

Green Hill Solar Farm

EN010170

The Applicant's Responses to Deadline 2 Submissions

Prepared by: Lanpro Services

Date: December 2025

Document Reference: EX3/GH8.1.18

The Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010

Rules 8(1)(c)



Contents

<u>1</u>	<u>Introduction</u>	<u>3</u>
1.1	Purpose of the Document	3
<u>2</u>	<u>The Applicant's Response to Deadline 2 Submissions</u>	<u>4</u>
2.1	Bozeat Parish Council	4
2.2	CPRE Northamptonshire	11
2.3	Wellingborough Walks Action Group Ltd	14
2.4	Jacob Hinson	19



Issue Sheet

Report Prepared for: Green Hill Solar Farm

Examination Deadline 3

The Applicant's Responses to Deadline 2 Submission

Prepared by

Name: Anna Rowan

Job title: EIA Consultant

Approved by

Name: Jane Crichton

Job title: Associate Director

Revision	Date	Prepared by	Approved by
Original	17/12/2025	AR	JC



1 Introduction

1.1 Purpose of the Document

- 1.1.1 This document provides Green Hill Solar Farm Limited's (the 'Applicant's') response to submissions made to the Planning Inspectorate (PINS) by 19 November 2025, relating to Examination Deadline 2 for the Development Consent Order Application (the 'Application') for Green Hill Solar Farm (the 'Scheme').
- 1.1.2 This report provides the Applicant's comments on responses to Deadline 2 submissions by Interested Parties, including any comments made in regard to Written Representations and Local Impact Reports.
- 1.1.3 References to the Application documentation are provided in accordance with the referencing system set out in the Planning Inspectorate's Green Hill Solar Farm [Examination Library](#).
- 1.1.4 Revision suffixes have also been attached to documents which, since submission, have been revised for and resubmitted by Deadline 3 to the Planning Inspectorate.



2 The Applicant's Response to Deadline 2 Submissions

2.1 Bozeat Parish Council

Table 2.1: [\[REP2-066\]](#) and [\[REP2-067\]](#)

Reference	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicants Response								
BPC-001	Noise and Vibration	Noise Level	<p>EN010170-000910-GH7.1_A_Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan Revision A (Tracked).</p> <p>We feel that the proposal to allow out of hours noise of over 65db until 11:00 pm is unacceptably late.</p>	<p>All appropriate precautions to minimise the potential for disturbance to the occupiers of neighbouring properties in terms of noise and vibration during the construction phases of the development have been included and are set out in Table 3.8 of the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan Revision A [REP1-131].</p> <p>The construction impact semantic scale, set out in the table below, is based on the ABC method of assessment described in Annex E.3.2 of BS 5228, which sets out threshold values depending upon the ambient noise at receptors, which have been determined from the baseline sound survey.</p> <p>Construction Time Period – Lowest Observed Adverse Effect Level (LOAEL) and Significant Observed Adverse Effect Level (SOAEL)</p> <table><tr><th>Time Period</th><th>LOAEL</th><th>SOAEL</th><th>Threshold Level L_{Aeq,1hr} dB</th></tr><tr><td>Day (07:00-19:00 hours Weekday and 07:00-12:00 Saturdays)</td><td>Baseline noise levels L_{Aeq,T}</td><td>Threshold level determined as per BS 5228-1:2009+A1:2014 Section E3.2 and Table E.1 BS</td><td>65 - 75</td></tr></table>	Time Period	LOAEL	SOAEL	Threshold Level L _{Aeq,1hr} dB	Day (07:00-19:00 hours Weekday and 07:00-12:00 Saturdays)	Baseline noise levels L _{Aeq,T}	Threshold level determined as per BS 5228-1:2009+A1:2014 Section E3.2 and Table E.1 BS	65 - 75
Time Period	LOAEL	SOAEL	Threshold Level L _{Aeq,1hr} dB									
Day (07:00-19:00 hours Weekday and 07:00-12:00 Saturdays)	Baseline noise levels L _{Aeq,T}	Threshold level determined as per BS 5228-1:2009+A1:2014 Section E3.2 and Table E.1 BS	65 - 75									



Reference	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicants Response			
						5228-1:2009+A1:2014	
				Night (23:00-07:00) hours	Baseline noise levels $L_{Aeq,T}$	Threshold level determined as per BS 5228-1:2009+A1:2014 Section E3.2 and Table E.1 BS 5228-1:2009+A1:2014	45 - 55
				Evening and weekends (time periods not covered above)	Baseline noise levels $L_{Aeq,T}$	Threshold level determined as per BS 5228-1:2009+A1:2014 Section E3.2 and Table E.1 BS 5228-1:2009+A1:2014	55 - 65
				<p>Adopting a threshold level of 65dB across the daytime and evening period is deemed reasonable and in accordance with the BS 5228-1:2009+A1:2014 Section E3.2 and Table E.1 BS 5228-1:2009+A1:2014 as set out in ES Chapter 14 Noise and Vibration [APP-051] and ES Addendum Chapter 14 [REP1-168].</p> <p>It should also be noted that construction of the Scheme will be restricted to the working hours of 07:00 to 18:00 Monday to Friday, and between 08:00 and 13:30 on Saturdays (section 2.4 of the outline Construction Environmental Management Plan</p>			



Reference	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicants Response
				<p>(oCEMP) [REP1-131], except where activities are required outside of these hours such as for continuous hydraulic directional drilling (HDD) activities. Construction noise will therefore stop after works are shut down at the end of each working day, and will not continue until 11:00 pm. Where works are required outside of the core working hours, the noise levels have been assessed against the nighttime threshold, typically 45 dB based on the background noise levels recorded, with mitigation proposed to reduce noise levels as far as practicable. The oCEMP secures that no residential property will experience nighttime noise levels exceeding 65dB and provides a series of mitigation measures that will, as far as practicable, reduce nighttime noise levels below the SOAEL Threshold Level (see Table 1.4 in ES Addendum Chapter 14 [REP1-168] for the level applicable to relevant receptors. The level is based on the surveyed ambient nighttime noise level for each receptor).</p> <p>Each location where HDD is used will require a bespoke mitigation package. However, Table 1.5 of ES Addendum Chapter 14 [REP1-168] illustrates the effect of applying only a single mitigation measure, an acoustic fence, to reduce HDD noise, and confirming that levels experienced at all residential receptors can readily be reduced to below 65dB.</p>
BPC-002	General Matters	Document error	EN010170-001023-GH8.1.6_Written Summary of the Applicants Oral Submissions and Responses at Issue Specific Hearing 1 and Responses to Action Points.	The Applicant notes this comment and apologises for the misspelling. Whilst it is not possible to replace the document with a corrected version, the Applicant will ensure Mr Skittrall's name is correct if used in any future document.



Reference	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicants Response
			Although not material, could my name please be corrected to Skittrall and not Skittral.	
BPC-003	General Matters	Local Impact Reports.	<p>EN010170-001041-LOCAL IMPACT REPORT_WEST NORTHANTS COUNCIL & EN010170-000758-07.11.25 GHSