 Respondents were concerned with whether</p> <p>33 solar could produce enough energy to replace</p> <p>33 the more reliable and traditional forms of</p> <p>33 energy generation.</p> <p>196</p> <p>200 Respondents also flagged concerns that</p> <p>235 battery can only back up wind and solar for</p> <p>106 relatively brief periods of time and the idea</p> <p>361 that battery can provide enough power to</p> <p>397 back up the shortfall from wind and solar</p> <p>398 would be naïve.</p> <p>424</p> <p>408 Comments were made that the transition</p> <p>199 away from fossil fuels should not be</p>	<p>Environmental Statement explains in further detail the alternatives that were considered and the design evolution process for the Scheme. Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy EN-1 (as designated) sets out the Government's view that a diverse mix of electricity infrastructure is needed to come forward to deliver a secure, reliable, affordable and net zero consistent energy system during the transition to 2050, and that such a system, in 2050, is likely to be composed predominantly of wind and solar [Paras 3.3.19 & 3.3.20].</p> <p>The draft revised Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy EN-1 (April 2025) states that that the UK has huge potential for solar power and that solar energy is at the heart of the Clean Power 2030 Mission [Paras 2.10.1 & 2.10.2].</p> <p>However, Paragraphs 3.2.6 to 3.2.8 of National Policy Statement (NPS) EN- 1 confirm that the Secretary of State (SoS) should assess all applications for development consent for the types of infrastructure covered by the NPS (including solar) on the basis that: 1. Need is established; 2. That the need is urgent; and 3. Substantial weight should be given to this need when considering applications for development consent. The Secretary of State is not required to consider separately the specific contribution of any individual project to satisfying the need established in this NPS.</p> <p>Large-scale solar schemes in the UK are efficient</p>
--	--	---	---



		<p>238 interpreted as a blanket approval for all 268 renewable energy proposals. Also, that every 106 area should share the new technology, 355 whether it be wind, solar or other. 33</p> <p>232 Instead, it was 233 suggested that solar is best suited for 256 brownfield sites, industrial areas, car parks, 267 and roads, where it can mitigate heat island 272 effects, improved heat and energy retention, 276 and reduce flood risks associated with paving 297 over absorbent land and removing 307 vegetation. 33</p>	<p>in comparison to other technologies in terms of the energy they generate over their lifetime on a per unit area basis. Solar technology can generate more energy per hectare of land than growing crops for energy. By following good design principles, solar schemes can generate a similar amount of energy per hectare of land as onshore wind.</p>
		<p>316 Combination of 328 energy technologies 332</p> <p>33 Many respondents saw the need for a 106 combination of energy types, and not a total 33 reliance on solar. They understood that one 366 source of energy would not be enough, and 367 they would support a combination of 372 technologies. 29</p> <p>380 Respondents suggested that a mix that 33 contains renewables to be important, but 389 some suggested that energy needs to be 397 balanced with a base such as fossil fuels, 398 gas, or nuclear. Similarly, some believe that 121 renewables are too inefficient and would 414 struggle to meet demand. Respondents 416 suggested that a blend of energy sources 415 would be the most sensible and sustainable 424 route to energy security, and showed support 429</p>	<p>Selection Assessment of the Environmental Statement. Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.5]) of the Environmental Statement explains in further detail the alternatives that were considered and the design evolution process for the Scheme.</p> <p>Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy EN-1 (as designated) sets out the Government's view that a diverse mix of electricity infrastructure is needed to come forward to deliver a secure, reliable, affordable and net zero consistent energy system during the transition to 2050, and that such a system, in 2050, is likely to be composed predominantly of wind and solar [Paras 3.3.19 & 3.3.20].</p> <p>The draft revised Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy EN-1 (April 2025) states</p>



		415 355 455 465 355 33 196 228 235 258 272 277 280	for new cleaner technology in future. Use all naturally arising sources of energy.	that that the UK has huge potential for solar power and that solar energy is at the heart of the Clean Power 2030 Mission [Paras 2.10.1 & 2.10.2]. The government's Clean Power 2030 Action Plan sets out capacity ranges for key technologies for 2030 and 2035. The capacity range (which represents the capacity government seeks to prioritise for connection), for solar generation is currently 45-47 GW by 2030 and 45-69GW by 2035.
		290 318 328 329 333 33 352 360 361 364 366 372 146 33 397 408 409 419 423 424 429 199	Natural gas, coal, and other fossil fuels Some respondents believe we should be using natural gas and oil reserves before spending money on solar and would like to see investment in gas and oil storage over other technologies. Respondents suggested that there is still lots of coal and gas in and around the UK, and that we should use up the fossil fuels that we have first before extending to solar or wind. Some noted that we have enough natural gas from fracking to give us cheap energy for centuries. It was suggested we exploit the large deposits of coal, oil and gas that are already here. Respondents suggested that fossil fuels are cheaper to use, and that losing gas storage in UK was a mistake and that the reliance on outside sources for energy and food needs	Selection Assessment of the Environmental Statement. Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.5]) of the Environmental Statement explains in further detail the alternatives that were considered and the design evolution process for the Scheme. Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy EN-1 (as designated) sets out the Government's view that a diverse mix of electricity infrastructure is needed to come forward to deliver a secure, reliable, affordable and net zero consistent energy system during the transition to 2050, and that such a system, in 2050, is likely to be composed predominantly of wind and solar [Paras 3.3.19 & 3.3.20]. The draft revised Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy EN-1 (April 2025) states that that the UK has huge potential for solar power and



		213 238 268 276 276 33 106 365 380 384 384 404 425 106 355 455 355 82 352 364 366 372 146 33 397 408 409 419 423 424 429 199 213 238 268	to be reversed.	that solar energy is at the heart of the Clean Power 2030 Mission [Paras 2.10.1 & 2.10.2]. The government's Clean Power 2030 Action Plan sets out capacity ranges for key technologies for 2030 and 2035. The capacity range (which represents the capacity government seeks to prioritise for connection), for solar generation is currently 45-47 GW by 2030 and 45-69GW by 2035.
			Wind Many respondents suggested that wind should be the primary renewable energy source due to its superior effectiveness, efficiency, and productivity. It was argued that both onshore and off-shore wind should be the primary source of energy as solar has significantly less potential and is not as beneficial or potent as wind power. Respondents also noted that wind turbines have many benefits over solar. This includes that they do not remove the surrounding land from agricultural use, are more efficient, have less impact on communities, less damage to the environment, use less emissions, do not need water for cooling, have no negative impacts on waterways, lakes and floodplains, are better suited to rural areas, and have a smaller footprint than solar. Furthermore, that they create more power for	Selection Assessment of the Environmental Statement. Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.5]) of the Environmental Statement explains in further detail the alternatives that were considered and the design evolution process for the Scheme. Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy EN-1 (as designated) sets out the Government's view that a diverse mix of electricity infrastructure is needed to come forward to deliver a secure, reliable, affordable and net zero consistent energy system during the transition to 2050, and that such a system, in 2050, is likely to be composed predominantly of wind and solar [Paras 3.3.19 & 3.3.20]. The draft revised Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy EN-1 (April 2025) states that that the UK has huge potential for solar power and that solar energy is at the heart of the Clean Power 2030 Mission [Paras



		276 276 33 106 365 380 384 384 404 425 106 355 455 355 82 352 455 200 225 237	less waste and less volume. Some respondents also noted that they preferred that wind power uses less cabling. Some respondents argued that neither wind or solar should be used as they cannot provide the power that we need for business and infrastructure.	2.10.1 & 2.10.2]. The government's Clean Power 2030 Action Plan sets out capacity ranges for key technologies for 2030 and 2035. The capacity range (which represents the capacity government seeks to prioritise for connection), for solar generation is currently 45-47 GW by 2030 and 45-69GW by 2035. Large-scale solar schemes in the UK are efficient in comparison to other technologies in terms of the energy they generate over their lifetime on a per unit area basis. Solar technology can generate more energy per hectare of land than growing crops for energy. By following good design principles, solar schemes can generate a similar amount of energy per hectare of land as onshore wind.
		245 276 332 465 196 105 432 233 532 542 19 7 198 33 201	Nuclear Respondents expressed that they see nuclear, as the viable alternative to solar as they believe it offers the best security for energy requirements and is important for reaching energy demands. Respondents stated safe and reliable nuclear would be the best alternative to fossil fuels instead of a reliance on solar and wind, and would like to see it as a permanent feature of energy security. Respondents understand the benefits of nuclear to be that it is available 24/7, not	Selection Assessment of the Environmental Statement. Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.5]) of the Environmental Statement explains in further detail the alternatives that were considered and the design evolution process for the Scheme. Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy EN-1 (as designated) sets out the Government's view that a diverse mix of electricity infrastructure is needed to come forward to deliver a secure, reliable, affordable and net zero consistent energy system during the transition to 2050, and that such a system, in 2050, is likely to be



		<p>203 weather dependent, is the best long term 205 option, that it is environmentally friendly, have 208 less impact on communities, less damage to 212 the environment, does not use farm land, 214 clean, cost effective, and helps mitigate against 216 the need of additional storage sites.</p> <p>217</p> <p>148 Some noted that they believe nuclear is 33 underutilised, and that they would like to see 224 more support and investment for nuclear and 223 prioritisation from the government. 226 Respondents also 227 stated that they thought small scale nuclear 228 has been sidelined and would like to see the 229 use of carbon free technology like small 33 nuclear reactors. 234 Respondents highlighted the need for a 235 balance of different energy alternatives with 236 nuclear. 237 Some called for the deployment of small 238 modular reactors (SMRs) to address the UK's 239 energy challenges.</p> <p>241</p> <p>243</p> <p>245</p> <p>247</p> <p>33</p> <p>255</p> <p>258</p> <p>259</p>	<p>composed predominantly of wind and solar [Paras 3.3.19 & 3.3.20].</p> <p>The draft revised Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy EN-1 (April 2025) states that that the UK has huge potential for solar power and that solar energy is at the heart of the Clean Power 2030 Mission [Paras 2.10.1 & 2.10.2].</p> <p>The government's Clean Power 2030 Action Plan sets out capacity ranges for key technologies for 2030 and 2035. The capacity range (which represents the capacity government seeks to prioritise for connection), for solar generation is currently 45-47 GW by 2030 and 45-69GW by 2035.</p> <p>The Applicant will submit a Statement of Need with its application. The Statement will show that developments with the proven ability to achieve carbon savings comfortably within the next decade, such as this solar and storage Scheme, are critical to meet the urgent need for new low-carbon generation assets to deliver Clean Power; that new onshore wind and/or nuclear capacity is unlikely to deliver within comparable timescales.</p>
		<p>260 Hydropower/tidal</p> <p>261</p> <p>263 Some respondents suggested that tidal 266 should be prioritised and considered as a 271 permanent source of energy. It was</p>	<p>Selection Assessment of the Environmental Statement. Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.5]) of the Environmental Statement explains in</p>



		273 277 278 279 280 281 282 284 285 289 291 293 291 299 33 303 33 308 311 313 316 318 319 322 328 330 334 336 337 341 342 343 346 349 33	suggested that we utilise the UK's position as an island and the rivers that are available	<p>further detail the alternatives that were considered and the design evolution process for the Scheme.</p> <p>Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy EN-1 (as designated) sets out the Government's view that a diverse mix of electricity infrastructure is needed to come forward to deliver a secure, reliable, affordable and net zero consistent energy system during the transition to 2050, and that such a system, in 2050, is likely to be composed predominantly of wind and solar [Paras 3.3.19 & 3.3.20].</p> <p>The draft revised Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy EN-1 (April 2025) states that that the UK has huge potential for solar power and that solar energy is at the heart of the Clean Power 2030 Mission [Paras 2.10.1 & 2.10.2].</p> <p>The government's Clean Power 2030 Action Plan sets out capacity ranges for key technologies for 2030 and 2035. The capacity range (which represents the capacity government seeks to prioritise for connection), for solar generation is currently 45-47 GW by 2030 and 45-69GW by 2035.</p> <p>Hydropower/tidal technology is not a suitable technology for the proposed location.</p>
			Hydrogen	Selection Assessment of the Environmental Statement. Chapter 5 (Alternatives and



		361 362 189 384 384 387 388 389 396 399 400 401 33 402 403 404 408 409 384 33 129 414 416 417 419 420 421 33 423 425 426 33 427 428 432	<p>Respondents noted that hydrogen engine and storage development is improving every day, and has the potential to replace both fossil fuels and electric.</p>	<p>Design Evolution [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.5]) of the Environmental Statement explains in further detail the alternatives that were considered and the design evolution process for the Scheme.</p> <p>The Applicant agrees that hydrogen is an important technology for the government to support in pursuit of its Clean Power aims. Hydrogen technology requires the production of large quantities of hydrogen.</p> <p>Producing hydrogen through electrolysis of water is expected to require a significant increase in low- carbon generation capacity. Therefore hydrogen is not an alternative to solar power, but the use of hydrogen in our energy system requires solar (and other low-carbon) generating infrastructure.</p>
			<p>Power plant</p> <p>A respondent suggested that a power plant should be built which would deliver more energy with less negative impact.</p>	<p>Selection Assessment of the Environmental Statement. Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.5]) of the Environmental Statement explains in further detail the alternatives that were considered and the design evolution process for the Scheme.</p> <p>Large-scale solar schemes in the UK are efficient in comparison to other technologies in terms of the energy they generate over their lifetime on a per unit area basis. Solar technology can generate more energy per hectare of land than growing crops for energy. By following good design</p>



		33 415 436 33 446 384 453 33 458 460 462 464 178		principles, solar schemes can generate a similar amount of energy per hectare of land as onshore wind.
		467 197 199 201 202 210 213 214 220 148 33 225 226 227 228 229 231 122	Solar panels A respondent suggested that every new build should install solar panels and heat pumps.	Selection Assessment of the Environmental Statement. Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.5]) of the Environmental Statement explains in further detail the alternatives that were considered and the design evolution process for the Scheme.
	Support for solar / renewables	235 237 238 239	Responding to the climate crisis The majority of respondents recognised the need for action on climate change. Many showed concern for the wellbeing on future generations including the impact of floods, fires, and the destruction of homes. They suggested that the UK needs to reduce its environmental impact and reliance on energy produced by fossil fuels. Some respondents acknowledged that while reaching net zero was an important goal, we are also relying on other nations to take action to have an impact, which is not guaranteed. These respondents note that the impact of the UK's drive towards net zero is minimal compared to that of larger countries.	Chapter 7: Climate Change [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.7] of the Environmental Statement presents the findings of the Environmental Impact Assessment concerning the potential impacts of the Scheme on the Climate inclusive of an analysis of the carbon footprint of constructing the solar farm and whether the renewable energy produced can sufficiently offset this.
			The need for renewable energy Many respondents agreed that investing in green energy is the best way for the UK to	Please refer to Chapter 6: Energy Need, Legislative Context and Energy Policy [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.6] for energy need to meet the UK Government's requirements.



		<p>241 reduce its environmental impact as an</p> <p>245 alternative to fossil fuels.</p> <p>246</p> <p>247</p> <p>253 The issue of the UK's dependency on</p> <p>255 international energy imports was also raised,</p> <p>256 with some respondents advocating for the need</p> <p>258 for energy independence in order to ensure</p> <p>259 energy costs are kept low. However, others</p> <p>261 raised that food security was of equal</p> <p>265 importance, and hence objected to the loss of</p> <p>33 agricultural land.</p> <p>268</p> <p>271</p> <p>273</p> <p>33</p> <p>279</p> <p>281</p> <p>282</p> <p>289</p> <p>290</p> <p>291</p> <p>293</p> <p>297</p> <p>299</p> <p>136</p> <p>33</p> <p>303</p> <p>33</p> <p>304</p> <p>307</p> <p>333</p> <p>312</p> <p>313</p> <p>314</p>	<p>reduce its environmental impact as an alternative to fossil fuels.</p> <p>The issue of the UK's dependency on international energy imports was also raised, with some respondents advocating for the need for energy independence in order to ensure energy costs are kept low. However, others raised that food security was of equal importance, and hence objected to the loss of agricultural land.</p>	<p>The Clean Power 2030 Action Plan includes a definition of government's Clean Power target. The UK government's Clean Power target means that, in a typical weather year: Clean sources produce at least as much power as Great Britain consumes in total (in 2023, clean sources produced 56% of GB consumption; and Clean sources produce at least 95% of Great Britain's generation (in 2023, clean sourced produced 60% of GB generation).</p> <p>The Scheme will generate low carbon power to support the UK to meet its Clean Power target, thereby reducing the UK's dependency on imports of foreign electricity.</p> <p>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. In addition, the land is not being entirely removed from farming, as sheep grazing may still take place on most of the Sites, allowing it to continue contributing to food production. Furthermore, soil health is expected to improve over the Scheme's 60-year lifespan as the land transitions away from intensive arable farming.</p>
		<p>304 Support for solar energy</p> <p>307</p> <p>333</p> <p>312</p> <p>313</p> <p>314</p>	<p>Many respondents supported the role that solar panels play in reducing our reliance on fossil fuels. They highlighted that solar is clean and carbon neutral.</p>	<p>The applicant notes these comments.</p> <p>The Clean Power 2030 Action Plan includes a definition of government's Clean Power target. The UK government's Clean Power target means</p>



		320 321 323 332 333 334 340 342 344 345 33 346 33 353 356 359 368 369 370 372 373 146 379 383 384 384	<p>Some respondents also highlighted the importance of the UK producing its own energy and reducing its reliance on international imports.</p> <p>One respondent conveyed that their previous experience of living near solar farms had been quiet, and that the biodiversity of the site had improved.</p> <p>Some respondents also raised issues regarding the importing of solar panels to the UK. These respondents were under the impression that these solar panels were being imported from China, and would be exposed to uncertainties regarding international geopolitics. Some respondents also raised concerns regarding human rights abuses in China related to the production of PV panels.</p> <p>Some residents felt that by the time the scheme is finalised, current EV technology will have become outdated or surpassed. There was also concern that the solar energy would be sold abroad.</p>	<p>that, in a typical weather year: Clean sources produce at least as much power as Great Britain consumes in total (in 2023, clean sources produced 56% of GB consumption; and Clean sources produce at least 95% of Great Britain's generation (in 2023, clean sourced produced 60% of GB generation.</p> <p>The Scheme will generate low carbon power to support the UK to meet its Clean Power target, thereby reducing the UK's dependency on imports of foreign electricity.</p> <p>The Scheme will follow the Rochdale Envelope Advice note and will allow flexibility to utilise technological advances.</p> <p>IGP is a signatory of the Solar Energy UK supply chain statement, which commits the company to a transparent, sustainable supply chain free of human rights abuses.</p>
--	--	--	---	---



	General opposition	392	General objections	Section 4.2 of the Statement of Need
		393		[EN010170/APP/GH7.12] , describes the
		399	Many respondents objected to the Scheme,	Government's policy that large capacities of low-
		403	believing it should not be brought forward,	carbon generation will be required to meet
		410	including specific requests for it to be	increased demand and replace output from
		414	abandoned.	retiring (fossil fuel) plants, and that "a
		33		<i>secure, reliable, affordable, Net Zero consistent</i>
		416		<i>system in 2050 is likely to be composed</i>
		421		<i>predominantly of wind and solar</i> ".
		33		
		33		The draft revised Overarching National Policy
		33		Statement for Energy EN-1 (April 2025) states
		430		that that the UK has huge potential for solar power
		431		and that solar energy is at the heart of the Clean
		433		Power 2030 Mission [Paras
		431		2.10.1 & 2.10.2].
		33		
		447		This Scheme therefore directly contributes towards
		33		meeting the national net zero and energy security
		384		requirements for the near future.
		384		
		355	BMV land and agriculture	Detailed Agricultural Land Classification surveys
		458		(ALC) have been undertaken to identify the grade
		460	A large number of respondents objected on	of the land within the Sites and are reported in
		463	the grounds that it was being built on arable	Chapter 20: Agriculture Circumstances
		466	and agricultural land, taking this land out of	[EN010170/APP/GH6.2.20] of the
		467	food production. Related objections centred	Environmental Statement
		211	on whether this would increase reliance on	and associated Appendix 20.1 (Agricultural
		229	imported food.	Circumstances).
		33		
		236		The utilised agricultural area (UAA) in the UK was
		255	Objectors believed that food security should be	16.8 million hectares in 2024. The agricultural
		265	prioritised and argued that the delivery of solar	land taken for the Scheme represents less than
		271	worked against this. In addition, some	0.01% of the UAA and is not expected to have a
		284	respondents shared concerns about the	significant impact on national food production and



		<p>291 potential impact on tenant farmers, the farming</p> <p>291 community, and villages in the area.</p> <p>320</p> <p>321</p> <p>328</p> <p>337</p> <p>340</p> <p>341</p> <p>361</p> <p>368</p> <p>377</p> <p>379</p> <p>382</p> <p>391</p> <p>392</p> <p>397</p> <p>398</p> <p>408</p> <p>414</p> <p>416</p> <p>425</p>	<p>potential impact on tenant farmers, the farming community, and villages in the area.</p>	<p>security. In addition, the land is not being entirely removed from farming, as sheep grazing may still take place on most of the Sites, allowing it to continue contributing to food production. Furthermore, soil health is expected to improve over the Scheme's 60-year lifespan as the land transitions away from intensive arable farming.</p> <p>The socio-economics assessment [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.17] accounts for potential impacts on equestrian business as visitor locations, and considers the direct impacts on agricultural employment as a result of the Scheme. The assessment acknowledges that economic and employment benefits from the Scheme are likely to be felt over a wider area than the immediate adverse impacts. Efforts to provide specific benefits in locally impacted communities are set out in the OSSCEP [EN010170/APP/GH7.8].</p>
		<p>426</p> <p>33</p> <p>456</p> <p>466</p> <p>197</p> <p>201</p> <p>203</p> <p>210</p> <p>225</p> <p>229</p> <p>241</p> <p>252</p> <p>259</p> <p>264</p>	<p>Biodiversity and environment</p> <p>Many respondents who objected to the Scheme shared concerns about its potential impact on biodiversity, the environment, and local wildlife. Concerns centred on whether solar panels would disrupt existing habitats and whether wildlife, such as deer, would be able to move freely through the area. Many also expressed concerns about the potential impact of the Scheme on birds and other protected species, such as skylarks.</p>	<p>Chapter 9: Ecology and Biodiversity [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.9] of the Environmental Statement considers the potential impacts and mitigation regarding the Scheme on wildlife and biodiversity.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that Appendix 9.13 to Chapter 9: Ecology and Biodiversity of the Environmental Statement provides the Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Assessment [EN010170/APP/GH6.3.9.13] for the Scheme.</p>



		33 291 291 33 353 370 146 395 396 408 458 466 297 192 239 258	Rooftops and alternative sites <p>Many respondents objected based on the suggestion that rooftops and already industrialised areas should be used for solar, rather than rural or agricultural land. Many suggested that the Scheme would come at the expense of the countryside. Similar objections centred on a preference for brownfield land to be prioritised over greenfield, while others suggested placing panels along motorways.</p>	<p>Selection Assessment of the Environmental Statement. Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.5]) of the Environmental Statement explains in further detail the alternatives that were considered and the design evolution process for the Scheme.</p> <p>The Applicant agrees that rooftop solar should also be pursued, but rooftop 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 this scheme.</p>
		349 370 372 201 131 317 410 414 198 206 227 227 229 33 234 286 289 290 129	Distrust in the developer and DCO process <p>A number of objections to the Scheme cited distrust in the developer as a reason for opposition. Some respondents went further, suggesting the developer and, in some cases, landowners were only interested in financial gain and would disregard comments and feedback shared during the DCO process. Others shared broader scepticism about the DCO process and questioned whether local authorities had enough influence. In addition, some respondents felt the materials available and events held as part of the statutory consultation were insufficient and inaccessible.</p>	<p>The Applicant acknowledges these comments but remains confident in the level of consultation undertaken and information presented throughout the pre-application stage, as described in the Consultation Report [EN010170/APP/GH5.1].</p> <p>The Applicant's mission is to deliver renewable energy solutions that create lasting value for the communities they serve, protecting the environment while fostering economic growth and energy independence.</p> <p>As part of this commitment, the Applicant hosted five early engagement workshops with local stakeholders and community groups to present early concept and design ideas for the Scheme, and invite stakeholders to provide their insights and feedback on the Scheme design. The</p>



		367 220 253 33 29 33 82 105 121 122 131 136 189 194 196 198 199 200 202 204 206 207 208 209 210 212 214 216		<p>Applicant consulted local planning authorities (LPAs) on the Statement of Community Consultation [EN010170/APP/GH5.5] prior to the launch of the public consultation, to ensure LPAs had an opportunity to provide their feedback on the approach to consulting the local communities.</p> <p>Furthermore, LPAs, district and parish councillors were invited to take part in the consultation as statutory consultees to the Scheme. Further information on the Applicant's approach to consulting LPAs can be found in Section 7 and Section 8 of the Consultation Report [EN010170/APP/GH5.1].</p> <p>The Applicant has considered the feedback from statutory consultees to refine the Scheme, and provided a response to the feedback received. This can be found in GH5.7 CR Appendix Section 42 Consultation Materials [EN010170/APP/GH5.7]. During the public consultation, the Applicant presented detailed information on the Scheme through the PEIR, and a Non-Technical Summary online and at free to use Local Information Points as well as telephone and email contact for the project team to aid accessibility and understanding of the Scheme.</p>
		217 220 221 223 227 232 233	<p>Scepticism around solar</p> <p>Some respondents noted general scepticism about solar as a reason for their objection, with many suggesting alternatives, such as offshore wind and nuclear, as more appropriate solutions.</p>	<p>Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy EN-1 (as designated) sets out the Government's view that a diverse mix of electricity infrastructure is needed to come forward to deliver a secure, reliable, affordable and net zero consistent energy system during the transition to 2050, and that such a system, in 2050, is likely to be</p>



		236 237 238 239 240 241 242 246 247 251 252 254 255 256 257 260 261 262 263 264 265 266 267 268 270 271 273 274 275 276 277 278 279 280 281	<p>Some queried the efficiency of solar and whether the UK was sunny enough for solar to be a viable option.</p> <p>Other related objections raised concerns about the ethical and sustainable sourcing of panels, as well as the disposal of old panels. Some respondents also questioned whether the growth of solar in the UK would increase reliance on countries such as China due to supply chain dependencies.</p>	<p>composed predominantly of wind and solar [Paras 3.3.19 & 3.3.20].</p> <p>The draft revised Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy EN-1 (April 2025) states that that the UK has huge potential for solar power and that solar energy is at the heart of the Clean Power 2030 Mission [Paras 2.10.1 & 2.10.2].</p> <p>The government's Clean Power 2030 Action Plan sets out capacity ranges for key technologies for 2030 and 2035. The capacity range (which represents the capacity government seeks to prioritise for connection), for solar generation is currently 45-47 GW by 2030 and 45-69GW by 2035.</p> <p>Large-scale solar schemes in the UK are efficient in comparison to other technologies in terms of the energy they generate over their lifetime on a per unit area basis. Solar technology can generate more energy per hectare of land than growing crops for energy. By following good design principles, solar schemes can generate a similar amount of energy per hectare of land as onshore wind.</p> <p>Selection Assessment of the Environmental Statement. Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.5]) of the Environmental Statement explains in further detail the alternatives that were considered and the design evolution process for the Scheme.</p>
--	--	---	---	--



		282		IGP is a signatory of the SEUK supply chain statement, which commits the company to a transparent, sustainable supply chain free of human rights abuses.
		283		
		285		
		286		
		289		
		291		
		292	Traffic and congestion	Mitigation measures associated with transport and access are summarised in the Transport Assessment (Section 8) [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.8] the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) [EN010170/APP/GH7.9], presented as Appendix 13.1 to Chapter 13: Transport and Access [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.13] of the Environmental Statement.
		293		
		294	Respondents who opposed the Scheme frequently cited concerns about increased traffic and congestion in the area. Often, concerns centred on the impact during construction and the suitability of local roads to accommodate HGVs	
		297		
		299		
		301		
		302		
		304		
		307		
		310		
		312	Flood risk	Section 5.2.2 of the Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy (FRA&DS) [EN010170/APP/GH6.3.10.1] Covering Report, and the corresponding model outputs are presented in Annex J of the FRA&DS submitted with the Environmental Statement.
		313		
		314	Respondents expressed concerns about the potential for the Scheme to increase flood risk in the area, citing existing issues with surface runoff and past flooding. Other respondents raised concerns about the management of waterways around the site.	
		315		
		316		
		317		
		318		
		319		
		323		
		324	Other objections	The below objections have been noted.
		325		
		326	Respondents shared a number of additional concerns, including:	Please refer to Chapter 4: Scheme Description [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.4] for BESS description.
		327		
		328		
		330		
		331	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A suggestion that more detail on BESS was needed. 	Please refer to Chapter 7: Climate Change [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.7] for climate change assessment.
		333	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Claims that climate change is a myth and 	
		334		



		<p>335 there is no need to achieve net zero.</p> <p>336 • The belief that the UK is not a major</p> <p>337 producer of carbon emissions on a global</p> <p>338 scale.</p> <p>341 • The potential impact of glint and glare on</p> <p>344 local aerodromes, drivers, cyclists, and</p> <p>345 equestrian facilities.</p> <p>346 • The view that there are insufficient</p> <p>347 grants and benefits for communities.</p> <p>349 • The belief that assessments</p> <p>350 undertaken by the EIA team were incorrect</p> <p>351 or insufficient.</p> <p>354 • Concerns about the impact on mental</p> <p>355 health.</p> <p>357 • A suggestion that the cable route is too</p> <p>358 big.</p> <p>359 • Concerns about the potential impact of</p> <p>360 EMF radiation.</p> <p>362 • Concerns about the length of the</p> <p>364 construction period and whether it would,</p> <p>365 in fact, last two years.</p> <p>366 • The belief that the Scheme should be</p> <p>367 located further away from local housing.</p> <p>369 • The view that the Scheme does not</p> <p>370 adhere to the local Corporate Plan.</p> <p>371 • Concerns about the impact of chemicals</p> <p>372 used to clean solar panels on wildlife and</p> <p>373 the local water supply.</p> <p>374 • The belief that the Scheme is not actually</p> <p>376 temporary,</p> <p>377 or concerns that 60 years is too long to be</p> <p>379 considered temporary.</p> <p>380</p> <p>382</p>	<p>there is no need to achieve net zero.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The belief that the UK is not a major producer of carbon emissions on a global scale. • The potential impact of glint and glare on local aerodromes, drivers, cyclists, and equestrian facilities. • The view that there are insufficient grants and benefits for communities. • The belief that assessments undertaken by the EIA team were incorrect or insufficient. • Concerns about the impact on mental health. • A suggestion that the cable route is too big. • Concerns about the potential impact of EMF radiation. • Concerns about the length of the construction period and whether it would, in fact, last two years. • The belief that the Scheme should be located further away from local housing. • The view that the Scheme does not adhere to the local Corporate Plan. • Concerns about the impact of chemicals used to clean solar panels on wildlife and the local water supply. • The belief that the Scheme is not actually temporary, or concerns that 60 years is too long to be considered temporary. <p>Concerns that solar farms are not safe.</p>	<p>Please refer to Statement of Need [EN010170/APP/GH7.12] submitted as part of this application.</p> <p>Please refer to Chapter 15: Glint and Glare [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.15] for assessment on local aerodromes, drivers, cyclists, and equestrian facilities.</p> <p>Please refer to Statement of Competence [EN010170/APP/GH6.3.1.1] The Applicant is proposing a community benefit fund and is considering a range of options for how this could operate. We will consider all feedback as we develop plans for the fund.</p> <p>Chapter 18: Human Health [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.18] considers both the physical and mental health implication of changes to PROW use, and considers the importance of community culture and how the Scheme impacts upon sense of place.</p> <p>Please refer to Chapter 21: Electromagnetic Fields [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.21] for radiation assessment.</p> <p>Please refer to the Policy Compliance Document [EN010170/APP/GH7.23]</p> <p>Please refer to Chapter 4: Scheme Description [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.4]. All solar panel cleaning will be undertaken with water.</p>
--	--	---	--	--



		383 384 385 386 387 390 391 393		Please refer to the Outline Decommissioning Statement [EN010170/APP/GH7.3] The Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan [EN010170/APP/GH7.1] outlines the two year construction window.
		394 397 399 400 403 404 406 409 410 411 415 417 418	Support for solar but not this Scheme A number of respondents expressed support for solar or the aim of achieving net zero more broadly but objected to this specific Scheme. Many believed that solar would be better placed on rooftops or in more suitable locations abroad, while others expressed concerns about the scale of the Scheme. Some respondents cited distrust in the developer or a belief that consultation had been inadequate as reasons for objecting.	Details of the process are set out in Appendix 5.1: Site Selection Assessment of the Environmental Statement. Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.5]) of the Environmental Statement explains in further detail the alternatives that were considered and the design evolution process for the Scheme
		419 420 421 422 423 424 426 427 428 429 430 432 433	Objections based on consultation Some respondents who objected to the Scheme cited concerns about the consultation process. Criticism centred on the framing of questions in the feedback form, with suggestions that they were leading. Others believed the consultation was a box-ticking exercise and that the developer would not listen to concerns, while some felt the information presented was insufficient.	The Applicant acknowledges these comments but remains confident in the level of consultation undertaken and information presented throughout the pre-application stage, as described in the Consultation Report [EN010170/APP/GH5.1]. As part of the pre-application consultation, the Applicant hosted five early engagement workshops with local stakeholders and community groups to present early concept and design ideas for the Scheme and invite stakeholders to provide their insights and feedback on the Scheme design.



		434 435 436 446 447 455 456 457 458 461 462		During the public consultation, the Applicant held four consultation events and three virtual webinars. In addition, the Applicant presented detailed information on the Scheme through the PEIR, and a Non- Technical Summary online and at free to use Local Information Points as well as telephone and email contact for the project team to aid accessibility and understanding of the Scheme.
	Food security	464 465 465 467 468 328 263 272 273 280 311 322 359 408 355 465 33 62 97 101 104 105 33 106	<p>Reduces food security by repurposing productive and valuable farmland. Some expressed the view that the current Government does not have a clear strategy as to how to manage these competing demands on the land and is content to accept easy solutions, to achieve net zero, by approving such development without due diligence and at the expense of food security.</p> <p>Some respondents raised the need for a balance between land use for food production and energy production as they recognise both are necessary; however, they expressed that this scheme would be taking away too much agricultural land to install solar panels.</p> <p>The Green Hill Solar farm's multi-site locations will cover farmland and greenfield spaces and will remove approximately 3000 - acres of the Best and Most Versatile (BMV) grades 1-3b agricultural land from food production. Respondents expressed the importance of this land to Britain's food</p>	<p>The Applicant understands the need for both energy and food security. At present however, energy security is considered a more pressing national need. Furthermore, the land used for the Scheme makes up only a negligible proportion of the agricultural land in the UK used for food production.</p> <p>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. In addition, the land is not being entirely removed from farming, as sheep grazing may still take place on most of the Sites, allowing it to continue contributing to food production. Furthermore, soil health is expected to improve over the Scheme's 60-year lifespan as the land transitions away from intensive arable farming.</p>



		<p>122 security and expressed the view that solar 129 installations should not be permitted on BMV 136 1-3b land.</p> <p>146</p> <p>148 Respondents emphasised that the UK needs 176 more renewable energy built but in other 178 places. The UK is an island and will eventually 196 have to import all of its food as all its arable 198 land will have been built on.</p> <p>199</p> <p>33</p> <p>33 According to some respondents, climate 202 change is an important issue but should not be 33 to the detriment of the UK's food production. 208 Some respondents consider food security to be 205 more important than climate change and do not 207 want the land to be used for energy production 210 instead of food production.</p> <p>211</p>	
	Land Use & Agriculture	<p>33 Loss of agricultural land</p> <p>131</p> <p>212 A large proportion of respondents perceive 213 the scheme to be taking away productive 214 agricultural land to install solar panels. 217 Respondents have raised that all the land 218 being proposed for the scheme is Best Most 219 Versatile Agricultural Land (BMV), with 1% 220 graded as 1, 25% graded as 2, 40% graded 221 as 3a and 33% graded as 3b. None of the 223 land is rated as grade 4 (poor quality) or 224 grade 5 (very poor quality).</p> <p>225</p> <p>227 Respondents emphasised the need to use 228 other land than agricultural land for the 229 scheme as this doesn't feel like good land use</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Detailed Agricultural Land Classification surveys (ALC) have been undertaken to identify the grade of the land within the Sites, soil mitigation measures and an Outline Soil Management Plan have also been developed. All are reported in - Chapter 20: Agriculture Circumstances [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.20] of the - Environmental Statement - and associated Appendix 20.1 (Agricultural Circumstances). <p>The Scheme will be temporary with no permanent loss of agricultural land extent or quality. In</p>



		122 33 232 233 235 236 237 238 33 33 33 33 239 240 241 242 244 245 246 247 254 33 255 256 258 259 260 261 262 263 264 265 33 266 267	<p>to them. The government and planning guidelines were raised by respondents as they recommend that brownfield land or lower grade land be sought for solar development: only if essential should high grade land be used.</p> <p>Many expressed their support and recognised the need for renewable energy infrastructure, production, and storage, but opposed to it being built on productive agricultural land and green field land as these are finite resources.</p> <p>Non-agricultural sites of all descriptions should be explored instead of agricultural land, according to some respondents as building a solar farm is in conflict with net zero targets and the overall aim of the UK to reduce its carbon footprint.</p> <p>Some respondents suggested that a loss of agricultural land would be detrimental to Britain's self-sufficiency and increase reliance on imported food.</p> <p>According to some respondents, climate change is an important issue but should not be to the detriment of destroying agricultural land the countryside to produce renewable energy.</p> <p>Solutions for energy must be found but not to the detriment of the farming industry and</p>	<p>addition, some agricultural land may be retained during the operational phase, such as with pasture grazed by sheep, for example. Grazing has been successfully implemented on a large number of solar arrays, and serves to reduce the need for mechanical grass cutting, allow for continued agricultural use of the land, and maintain the biodiversity value of the grassland sward.</p> <p>Chapter 20: Agriculture Circumstances [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.20] of the Environmental Statement concludes that the 60 year lifetime of the project will facilitate a recovery in topsoil organic matter. This will enhance the functional capacity of the soil resource for future arable soil health and potentially ALC grades. production</p> <p>A farming report [EN010170/APP/GH7.27] has also been prepared and sets out an assessment of the potential effects of the proposed works on agricultural land, soils and farm businesses.</p> <p>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. In addition, the land is not being entirely removed from farming, as sheep grazing may still take place on most of the Sites, allowing it to continue contributing to food production. Furthermore, soil health is expected to improve over the Scheme's 60-year lifespan as</p>
--	--	--	--	---



		<p>268 food production.</p> <p>33</p> <p>269</p> <p>33 Respondents suggested that other sources of</p> <p>33 energy, such as nuclear, did not use</p> <p>270 farmland and thus were more viable options.</p> <p>271</p> <p>272 Some respondents raised the need for a</p> <p>273 balance between land use for agriculture and</p> <p>33 energy production as they recognise both are</p> <p>274 necessary; however, they expressed that this</p> <p>275 scheme would be taking away too much</p> <p>33 agricultural land to install solar panels.</p> <p>276</p> <p>277 Concerns over the feasibility of using the active</p> <p>278 solar farm as sheep grazing land were raised.</p> <p>279 Respondent asked to see examples of where</p> <p>280 and how this has previously been done. If that</p> <p>281 is a viable option, giving farmers incentives to</p> <p>282 do so.</p> <p>283</p> <p>284</p> <p>285 Respondents also asked about what kind of</p> <p>286 agriculture was possible on solar farms and</p> <p>287 so provide further information on the topic.</p> <p>289</p> <p>290 There are doubts on the fact that covering the</p> <p>291 countryside in solar panels will achieve a</p> <p>292 sufficient reduction in carbon footprint to</p> <p>294 make up for the loss of the countryside and</p> <p>295 loss of ability to feed the nation.</p> <p>297</p> <p>298 Respondents wish to see compensation for</p> <p>299 local businesses and individuals who have or</p> <p>33 will lose their jobs as a result of the Green Hill</p>	<p>the land transitions away from intensive arable farming.</p> <p>The assessment of socio-economic effects in ES Chapter 17 [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.17] assesses the likely impacts of the Scheme on businesses anticipated to be directly affected by the Scheme, or at risk of indirect effects as a result of reduced visitor spending.</p> <p>The assessment acknowledges that economic and employment benefits from the Scheme are likely to be felt over a wider area than the immediate adverse impacts. Efforts to provide specific benefits in locally impacted communities are set out in the OSSCEP [EN010170/APP/GH7.8].</p> <p>Chapter 9 Climate Change [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.7] of the Environmental Assessment assesses climate change impacts of the Scheme during the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases. The assessment shows that the Green House Gas (GHG) emissions from the Scheme in operation will offset emissions in a comparative scenario where energy generation may be from other sources with a higher carbon intensity, it is considered that the overall GHG impact of the Scheme is beneficial, 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.</p>
--	--	---	--



		301 302 303 33 305 306 307 308 309	Solar project. Examples are farm workers, livery yards, riding schools, cafes to name a few. Another comment was made about making a donation to the Wildlife trust to compensate for the loss of green field land.	
		33 82 310 311 313 314 315 316 318 319 320 321 322 323 324	Land use Respondents expressed being unfavourable to the loss of green fields, which are good for their physical and mental health as well as visually pleasing, to build a solar farm. Concerns were expressed concerns about the landowners of the land being used for the scheme. They are seen as being absent landlords which would therefore require a number of tenant farmers renting land from these landowners to be put out of business.	Chapter 18: Human Health [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.18] considers both the physical and mental health implication of changes to PROW use, and considers the importance of community culture and how the Scheme impacts upon sense of place. A farming report [EN010170/APP/GH7.27] has also been prepared and sets out an assessment of the potential effects of the proposed works on agricultural land, soils and farm businesses.
		325 326 327 328 329 332 333 33 334 336 337	Decommissioning of the Scheme Some respondents expressed concerns over the lack of guarantee that the land used for this solar farm would be returned to agricultural use at the end of the scheme's lifecycle. This would lead to long-term impacts on local agriculture and rural livelihoods.	- The principles embedded within the scheme's Outline Soil Management Plan[EN010170/APP/GH7.6], Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan [EN010170/APP/GH7.1] and Outline Decommissioning Statement [EN010170/APP/GH7.3].



		338 339 341 33 342	Respondents have asked to see clear proposals and evidence for the decommissioning and returning the land to agricultural use when the scheme ends.	
		33 343 345 346 347 348 349 350 351 33 352 353 33 33 354 355 357 358 359 361 362 364 365 366 33 33 33 370 371 372	<p>Scale of the Scheme</p> <p>Respondents perceived the scheme as using too much land in comparison with the quantity of electricity the scheme will be able to provide. According to some respondents it will dominate and transform the landscape in the area.</p> <p>The area is already going through a lot of infrastructure development such as housing, transport, and warehousing. Residents feel that energy production through solar farms should not be added as an extra pressure to the area.</p> <p>Residents opposed to the size of the scheme and the land it is taking away from biodiversity and agriculture.</p> <p>Residents have compared the size of the scheme to Heathrow airport and have commented on how much land that is taking away from the area.</p> <p>There is general support for solar developments on brown field sites but opposition for using green field sites. Some feel that a more efficient use of</p>	<p>Details of the process are set out in Appendix 5.1: Site Selection Assessment of the Environmental Statement. Chapter 5 (Alternatives and Design Evolution [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.5]) of the Environmental Statement explains in further detail the alternatives that were considered and the design evolution process for the Scheme.</p> <p>The Applicant notes the comments around the size of the Scheme.</p> <p>A Statement of Need [EN010170/APP/GH7.12] has been submitted as part of the with its application which demonstrates that a significant capacity of low carbon solar generation is urgently needed in the UK, and that the Scheme will, if consented, provide an essential progression to meeting the governmental objectives of delivering sustainable development to enable decarbonisation.</p> <p>Large-scale solar schemes in the UK are efficient in comparison to other technologies in terms of the energy they generate over their lifetime on a per unit area basis. Solar technology can generate more energy per hectare of land than growing crops for energy. By following good design</p>



		<p>373 land would be to install solar panels on all the</p> <p>374 homes in the area.</p> <p>376</p> <p>379 Others believe over reliance upon Solar</p> <p>380 Energy Farms places an unfair burden on the</p> <p>382 countryside, and that solar panels should be</p> <p>383 part of an integrated plan to be installed on</p> <p>384 new and existing brownfield sites.</p> <p>385</p> <p>386 Some are concerned the scheme would alter</p> <p>387 the local area immeasurably and for the</p> <p>388 foreseeable future.</p> <p>389</p> <p>391 Some respondents opposed to using land for</p> <p>392 scheme which is close to villages with</p> <p>393 listed buildings and conservation areas.</p> <p>397</p> <p>398 Respondents also feel they are being</p> <p>33 encircled and trapped by the scheme and its</p> <p>400 size.</p> <p>402</p> <p>403</p> <p>404</p> <p>406</p> <p>408</p> <p>409</p> <p>410</p> <p>411</p> <p>129</p> <p>33</p> <p>33</p> <p>33</p> <p>415</p> <p>417</p>	<p>principles, solar schemes can generate a similar</p> <p>amount of energy per hectare of land as onshore</p> <p>wind</p> <p>The utilised agricultural area (UAA) in the UK was</p> <p>16.8 million hectares (ha) in 2024. The</p> <p>agricultural land taken for the Scheme represents</p> <p>less than 0.01% of the UAA and is not expected to</p> <p>have a significant impact on national food</p> <p>production and security. In addition, the land is</p> <p>not being entirely removed from farming, as</p> <p>sheep grazing may still take place on most of the</p> <p>Sites, allowing it to continue contributing to food</p> <p>production. Furthermore, soil health is expected to</p> <p>improve over the Scheme's 60-year lifespan as</p> <p>the land transitions away from intensive arable</p> <p>farming.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Chapter 8: Landscape and Visual Impact [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.8](the) of the Environmental Statement set outs the ways in which the Applicant has considered the potential visual and landscape impacts to local residents and visitors, potential effects associated with the panels and associated infrastructure. - The Applicant notes that the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) considers both the landscape and visual effects of the Scheme - independently to ensure both the impacts and - effects on the fabric of the landscape
--	--	---	--



		33 418 419 33 420 214 270 301 33 409 419 421 423 424 33 33 425 426 33 428 429 458 459 33 460 461 462 463 464 33 465 466 467 468		<p>are taken</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - into account as well as the views and visibility. <p>Chapter 12: Cultural Heritage [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.12],</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - supported by the heritage statement in Appendix 12.1, considers impacts on heritage and conservation areas. -
			<p>Access</p> <p>Respondents mention that the plans for the scheme are going to disrupt agricultural land and existing pathways to create access to sites, as well as disrupt the local landscape with listed buildings. This could cause structural damage to the listed buildings.</p> <p>Concerns about access to Green Hill F to build the solar farm will cause severe damage to agricultural trackways and PROW. Replacing agricultural land with man-made infrastructure will exacerbate the region's already existing flooding issue.</p> <p>Respondents raised the issue of the site being too close to wetlands and nature reserves, where chemicals could affect the soil and water, and in turn the quality of the land.</p> <p>Respondents asked to be advised on how this site is classed as temporary; all other industries class temporary as a few days going up to 1 year, not 60 years.</p>	<p>Impacts on PROWs, including on their desirability and enjoyment of use have been assessed in ES Chapter 17: Socio-Economics, Tourism and Recreation [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.17] for construction, and the operational lifetime of the Scheme. During construction, the routing of PROWs within the Order Limits are to be protected and kept open wherever feasible to do so. Any closures or diversions, such as for cable laying and landscape planting will be temporary in nature, and any damage to PROW surfaces will be repaired upon completion of any works to the PROWs. During the Scheme's operation, PROWs will be maintained and kept open, with a minimum 15m buffer from the route centreline to the nearest onsite infrastructure. Fencing will be kept away from the PROW route and groundcover planting including wildflower areas will be planted between the PROW and any fencelines to enhance the user experience. Fences will not replace existing hedgerows, which will be kept in situ with any gappy sections replanted and allowed to grow out.</p>



		522 590 33 33 33 430 431 432 433 434 435 436 33 33 106 437 446 447		<p>The Scheme is considered temporary because the operational life of the Scheme will be a maximum of 60 years. Once the Scheme ceases to operate, it will be decommissioned. The impacts of decommissioning have been assessed throughout the Environmental Statement. Please refer to the Outline Decommissioning Statement [EN010170/APP/GH7.3] which provides details and control measures of decommissioning activities. Further decommissioning plans will be produced prior to the commencement of the decommissioning phase of the Scheme. Approval and implementation of these plans will be secured through a Requirement of the Development Consent Order.</p>
		33 33 453 455 456 457	<p>Public Rights of Way</p> <p>Respondents were concerned about the impacts on Public Rights of Way (PRoWs) and how this will be affected by the scheme and its construction phase. According to them, footpaths and bridleways would be altered and become unpleasant, unusable, or even unsafe. Fences instead of hedges will make the area unpleasant and hostile.</p>	<p>Impacts on PROWs, including on their desirability and enjoyment of use have been assessed in ES Chapter 17: Socio-Economics, Tourism and Recreation [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.17] for construction, and the operational lifetime of the Scheme. During construction, the routing of PROWs within the Order Limits are to be protected and kept open wherever feasible to do so. Any closures or diversions, such as for cable laying and landscape planting will be temporary in nature, and any damage to PROW surfaces will be repaired upon completion of any works to the PROWs. During the Schem's operation, PROWs will be maintained and kept open, with a minimum 15m buffer from the route</p>



				centreline to the nearest onsite infrastructure. Fencing will be kept away from the PROW route and groundcover planting including wildflower areas will be planted between the PROW and any fencelines to enhance the user experience. Fences will not replace existing hedgerows, which will be kept in situ with any gappy sections replanted and allowed to grow out.
--	--	--	--	--

People



Issue	Sub- issue	User IDs	Summary	Applicant's Response
Air quality	Impact of construction activities on local air quality	33 56 62 80 97 169 194 200 216 253 274 283 306 314 330 339 342 351 358 406 408 422 421 434 442 447	<p>Respondents expressed concerns that the proposed project would lead to significant air quality issues, with construction activities predicted to increase pollution and dust levels.</p> <p>A few respondents expressed concern that impact on air quality during the construction of the project may result in breaches local air quality regulations.</p> <p>There is a perception among some respondents that the impact on air quality during construction of the project may lead to disruption of rural life, harm local wildlife, and affect the health and wellbeing of nearby residents.</p>	<p>Chapter 16: Air Quality [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.16] of the Environmental Statement assesses the effects of the Scheme on air quality during the construction, operation and decommissioning phases as a result of construction dust emissions, vehicle emissions, non-road mobile machinery emissions and BESS fire emissions on nearby human and ecological receptors. Mitigation measures have been proposed where required.</p> <p>Resultant effects on human health from air quality impacts have also been assessed in Chapter 18: Human Health [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.18] of the Environmental Statement.</p>
		452 551 556 566 567 568 570	<p>Many respondents feel that the 2.5-year construction phase will seriously compromise air quality and could lead to lasting air quality degradation and other environmental issues due to dust, noise, and chemical risks.</p> <p>There are concerns among respondents about how construction dust and vehicle emissions will affect overall air</p>	<p>Chapter 16: Air Quality [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.16] of the Environmental Statement assesses the effects of the construction phase and has proposed mitigation measures to ensure effects are not significant.</p>



		571 573 574 575 576 578 579 580 581 582 171 302	quality in the area.	<p>Resultant effects on human health from air quality impacts have also been assessed in Chapter 18: Human Health [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.18] of the Environmental Statement.</p> <p>Mitigation measures have been proposed where required.</p> <p>Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.14] of the Environmental Statement evaluates the likely significant effects of the Scheme on nearby noise and vibration sensitive receptors during construction, operation and decommissioning.</p>
	Impact of reduced air quality on human health		Some respondents expressed concern that increased dust and pollution will pose health risks, especially to children in nearby play areas, leading them to believe the project may not comply with local air quality standards.	<p>Chapter 16: Air Quality [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.16] of the Environmental Statement assesses the effects of the Scheme on air quality during the construction, operation and decommissioning phases as a result of construction dust emissions, vehicle emissions, non-road mobile machinery emissions and BESS fire emissions.</p> <p>Mitigation measures have been proposed where required. Air quality objectives are not predicted to be breached.</p> <p>Resultant effects on human health from air quality impacts have also been assessed in Chapter 18: Human Health [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.18] of the Environmental Statement.</p>



				<p>Mitigation measures have been proposed where required.</p> <p>Resultant effects on human health from air quality impacts have also been assessed in Chapter 18: Human Health [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.18] of the Environmental Statement, taking into regard those of higher sensitivity to air quality impacts, such as children, and those with respiratory illnesses.</p>
Safety of Battery Energy Storage System (BESS)			<p>Respondents also expressed concerns regarding potential fire risks associated with the Battery Energy Storage Systems (BESS), some feared that these gases could be carried by prevailing winds into nearby villages.</p>	<p>The Outline Battery Storage Safety Management Plan [EN010170/APP/GH7.7] sets out fire fighting and safety measures in the event of a fire or explosion.</p> <p>Chapter 16: Air Quality [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.16] of the Environmental Statement assesses the effects of BESS fire emissions on local receptors, including those in nearby villages. Mitigation measures have been proposed where required.</p> <p>Chapter 18: Human Health [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.18] in the Environmental Statement also states the Northamptonshire Fire and Rescue Service are to be consulted as statutory consultees to the Scheme, and as targeted consultees for the agreement of the Outline Battery Fire Safety Management Plan. NFRS</p>



				can advise on the fire safety protocols and concerns regarding fire safety risks.
Noise and vibration	Noise and vibration from construction activities and Site infrastructure	112 116 119 121 221 236 263 384 469 489 564 585 56 101 139 166 177 182 183 184 194 200 228 252 268 269 282 294 299 303 309	<p>Respondents expressed major concerns about increased noise and vibrations from heavy construction traffic and the operation of the Battery Energy Storage Systems (BESS), fearing significant disruption to daily life and the local environment.</p> <p>Respondents expressed concern about the two-year construction period which they anticipate will generate continuous noise.</p> <p>Respondents that local roads may not withstand the strain, leading to noise pollution and infrastructure damage.</p> <p>Respondents called for detailed noise assessments and robust mitigation strategies to manage the disturbances during and after construction.</p>	<p>Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.14] of the Environmental Statement evaluates the likely significant effects of the Scheme on nearby noise and vibration sensitive receptors during construction, operation and decommissioning.</p> <p>The aim of this assessment is to predict the levels of noise and assess these against relevant guidelines, and where necessary, identify any required mitigation measures to make effects acceptable. Worst-case noise and vibration activities associated with the proposed cabling have been assessed at the closest distances to nearby sensitive receptors to provide a robust assessment.</p> <p>Details of the noise assessment can be found in Chapter 14 of the Environmental Statement [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.14].</p> <p>For the operational phase noise assessment, the noise generating items of plant and equipment have been assessed at nearby noise sensitive receptors in the area and compared to the relevant noise criteria. Where</p>



		314 315 320 329 330 337 342 350 354 356 387 390 401 406 408 410 415 422 434 435 438 439 444 447 452 491 511 512		<p>necessary, any required mitigation measures to make effects acceptable have been identified.</p> <p>Chapter 18: Human Health [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.18] of the Environmental Statement assesses noise and vibration against human health receptors and advises the Scheme adopts a best practice measure to reduce noise and vibration impacts, to minimise resultant mental health and wellbeing impacts on residential or other sensitive receptors (schools, health facilities, tourism sites, etc.). Also, the CEMP requires construction works to adhere to time limits for noisy works and ensures planning conditions for night works where required are agreed in advance.</p>
	Operational noise concerns	522 525 556 573 577	Respondents also expressed concerns regarding potential operational noise from components of the proposed new infrastructure, including inverters and transformers.	Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.14] of the Environmental Statement evaluates the likely significant effects of the Scheme on nearby noise and vibration sensitive receptors during construction, operation and decommissioning.



				<p>This chapter sets out the findings of the assessments undertaken regarding potential noise emissions from inverters, transformers. During the operational phase of the Scheme, no additional mitigation measures for the scheme are considered to be required given that no significant adverse effects are expected. The site layout has been developed to minimise noise and vibration effects at sensitive receptor locations.</p>
	Cumulative impact of noise and vibration		<p>Some respondents felt that the perceived noise pollution and potential damage to local infrastructure could adversely affect the community and wildlife.</p>	<p>Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.14] of the Environmental Statement evaluates the likely significant effects of the Scheme on nearby noise and vibration sensitive receptors during construction, operation and decommissioning.</p> <p>A Habitat Regulations Assessment [EN010170/APP/GH7.21] has been prepared for effects on wildlife – please see Appendix 9.14 of Chapter 9: Ecology and Biodiversity [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.9]. Impacts are also discussed in the ES chapter.</p>
	Impact of noise and vibration due to proximity to residential areas		<p>Some highlighted the proximity of proposed new infrastructure to residential areas, including noise sensitive ones.</p>	<p>Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.14] of the Environmental Statement evaluates the likely significant effects of the Scheme on nearby noise and vibration sensitive receptors during construction, operation</p>



				and decommissioning. Residential dwellings close to the development area have been identified and used as assessment locations throughout the noise assessment chapter (i.e. for construction, operation and decommissioning works).
	Impact of noise on cultural heritage sites		Respondents also felt that noise generated during construction may impact local historical structures.	Chapter 12: Cultural Heritage [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.12] of the Environmental Statement evaluates how noise impacts can affect heritage assets and advises during the Decommissioning Phase to adhere to an agreed approach on activities that generate noise which can impact the appreciation of heritage assets nearby.
Human health, safety & wellbeing	General concerns for increased health risks associated with the construction and operation of the Project	116 221 225 233 236 468 469 489 551 552 592 45 47 56 62 63	<p>Respondents noted considerable apprehension regarding the health risks associated with the construction and operation of the project.</p> <p>Some concern was expressed about community safety due to potential exposure to pollutants, noise pollution, and increased traffic risks, particularly affecting those living in close proximity to the development.</p> <p>Some respondents feel that adequate surveys have not been conducted, leading to distrust in the company's approach.</p>	<p>The Applicant confirms that all relevant health risks have been assessed in regard to the Scheme and the authorities' Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategies have been considered and are listed in Appendix 18.1 of the ES [EN010170/APP/GH6.3.18.1].</p> <p>Chapter 16: Air Quality [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.16] of the Environmental Statement assesses the effects of the Scheme on air quality during the construction, operation and decommissioning phases as a result of construction dust emissions, vehicle</p>



		80 81 96 97 100 101 104 130 135 161 165 166 167 174 182		<p>emissions, non-road mobile machinery emissions and BESS fire emissions. Mitigation measures have been proposed where required. Baseline surveys have not been undertaken as there was considered to be sufficient existing data to inform the assessment. Monitoring is proposed during the construction period to ensure that the mitigation measures are working effectively.</p> <p>A full suite of surveys has been completed and an assessment of effects on each receptor is detailed in each chapter of the Environmental Statement.</p>
	Impact on health and safety from increased fire and flood risk	186 194 200 274 283 289 290 292 298 299 303 304 305 306 307 308 309	Concerns about potential impact human safety and wellbeing due to on the increased risks of fire and flooding due to perceived inadequate site selection and safety measures.	<p>Resultant impacts on human health, safety and wellbeing due to fire and flood risk effects have been assessed in Chapter 18: Human Health [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.18] of the Environmental Statement. This takes into account the risk to human health from smoke from fires, while safety risks directly from fires and explosions are assessed in Chapter 23: Major Accidents and Disasters [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.23].</p> <p>Risks to human health and safety from flooding, both to residents, and to onsite workers have been assessed. No likely significant effects to human health from</p>



		310 313 314 320 327 332 337 350 351 354 356 357 361		<p>fires or flooding are anticipated as a result of the Scheme and its designed mitigation measures.</p> <p>An outline battery storage safety management plan [EN010170/APP/GH7.7] has been prepared and submitted in support of the application. As part of the BSSMP to be prepared prior to construction of the BESS, 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.</p>
	Fire evacuation procedures	369 390 394 399 402 404 405 406 408 409 410 414 415 422 425 434	Respondents questioned the project's proposed fire safety protocols and expressed anxiety over potential evacuation requirements.	<p>An outline battery storage safety management plan [EN010170/APP/GH7.7] has been prepared and submitted in support of the application. As part of the BSSMP to be prepared prior to construction of the BESS, 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.</p>



		438 439 444 454 461 491 512 522 525 551		
	Mental health risks	556 566 570 575 578 579 590 171 213 309 433 448	<p>There is a perception from respondents that the proposed development could negatively impact mental health due to the loss of natural landscapes, environmental changes and construction disruptions.</p> <p>Some felt that noise during construction could impact people's mental health.</p>	<p>The Applicant confirms that consideration of the potential impacts of the Scheme on the mental health and wellbeing of the existing resident population has also been included in the assessment of human health effects in Chapter 18: Human Health [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.18] of the Environmental Statement.</p> <p>This includes for impacts from noise and vibration on residential receptors, and has determined that no likely significant adverse effects are anticipated.</p> <p>The Applicant seeks to provide sufficient detailed information about the Scheme's impacts at DCO submission for the benefit of addressing outstanding concerns and anxieties from members of the public about how the Scheme may impact upon health and wellbeing.</p>



Electro Magnetic Fields (EMFs)	<p>General concern about health risks of increased EMFs, associated with Site infrastructure</p>	<p>79 116 117 233 96 167 209 275 309 345 414 505 99 176 177</p>	<p>Respondents noted concerns about possible health risks from long term Electric and Magnetic fields (EMFs) exposure caused by the proposed infrastructure.</p> <p>Some respondents expressed worries about the EMF generated by the proposed infrastructure, suggesting that comprehensive surveys and community communications may not have been conducted adequately.</p>	<p>Chapter 24: Other Environmental Matters [EN010170/APP/6.2.24] of the Environmental Statement assesses the impacts of the Scheme upon human health and also considers major accidents and disasters. Section 21.2 [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.21] considers electro-magnetic fields.</p> <p>Chapter 21: Electromagnetic Fields [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.21] of the Environmental Statements details the EMF assessment for the Scheme in full. Any potential for public health impacts have also been cross-referenced and assessed specifically in Chapter 18: Human Health [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.18] of the ES.</p> <p>The assessment considers the locations of electrical infrastructure and the proximity of receptors, such as residential properties and workplaces.</p> <p>The most notable EMF source is the underground cables, which produce no electric field due to the shielding effect of the earth. The nearest dwelling is 20 metres from the proposed cable route, meaning magnetic field exposure is minimal and well below public health guidelines.</p>
	<p>Long term health risks</p>		<p>Some respondents noted that there has been a lack of</p>	<p>Chapter 21: Electromagnetic Fields</p>



	associated with EMFs Developer understanding and communication of EMFs		<p>detailed information which has caused some anxiety about potential long-term impacts of exposure to EMFs, particularly in areas near residential properties and public spaces.</p> <p>There is a strong sentiment among residents that the company lacks proper understanding of risks associated with EMFs. Many feel that transparency about these risks has been insufficient, making them feel unsafe about their proximity to the project.</p> <p>Occasional references were made to concerns about EMFs, with respondents perceiving a need for clearer communication on EMF assessments and potential health implications.</p>	<p>[EN010170/APP/GH6.2.21] of the Environmental Statements details the EMF assessment for the Scheme in full. Any potential for public health impacts have also been cross-referenced and assessed specifically in Chapter 18: Human Health</p> <p>[EN010170/APP/GH6.2.18] of the ES. Chapter 21: Electromagnetic Fields</p> <p>[EN010170/APP/GH6.2.21] of the Environmental Statements details the EMF assessment for the Scheme in full. Any potential for public health impacts have also been cross-referenced and assessed specifically in Chapter 18: Human Health</p> <p>[EN010170/APP/GH6.2.18] of the ES.</p>
Landscape and visual	Loss of landscape beauty	62 74 101 309 354 372 387 389 403 406 408 422 426 440 444 447 449	<p>Respondents expressed significant concerns that the solar farm and its associated infrastructure would blight the natural landscape, resulting in a loss of visual amenity and altering the scenic beauty of the countryside.</p> <p>Many residents worry that the construction and operation of the proposed new infrastructure will transform the picturesque landscape into an "eyesore," which they note will diminish their quality of life and disrupting the natural environment.</p> <p>Some suggested that feel that without 3D visualisations, it is challenging to understand how solar panels will visually affect the landscape.</p>	<p>Chapter 8: Landscape and Visual Assessment [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.8] of the Environmental Statement set outs the ways in which the Applicant has considered the potential visual and landscape impacts to local residents and visitors, potential effects associated with the panels and associated infrastructure.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.8] considers both the landscape and visual effects of the Scheme independently to ensure both the</p>



		525 39 44 56 70 72 74 80 84 86 91 95 96 101 146 154 161 162 166 167 169 176 181 185 186 193 194 201 203 265 270 272 281 289 293		<p>impacts and effects on the fabric of the landscape are taken into account as well as the views and visibility.</p> <p>Photomontages depicting how the Scheme will look from a series of viewpoints across the Scheme will be submitted with this application. This will provide readers with the opportunity to see how the proposals will look in the local and wider landscape. [EN010170/APP/6.4.8.14.1-14.NN13].</p> <p>The Applicant notes that the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, such as presented in Section 8.6 and Table 8.22 of Chapter 8 [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.8] of the Environmental Statement, takes embedded mitigation into account to include the offset distances.</p>
--	--	---	--	---



		297		
		298		
		303		
		305		
		307		
		311		
		315		
		317		
		324		
		328		
		329		
		334		
		337		
		341		
		349		
		350		
		352		
		354		
		356		
		369		
		372		
		387		
		389		
		392		
		394		
		400		
		401		
		402		
		406		
		408		
		410		
		412		
		413		
		416		
		419		



		421		
		422		
		424		
		430		
		436		
		443		
		455		
		456		
		459		
		491		
		505		
		512		
		525		
		556		
		560		
		571		
		575		
		581		
		582		
		31		
		60		
		75		
		117		
		119		
		122		
		221		
		241		
		243		
		258		
		263		
		363		
		368		
		373		
		463		
		465		



		466		
		468		
		469		
		489		
		528		
		552		
		558		
		564		
		592		
		594		
		34		
		39		
		42		
		45		
		47		
		51		
		53		
		54		
		56		
		57		
		62		
		63		
		64		
		65		
		70		
		72		
		73		
		84		
		85		
		86		
		88		
		91		
		92		
		93		
		95		



		96		
		97		
		100		
		101		
		102		
		103		
		104		
		126		
		130		
		131		
		139		
		147		
		155		
		161		
		162		
		164		
		165		
		166		
		167		
		169		
		170		
		172		
		174		
		176		
		177		
		179		
		182		
		183		
		184		
		185		
		186		
		191		
		193		
		194		
		196		



		199		
		200		
		201		
		203		
		209		
		220		
		228		
		249		
		252		
		253		
		260		
		266		
		270		
		271		
		272		
		273		
		275		
		276		
		280		
		281		
		283		
		284		
		289		
		290		
		291		
		292		
		294		
		299		
		300		
		301		
		303		
		305		
		306		
		309		
		310		



		312		
		313		
		314		
		315		
		317		
		320		
		325		
		329		
		330		
		331		
		332		
		333		
		334		
		337		
		338		
		339		
		340		
		341		
		342		
		345		
		346		
		347		
		350		
		351		
		352		
		353		
		354		
		356		
		357		
		358		
		372		
		377		
		389		
		390		
		391		



		392		
		393		
		394		
		395		
		398		
		399		
		400		
		401		
		402		
		406		
		408		
		409		
		410		
		413		
		414		
		415		
		416		
		421		
		422		
		423		
		424		
		425		
		426		
		427		
		429		
		431		
		435		
		436		
		437		
		438		
		439		
		442		
		444		
		447		
		448		



		449		
		452		
		454		
		455		
		456		
		459		
		461		
		462		
		486		
		491		
		496		
		497		
		498		
		501		
		503		
		505		
		507		
		508		
		509		
		511		
		512		
		522		
		525		
		551		
		561		
		562		
		564		
		565		
		566		
		567		
		568		
		569		
		570		
		571		
		572		



		573		
		574		
		575		
		576		
		577		
		578		
		579		
		580		
		53		
		54		
		70		
		155		
		180		
		197		
		201		
		228		
		274		
		301		
		307		
		309		
		313		
		319		
		323		
		334		
		341		
		349		
		354		
		356		
		372		
		402		
		414		
		426		
		439		
		522		



Glint and glare	Glint and glare from Site infrastructure	97	Residents voiced concerns about potential glint and glare from the solar panels, which could disrupt both visual amenity. Concerns were raised about how about how glare from the proposed panels could affect residents and local wildlife.	<p>Chapter 15: Glint and Glare [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.15] of the Environmental Statement presents the landscape mitigation measures that will seek to provide new planting to mitigate the potential impacts and effects of glint and glare, which will include new native hedgerows and tree cover, and this will also include their management and maintenance.</p> <p>Chapter 15: Glint and Glare [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.15] of the Environmental Statement presents the landscape mitigation measures that will seek to provide new planting to mitigate the potential impacts and effects of glint and glare.</p> <p>Where significant glint and glare effects are predicted towards road and residential receptors, instant vegetation screening is proposed so to provide instant mitigation.</p> <p>Without mitigation, significant glint and glare effects would be most likely to occur at receptors located closest to the fields with proposed solar panels. To mitigate against these effects, the landscaping mitigation includes for instant vegetation screening to avoid glint and glare effects. With these in place, the effects from glint</p>
		185		
		309		
		406		
		422		
		444		
		45		
		56		
		80		
		96		
		102		
		165		
		185		
		200		
		228		
		252		
		279		
		282		
		307		
		322		
		394		
		398		
		413		
		45		
		74		
		96		
		97		
		160		
		170		
		178		
		191		
		228		
		253		
		287		



		<p>289</p> <p>298</p> <p>313</p> <p>330</p> <p>361</p> <p>398</p> <p>406</p> <p>408</p> <p>413</p> <p>422</p> <p>427</p> <p>434</p> <p>444</p> <p>447</p> <p>501</p> <p>525</p> <p>510</p> <p>121</p> <p>221</p> <p>224</p> <p>254</p> <p>518</p> <p>528</p> <p>592</p>		and glare are not likely to be significant.
	Impact of glint and glare on Aerodromes		<p>Concerns were raised about aviation safety, particularly at nearby aerodromes like Sywell.</p> <p>Several raised concern about the potential safety impacts of glint and glare from panels on road safety and on aviation, particularly locally. Uncertainty and concern was also raised about the potential impact on local facilities, such as Sywell Aerodrome, where glint and glare may pose a</p>	<p>The effects of glint and glare upon road safety and aviation have been considered and assessed as part of Chapter 15: Glint and Glare [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.15] of the Environmental Statement.</p> <p>The effects towards Sywell Aerodrome</p>



			<p>risk to aircraft.</p> <p>Some expressed concern about the potential impacts on communities due to the potential safety risks to aviation as a result of glare.</p>	<p>have also been assessed as part of this report, as detailed in Section 15.8.</p> <p>Secondary impacts from glint and glare on recreational aviation are also considered in Chapter 17: Socio-Economics, Tourism and Recreation [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.17], including at Sywell Aerodrome as a specifically assessed receptor.</p>
	Impact of glint and glare on road users		<p>In addition to potentially impacting the safety of road users operating motor vehicles, some respondents noted that the and safety cyclists and pedestrians could be impacted by this issue.</p> <p>There were perceptions that glint and glare from solar panels could pose hazards, particularly affecting residential areas and roads. Respondents noted the need for strategies to manage potential reflective nuisances.</p> <p>The issue of glint and glare could deter recreational use of the</p>	<p>The effects of glint and glare upon road safety and aviation have been considered and assessed as part of Chapter 15: Glint and Glare [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.15] of the Environmental Statement. The effects towards Sywell Aerodrome have also been assessed as part of this report, as detailed in Section 15.8.</p>



			surrounding landscapes.	
	Impact of glint and glare on recreational users		The issue of glint and glare could deter recreational use of the surrounding landscapes.	<p>Chapter 15: Glint and Glare [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.15] of the Environmental Statement presents the landscape mitigation measures that will seek to provide new planting to mitigate the potential impacts and effects of glint and glare.</p> <p>Where significant glint and glare effects are predicted towards road and residential receptors, instant vegetation screening is proposed so to provide instant mitigation.</p>
	Impact of glint and glare on residential areas		There is uncertainty and concern about the impacts of potential glare from the proposed panels, on near residential areas	<p>Chapter 15: Glint and Glare [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.15] of the Environmental Statement presents the landscape mitigation measures that will seek to provide new planting to mitigate the potential impacts and effects of glint and glare, which will include new native hedgerows and tree cover, and this will also include their management and maintenance.</p>
	Glint and glare		Respondents felt that proposed mitigation strategies relating to	Chapter 15: Glint and Glare



	mitigation		<p>glint and glare, including vegetation screening, might be inadequate due to the area's topography.</p> <p>Some criticised the proposed mitigation, such as hedgerow planting, as inadequate.</p>	<p>[EN010170/APP/GH6.2.15] of the Environmental Statement presents the landscape mitigation measures that will seek to provide new planting to mitigate the potential impacts and effects of glint and glare.</p> <p>The landscaping mitigation has been reviewed by the glint and glare specialist to confirm its likely effectiveness. Since the statutory consultation, the landscaping mitigation has been further developed to include instant vegetation mitigation for glint and glare effects.</p>
	Lack of information about glint and glare		Some residents suggested that they felt the materials presented during were misleading and do not adequately assess the potential likelihood and impact of glint and glare.	<p>Chapter 15: Glint and Glare [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.15] of the Environmental Statement presents the full glint and glare assessment based on the final design of the scheme. Technical appendices provide the technical details behind the assessment. The landscape mitigation measures have been enhanced following input from the glint and glare specialists to mitigate the potential impacts and effects of glint and glare.</p>
Impact to local tourism	Impact on local heritage and natural tourist sites	165 406 408	Respondents expressed concerns about the perceived negative impact on tourism, with fears that the project might deter visitors to local heritage and natural attractions.	<p>Chapter 17: Socio-Economics, Tourism and Recreation [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.17] of the</p>



		<p>422 444 556 274 354 404 405 406 408 422 444 56 97 158 167 228 299 300 406 422 431 435 444 496 505 56</p>	<p>The perceived change in landscape character was seen as a threat to the area's tourist draw and appeal.</p> <p>Respondents noted that they felt the proposal would result in industrialising rural views which could also deter visitors and disrupt access to natural and historical attractions.</p> <p>Many respondents expressed a belief that local tourism will suffer as a result of the project.</p> <p>Respondents felt that as a result of visitors being deterred due to the perceived visual impact of the proposals, local businesses and parts of the local economy which rely on tourism, may be negatively impacted.</p>	<p>Environmental Statement considers environmental effects arising as a result of the Scheme, in relation to topics including tourism and accessibility and desirability of recreational facilities.</p> <p>This includes a detailed assessment of the likely impacts from the Scheme on the tourism economy and on individual tourism and recreation facilities and assets in the Scheme's Zone of Influence. This will account for potential impacts on public rights of way, impacts on tourism and visitor destinations, and the potential impact on tourism-dependent businesses in the areas immediately impacted by the Scheme.</p> <p>The OCEMP [EN010170/APP/GH7.1] commits to targeted construction mitigation measures such as offsets from roads, PROWs, and selective removal of parts of the Scheme to ensure impacts on the landscape as an assets for the desirability of the area for tourism is minimised.</p>
	Impact on active tourism	<p>101 299 337 354 406 413</p>	<p>Some respondents also noted that the project is expected to negatively impact tourism by restricting access to public rights of way, which they believe will disrupt the rural experience.</p>	<p>Chapter 17: Socio-Economics, Tourism and Recreation</p> <p>[EN010170/APP/GH6.2.17] of the Environmental Statement considers environmental effects arising as a result of the Scheme, in relation to</p>



		491		<p>topics including tourism and accessibility and desirability of recreational facilities.</p> <p>This includes a detailed assessment of the likely impacts from the Scheme on the tourism economy and on individual tourism and recreation facilities and assets in the Scheme's Zone of Influence. This will account for potential impacts on public rights of way, impacts on tourism and visitor destinations, and the potential impact on tourism-dependent businesses in the areas immediately impacted by the Scheme. The OCEMP</p> <p>[EN010170/APP/GH7.1] commits to targeted construction mitigation measures such as offsets from roads, PROWs, and selective removal of parts of the Scheme to ensure impacts on the landscape as an assets for the desirability of the area for tourism is minimised.</p>
	Construction impact on tourism		Some respondents also noted that the prolonged construction noise and traffic may also impact the tourism sector.	<p>Chapter 17: Socio-Economics, Tourism and Recreation</p> <p>[EN010170/APP/GH6.2.17] of the Environmental Statement considers environmental effects arising as a result of the Scheme, in relation to topics including tourism and accessibility and desirability of recreational facilities.</p>



<p>Impact on local community</p>	<p>Disruption of everyday life</p>	<p>31 32 34 35 36 37 84</p>	<p>Respondents felt that the proposed development would cause significant disruption, impacting everyday life with changes to the local environment. With many commenting that they feel the impact on local communities will be negative.</p> <p>There is a perception that the community will experience negative changes with few tangible benefits in return.</p>	<p>This includes a detailed assessment of the likely impacts from the Scheme on the tourism economy and on individual tourism and recreation facilities and assets in the Scheme's Zone of Influence. This will account for potential impacts on public rights of way, impacts on tourism and visitor destinations, and the potential impact on tourism-dependent businesses in the areas immediately impacted by the Scheme. The OCEMP [EN010170/APP/GH7.1] commits to targeted construction mitigation measures such as offsets from roads, PROWs, and selective removal of parts of the Scheme to ensure impacts on the landscape as an assets for the desirability of the area for tourism is minimised.</p> <p>Chapter 14: Noise and Vibration [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.14] of the Environmental Statement evaluates the likely significant effects of the Scheme on nearby noise and vibration sensitive receptors during construction, operation and decommissioning. The Applicant acknowledges there will always be some impact on community feeling towards changes in their surroundings, and the potential this has for mental health impacts from this type of development. The areas most</p>
---	------------------------------------	---	---	--



		266 274 304 309 323 325 349 354 424 439 447 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58		<p>immediately affected have assessed in ES Chapter 18: Human Health [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.18], and the Applicant is committed to ensuring sufficient mitigation measures are put in place to minimise these.</p> <p>The assessment acknowledges that benefits (such as economic effects and energy production) from the Scheme are likely to be felt over a wider area than the immediate adverse impacts.</p> <p>Efforts to provide specific benefits in locally impacted communities are set out in the OSSCEP [EN010170/APP/GH7.8] (for employment and economy), in the OLEMP [EN010170/APP/GH7.4] (for landscape and ecological improvements) and through the provision of community benefits such as new permissive access routes, or through the community benefit fund (separate to the DCO process).</p>
	Community benefits	60 61 62 63	<p>Many community members feel that the project is inappropriate for their area, citing concerns about its scale.</p> <p>Some respondents perceived a disregard for local needs in</p>	<p>The assessment acknowledges that benefits (such as economic effects and energy production) from the Scheme are likely to be felt over a wider area than the</p>



		64 65 66 67 68 69 70 71 72 73 74 75 76 77 78 79 80 81 82 83 84 85 86 87 88 89 90 91 92 93 94 95 96 97 98	favour of developer profits. Respondents were sceptical that local communities would benefit from the energy produced, as it would feed into the national grid.	immediate adverse impacts. Efforts to provide specific benefits in locally impacted communities are set out in the OSSCEP [EN010170/APP/GH7.8] (for employment and economy), in the OLEMP [EN010170/APP/GH7.4] (for landscape and ecological improvements) and through the provision of community benefits such as new permissive access routes, or through the community benefit fund (separate to the DCO process).
--	--	--	--	---



		99		
		100		
		101		
		102		
		103		
		104		
		105		
		106		
		107		
		108		
		109		
		110		
		111		
		112		
		113		
		114		
		115		
		116		
		117		
		118		
		119		
		120		
		121		
		122		
		123		
		124		
		125		
		126		
		127		
		128		
		129		
		130		
		131		
		132		
		133		



		134		
		135		
		136		
		137		
		138		
		139		
		140		
		141		
		142		
		143		
		144		
		146		
		147		
		148		
		149		
		150		
		151		
		152		
		153		
		154		
		155		
		156		
		157		
		158		
		159		
		160		
		161		
		162		
		163		
		164		
		165		
		166		
		167		
		168		
		169		



		170		
		171		
		172		
		173		
		174		
		175		
		176		
		177		
		178		
		179		
		180		
		181		
		182		
		183		
		184		
		185		
		186		
		187		
		188		
		189		
		190		
		191		
		192		
		193		
		194		
		195		
		196		
		197		
		198		
		199		
		200		
		201		
		202		
		203		
		204		



		205		
		206		
		207		
		208		
		209		
		210		
		211		
		212		
		213		
		214		
		215		
		216		
		217		
		218		
		219		
		220		
		221		
		222		
		223		
		224		
		225		
		226		
		227		
		228		
		229		
		230		
		231		
		232		
		233		
		234		
		235		
		236		
		237		
		238		
		239		



		240		
		241		
		242		
		243		
		244		
		245		
		246		
		247		
		248		
		249		
		250		
		251		
		252		
		253		
		254		
		255		
		256		
		257		
		258		
		259		
		260		
		261		
		262		
		263		
		264		
		265		
		266		
		267		
		268		
		269		
		270		
		271		
		272		
		273		
		274		



		275		
		276		
		277		
		278		
		279		
		280		
		281		
		282		
		283		
		284		
		285		
		286		
		287		
		288		
		289		
		290		
		291		
		292		
		293		
		294		
		295		
		296		
		297		
		298		
		299		
		300		
		301		
		302		
		303		
		304		
		305		
		306		
		307		
		308		
		309		



		310		
		311		
		312		
		313		
		314		
		315		
		316		
		317		
		318		
		319		
		320		
		321		
		322		
		323		
		324		
		325		
		326		
		327		
		328		
		329		
		330		
		331		
		332		
		333		
		334		
		335		
		337		
		338		
		339		
		340		
		341		
		342		
		343		
		344		
		345		



		346		
		347		
		348		
		349		
		350		
		351		
		352		
		353		
		354		
		355		
		356		
		357		
		358		
		359		
		360		
		361		
		362		
		363		
		364		
		365		
		366		
		367		
		368		
		369		
		370		
		371		
		372		
		373		
		374		
		375		
		376		
		377		
		378		
		379		
		380		



		381		
		382		
		383		
		384		
		385		
		386		
		387		
		388		
		389		
		390		
		391		
		392		
		393		
		394		
		395		
		396		
		397		
		398		
		399		
		400		
		401		
		402		
		403		
		404		
		405		
		406		
		407		
		408		
		409		
		410		
		411		
		412		
		413		
		414		
		415		



		416		
		417		
		418		
		419		
		420		
		421		
		422		
		423		
		424		
		425		
		426		
		427		
		428		
		429		
		430		
		431		
		432		
		433		
		434		
		435		
		436		
		437		
		438		
		439		
		440		
		441		
		442		
		443		
		444		
		445		
		446		
		447		
		448		
		449		
		450		



		451		
		452		
		453		
		454		
		455		
		456		
		457		
		458		
		459		
		460		
		461		
		462		
		463		
		464		
		465		
		466		
		467		
		468		
		469		
		470		
		471		
		472		
		473		
		474		
		475		
		476		
		477		
		478		
		479		
		480		
		481		
		482		
		483		
		484		
		485		



		486		
		487		
		488		
		489		
		490		
		491		
		492		
		493		
		494		
		495		
		496		
		497		
		498		
		499		
		500		
		501		
		502		
		503		
		504		
		505		
		506		
		507		
		508		
		509		
		510		
		511		
		512		
		513		
		514		
		515		
		516		
		517		
		518		
		519		
		520		



		521		
		522		
		523		
		524		
		525		
		526		
		527		
		528		
		529		
		530		
		531		
		532		
		533		
		534		
		535		
		536		
		538		
		539		
		540		
		541		
		542		
		543		
		544		
		545		
		547		
		549		
		550		
		551		
		552		
		553		
		556		
		557		
		558		
		559		
		560		



		561		
		562		
		564		
		565		
		566		
		567		
		568		
		569		
		570		
		571		
		572		
		573		
		574		
		575		
		576		
		577		
		578		
		579		
		580		
		581		
		582		
		583		
		584		
		585		
		586		
		587		
		590		
		34		
		56		
		62		
		67		
		74		
		80		
		96		
		99		



		101 176 179 277 309 329 354 398 440 511 525 34 44 45 47 53 54 56 63 70 72 73 80 81 98 101 157 158 159 160 162 165 166 177 179		
--	--	---	--	--



		182		
		185		
		195		
		203		
		209		
		228		
		252		
		259		
		260		
		274		
		277		
		279		
		284		
		291		
		292		
		298		
		299		
		300		
		307		
		324		
		327		
		330		
		339		
		342		
		345		
		350		
		351		
		352		
		354		
		360		
		388		
		389		
		392		
		394		
		397		



		399 400 406 412 413 414 416 421 491 525 560 34 36 37 39 40 45 53 54 57 62 72 81 83 84 88 96 97 101 104 126 130 135 139 155		
--	--	--	--	--



		156		
		158		
		160		
		161		
		162		
		163		
		165		
		166		
		167		
		174		
		177		
		182		
		184		
		185		
		186		
		195		
		196		
		198		
		199		
		200		
		209		
		228		
		251		
		252		
		253		
		259		
		269		
		274		
		276		
		280		
		281		
		283		
		287		
		289		
		290		



		294		
		303		
		304		
		305		
		306		
		307		
		309		
		313		
		314		
		315		
		324		
		325		
		330		
		334		
		335		
		339		
		342		
		345		
		349		
		350		
		351		
		354		
		356		
		361		
		372		
		387		
		389		
		390		
		398		
		402		
		406		
		408		
		412		
		414		
		421		



		422		
		424		
		433		
		436		
		438		
		441		
		442		
		444		
		445		
		447		
		461		
		497		
		498		
		501		
		503		
		551		
		556		
		560		
		573		
		576		
		577		
		579		
		580		
		581		
		582		
		84		
		266		
		274		
		304		
		309		
		323		
		325		
		349		
		354		
		424		



		439 447 60 116 117 119 215 238 255 263 381 386 468 552		
Local amenity	Impact on public spaces	60 75 121 384 551 32 37 38 44 45 53 62 73 77 82 86 90 91 92	<p>Respondents perceive that the project will have a negative impact on amenities, including disrupting community activities and diminishing the quality of local public spaces.</p> <p>Respondents stated they are concerned about losing access to walking and riding paths and the area's tranquil environment.</p> <p>There is a perception that the transformation of green spaces via the proposed infrastructure might limit recreational opportunities, affecting paths used for walking, cycling, and horse riding.</p> <p>Concern was also expressed that the construction the project may limit access to essential community spaces, including playgrounds and allotments, impeding recreational opportunities and local gatherings.</p> <p>Respondents expressed concerns regarding restricted access to Public Rights of Way (PRoWs), which they expressed are vital</p>	<p>Chapter 17: Socio-Economics, Tourism and Recreation [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.17] of the Environmental Statement considers environmental effects arising as a result of the Scheme, in relation to topics including tourism and accessibility and desirability of recreational facilities. This involves considering the amenity value of the existing footpath network, open spaces, and access to the countryside for recreational use.</p> <p>Chapter 17: Socio-Economics, Tourism and Recreation [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.17] of the Environmental Statement assesses impacts on the accessibility, desirability and use of public rights of way (PRoWs),</p>



		94 95 96 98 100 101 102 181 247 354 357 389 392 393 403 406 408 422	for recreation and leisure activities such as walking, cycling, and horse riding. Respondents noted that the proposed construction phase will significantly impact local recreational facilities, such as footpaths and bridleway.	open spaces, formal and informal recreation facilities in the countryside in Section 17.8 of the chapter. There has been opportunities to improve connectivity within the project area and the Applicant has welcomed input from the local community and interested parties on their proposals to do this, so these can be explored further. ES Chapter 17: Socio-Economics, Tourism and Recreation [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.17] includes a detailed assessment of the likely impacts from the Scheme on recreation facilities and assets in the Scheme's Zone of Influence. This will account for potential impacts on public rights of way, impacts on visitor destinations, sports, equestrian, and play areas in the areas immediately impacted by the Scheme.
Archaeological and Cultural heritage	Impact on local cultural, historical and archaeological sites	97 306 309 313 342 350 400 406 408 422 444 522 556 90	Some perceive the project as a threat to the area's natural beauty and historic character, fearing that the visual impact on historic views and the overall aesthetic of the countryside will be detrimental and lasting. Respondents expressed that the project would harm archaeological sites and cultural heritage, including historic buildings. Some respondents note that the development is seen as incompatible with the preservation of historical and cultural sites. Respondents also expressed worry about potential damage to	Chapter 12: Cultural Heritage [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.12] of the Environmental Statement presents an assessment of the effects of the Scheme on cultural heritage and archaeological receptors. This includes an assessment of the Scheme's effect on heritage, historic landscape and archaeology arising from likely impacts alongside proposed appropriate mitigation. The assessment identifies and evaluates heritage assets within and surrounding the Study Area and assesses how the



		<p>348 389 436 503 56 101 157 162 169 252 265 281 283 289 298 299 300 303 306 322 334 342 374</p>	<p>historical sites and archaeological resources. Concerns were noted regarding potential negative impacts on the historic settings of villages, risking the integrity of listed buildings and cultural landmarks, in particular some respondents noted those located in Grendon and Easton Maudit.</p>	<p>Scheme may potentially affect those heritage assets.</p>
	<p>Consideration of cultural landmarks</p>	<p>389 399 400 406 408 414 422 510 556 573 72 275</p>	<p>Respondents requested careful consideration and protection of cultural landmarks and some stressed the importance of integrating archaeological evaluations into the project planning process.</p> <p>Respondents noted that the scheme would be situated within a sensitive heritage and conservation area. Easton Maudit and Mears Ashby were also referenced as conservation areas. Some respondents suggested that solar panels be removed from Green Hill D and E to protect local conservation areas.</p>	<p>The Heritage Statement (ES Appendix 12.1) [EN010170/APP/GH6.3.12.1] assesses the potential impact of the Scheme on the historic setting of the area, including on Easton Maudit and Mears Ashby.</p>



		<p>424 439 505 249 295 306 340 401 406 422 444 97 406 408 416 56 72 165 169 200 249 269 298 306 308</p>		
	Mitigation to protect cultural, historical and archaeological sites	<p>309 313 374 406 422 438 444 446 512 573</p>	<p>There was scepticism regarding the effectiveness of proposed mitigation measures. Many respondents expressed scepticism about the adequacy of proposed mitigation strategies such as planting trees and hedgerows to screen the development, some respondents highlighted doubts about their effectiveness in the short/medium term.</p> <p>Several respondents advocated for visual buffers and other mitigation strategies to be used.</p>	<p>Chapter 12: Cultural Heritage [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.12] of the Environmental Statement includes an assessment of potential effects upon Historic Landscape Character of the Scheme.</p> <p>The mitigation associated with the Scheme is included in the Landscape and Ecology Mitigation & Enhancement Measures</p>



		54 158 165 166 199 284 306 309 342 399 406 422 444 556 72 275 424 439 505 90 421 456 590 60 75 116 117 232 233 261 379 468 528 594		forming part of the LVIA with details shown on Figures 8.16.1 to 8.16.10 and Section 8.8 of Chapter 8: Landscape and Visual Impact [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.8] of the Environmental Statement. The landscape measures also include the preparation of an Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (OLEMP) [EN010170/APP/GH7.4] which prescribes how the landscape and ecology mitigation measures identified and proposed would be implemented and managed to ensure the effectiveness and certainty in achieving the objectives.
Local business	Cumulative impact of	117	Respondents commented on the potential negative impacts on	Chapter 17: Socio-Economics, Tourism



reduced tourism on local businesses	235 32 90 95 98 100 159 309 315 354 406 408 422 444 88 97 183 340 361 101 167 283 299 300 303 309 337 354 406 431 435 496 144 63 81	<p>local businesses, particularly those reliant on tourism and outdoor recreational activities and a result of the proposed Project.</p> <p>Some expressed concern that the development could deter visitors, affecting the local economy, and that the disruption from construction and changes to the landscape could adversely impact businesses such as riding schools and livery stables, which depend on the natural beauty of the countryside.</p>	<p>and Recreation [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.17] of the Environmental Statement considers environmental effects arising as a result of the Scheme, in relation to topics including tourism and accessibility and desirability of recreational facilities. This includes a detailed assessment of the likely impacts from the Scheme on the tourism economy and on individual tourism and recreation facilities and assets in the Scheme's Zone of Influence. This will account for potential impacts on public rights of way, impacts on tourism and visitor destinations, and the potential impact on tourism-dependent businesses in the areas immediately impacted by the Scheme. The OCEMP [EN010170/APP/GH7.1] commits to targeted construction mitigation measures such as offsets from roads, PROWs, and selective removal of parts of the Scheme to ensure impacts on the landscape as an assets for the desirability of the area for tourism is minimised.</p> <p>The socio-economics assessment [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.17] accounts for potential impacts on equestrian business as visitor locations, and considers the direct impacts on agricultural employment as a result of the Scheme. The assessment acknowledges that economic and employment benefits from</p>
--	---	---	--



		96 101 185 203 265 274 289 290 337 354 361 398 400 406 411 491 556		the Scheme are likely to be felt over a wider area than the immediate adverse impacts. Efforts to provide specific benefits in locally impacted communities are set out in the OSSCEP [EN010170/APP/GH7.8].
	Impact on local agricultural and equestrian businesses		<p>Some respondents suggested that the proposal is seen as a threat to local economic activities, particularly in agriculture, tourism, and equestrian businesses, which may suffer due to disruptions and stress on animals.</p> <p>Many expressed concern about a possible shift from productive use of agricultural land tourism to solar production and what the its economic implications for the local economy may be.</p>	<p>Chapter 17: Socio-Economics, Tourism and Recreation [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.17] of the Environmental Statement considers environmental effects arising as a result of the Scheme, in relation to topics including tourism and accessibility and desirability of recreational facilities.</p> <p>This includes a detailed assessment of the likely impacts from the Scheme on the tourism economy and on individual tourism and recreation facilities and assets in the Scheme's Zone of Influence. This will account for potential impacts on public rights of way, impacts on tourism and visitor destinations, and the potential impact on tourism-</p>



				<p>dependent businesses in the areas immediately impacted by the Scheme. The OCEMP [EN010170/APP/GH7.1] commits to targeted construction mitigation measures such as offsets from roads, PROWs, and selective removal of parts of the Scheme to ensure impacts on the landscape as an assets for the desirability of the area for tourism is minimised.</p> <p>The socio-economics assessment accounts for potential impacts on equestrian business as visitor locations, and considers the direct impacts on agricultural employment as a result of the Scheme.</p> <p>The assessment acknowledges that economic and employment benefits from the Scheme are likely to be felt over a wider area than the immediate adverse impacts. Efforts to provide specific benefits in locally impacted communities are set out in the OSSCEP [EN010170/APP/GH7.8].</p>
	Impact of the construction phase on local businesses		Residents fear that the construction phase will lead to severe traffic congestion which may lead to economic loss and disruption to existing businesses	<p>Mitigation measures associated with transport and access are summarised in the Transport Assessment (Section 8) the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (OCTMP) [EN010170/APP/GH7.9], presented as Appendix 13.1 to Chapter 13: Transport and Access [EN010170/APP/GH6.3.12.1] of the Environmental Statement.C</p>



Recreational activities	Impact on recreational activities tied to the natural local landscape	60		Chapter 17: Socio-Economics, Tourism and Recreation [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.17] of the Environmental Statement considers environmental effects arising as a result of the Scheme, in relation to topics including accessibility and desirability of recreational facilities. This includes a detailed assessment of the likely impacts from the Scheme on recreation facilities and assets in the Scheme's Zone of Influence. This will account for potential impacts on public rights of way, impacts on visitor destinations, sports, equestrian, and play areas in the areas immediately impacted by the Scheme. Chapter 17 also assesses impacts on the accessibility, desirability and use of public rights of way (PRoWs), open spaces, formal and informal recreation facilities in the countryside in Section 17.8 of the chapter. Opportunities to improve connectivity within the Scheme have been explored with input from the local community and interested parties. As a result, the Scheme includes the provision of new permissive paths. These are set out in the Outline Public Rights of Way and Permissive Management Plan (OPROWPPMP) [EN010170/APP/GH7.10], which is secured by requirement in the draft Development Consent Order
		75		
		117		
		241		
		592		
		44		
		45		
		47		
		81		
		94		
		96		
		98		
		159		
		160		
		191		
		193		
		372		
		392		
		393		
		408		
		422		
		440		
		444		
		57		
		63		
		94		
		228		
		491		
		54		
		56		
		72		
		97		
		158		
		165		



		166 169 200 249 275 284 295 298 306 308 309 313 340 374 399 401 406 408 416 422 424 438 439 444 446 512 556 573 505		[EN010170/APP/GH3.1].
Community Benefits	Lack of confidence in the Applicant to develop community benefits	106 116 117 121 214	Many respondents express concern that the Project doesn't offer tangible benefits to local communities. Respondents suggested that they feel the negative impacts from the Project will outweigh any benefits that may arise. Some respondents expressed concern that community benefits won't be delivered.	The Applicant is committed to ensuring that communities benefit from the Scheme including by receiving direct funding to important causes in the local area. During the development of the proposals for Green Hill Solar Farm, we



		<p>216</p> <p>238</p> <p>94</p> <p>97</p> <p>32</p> <p>34</p> <p>37</p> <p>38</p> <p>40</p> <p>42</p> <p>44</p> <p>45</p> <p>52</p> <p>53</p> <p>54</p> <p>56</p> <p>57</p> <p>62</p> <p>63</p> <p>65</p>		<p>have consulted on community benefits and, based on feedback, will determine how best to distribute funding.</p> <p>The Scheme will also generate business rates that are paid to the local authority. Opportunities to improve connectivity within the Scheme have been explored with input from the local community and interested parties. As a result, the Scheme includes the provision of new permissive paths. These are set out in the Outline Public Rights of Way and Permissive Management Plan (OPROWPPMP) [EN010170/APP/GH7.10], which is secured by requirement in the draft Development Consent Order [EN010170/APP/GH3.1].</p>
	Lack of energy benefits	<p>66</p> <p>67</p> <p>69</p> <p>70</p> <p>72</p> <p>73</p> <p>74</p> <p>77</p> <p>80</p> <p>81</p> <p>82</p> <p>84</p> <p>85</p> <p>86</p>	<p>Some respondents expressed concern about the viability of community benefits, given the energy production from the scheme feeds into the national grid without delivering direct advantages to the community.</p>	<p>Solar Energy UK are developing best practice guidance for community benefits for solar farms and part of this work has been to determine what is financially viable for solar farms to offer communities. The Applicant intends to align approach once this guidance has been published.</p>



		88		
		89		
		90		
		91		
		92		
		93		
		94		
		95		
		96		
		97		
		98		
		99		
		100		
		101		
		102		
		103		
		108		
		131		
		147		
		196		
		197		
		202		
		247		
		249		
		270		
		283		
		289		
		299		
		303		
		304		
		305		
		309		
		329		
		333		



		351		
		356		
		360		
		372		
		387		
		389		
		390		
		391		
		392		
		393		
		394		
		399		
		401		
		403		
		404		
		405		
		406		
		408		
		409		
		410		
		412		
		413		
		414		
		415		
		416		
		421		
		422		
		424		
		427		
		430		
		431		
		433		
		438		
		439		



		440		
		444		
		446		
		447		
		449		
		452		
		453		
		454		
		455		
		456		
		457		
		459		
		460		
		461		
		471		
		478		
		486		
		491		
		492		
		496		
		500		
		505		
		510		
		511		
		525		
		556		
		571		
		576		
		578		
		34		
		73		
		80		
		94		
		98		



		<p>270 399 98 437 166 56 304 309 372 560 576 191 247 304 372</p>		
Net Zero	Lack of confidence that the Project will positively contribute to national net zero goals	<p>379 51 56 65 91 101 104 153 158 160 164 168 178 195 196 213 248 275 281</p>	Many respondents acknowledged the importance of achieving net-zero, however there are doubts about whether the perceived cost to local communities and environments outweighs potential benefits.	<p>A Statement of Need [EN010170/APP/GH7.12] has been submitted as part of the application, setting out context, requirement and contribution of the Scheme to securing and decarbonising UK energy supply.</p> <p>Local and national planning policy has been identified in Chapter 6 (Energy Need, Legislative Context and Energy Policy) of the Environmental Statement [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.6].</p> <p>Chapter 7: Climate Change [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.7] of the Environmental Statement presents the findings of the Environmental Impact Assessment concerning the potential impacts of the Scheme on the Climate inclusive of an analysis of the carbon</p>



		306 34 51 74 98 158 315 333 338 346 354 357 396 507 522 576 580 104 332 338 354 357 427 440 445 457 507 522 580 97 36 37 39 41		footprint of constructing the solar farm and whether the renewable energy produced can sufficiently offset this.
--	--	---	--	--



		53		
		55		
		65		
		74		
		90		
		91		
		92		
		94		
		97		
		103		
		104		
		126		
		131		
		135		
		158		
		159		
		160		
		167		
		178		
		182		
		191		
		268		
		269		
		278		
		302		
		304		
		305		
		310		
		315		
		316		
		317		
		322		
		327		
		328		



		332		
		347		
		387		
		389		
		391		
		392		
		393		
		397		
		398		
		400		
		403		
		405		
		412		
		423		
		427		
		433		
		434		
		436		
		437		
		439		
		441		
		448		
		450		
		453		
		455		
		457		
		459		
		460		
		462		
		474		
		491		
		495		
		497		
		498		



		503 504 31 51 54 56 62 97 100 158 167 176 185 194 195 264 274		
	Financial compensation as a community benefit		Respondents suggest that local investment and revenue-sharing schemes should be considered as a benefit for those affected by the project. Some also suggested reduced energy bills as a way of reducing energy costs.	The Applicant is committed to ensuring that communities benefit from the Scheme including by receiving direct funding to important causes in the local area. During the development of the proposals for Green Hill Solar Farm, we have consulted on community benefits and, based on feedback, will determine how best to distribute funding. The Scheme will also generate business rates that are paid to the local authority.
	Carbon footprint of the Scheme		Concerns include the carbon footprint of constructing the solar farm and whether the renewable energy produced can sufficiently offset this. Additionally, respondents express concerns about undermining food security by using prime agricultural land. They also question the carbon footprint associated with sourcing solar panels from high-polluting regions. Some respondents are sceptical about the role of solar	Chapter 7: Climate Change [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.7] of the Environmental Statement presents the findings of the Environmental Impact Assessment concerning the potential impacts of the Scheme on the Climate



			panels in achieving net zero emissions.	inclusive of an analysis of the carbon footprint of constructing the solar farm and whether the renewable energy produced can sufficiently offset this
Climate Change	Lack of confidence in solar energy as a strategy to tackle climate change	42 86 96 101 104 176 195 209 274 88 89 97 104 197 198 33 201 206 210 211 33 212 218 148 33 33 223 226 228 229	<p>Respondents noted a recognition of climate change as a pressing issue, yet many express scepticisms about the efficacy of large-scale solar farms in effectively addressing it.</p> <p>There is a call for alternative approaches that do not compromise local environments, indicating a preference for solutions that balance renewable energy production with the preservation of agricultural land and natural landscapes.</p> <p>Some respondents also highlighted frustration that the UK's efforts are negligible on a global scale unless larger countries take similar actions.</p>	<p>The Applicant notes these comments and that further relevant information has been provided in the DCO application. For example, the Statement of Need [EN010170/APP/GH7.12] explains the reasons for the Scheme being large scale solar generation and sets out the context, requirement and contribution of the Scheme to securing and decarbonising UK energy supply. It is not considered that small scale generation is an alternative to this, rather it compliments it.</p> <p>The Applicant is cognisant of other projects being proposed in the area and has undertaken assessments to consider the potential cumulative effect of this. Cumulative impacts of the Scheme have been addressed as a whole within Chapter 25: Cumulative Effects [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.25] of the Environmental Statement. Each topic chapter considers the impacts of Scheme; and the impact of the Scheme in conjunction with other large scale solar proposals and other committed developments within the region.</p> <p>The efficacy of the scheme with regards to Greenhouse gas emissions and Climate resilience is assessed in</p>



		33 231 233 234 236 238 239 241 243 245		Chapter 7: Climate Change [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.7] of the Environmental Statement. The conclusions show that, while there will be emissions associated with building the site and associated production of on site materials, the scheme will have an overall beneficial effect.
	Alternative Technologies	257 258 259 263 33 271 272 33 277 33 282 288 292 300 136 303 33 304 33 319 328 331 332	Respondents advocate for more sustainable land use practices, prioritising solar development on brownfield sites instead of expansive rural areas, to ensure the preservation of local agriculture and ecological balance.	The Applicant has undertaken detailed agricultural land classification (ALC) assessment of the Sites, as presented in Chapter 20: Agricultural Circumstances [EN010170/APP/GH6.2.20].



		333 338 340 33 343 33 345 350 106 352 33 372 373 146 380 381 382 383 384 384 388 389 391 394 396 397 398 399 33 402 121 406 384 33		
--	--	---	--	--



		129 33 416 415 419 421 422 33 426 33 427 33 429 431 433 431 434 415 33 33 446 33 33 447 384 384 415 453 106 355 593		
--	--	---	--	--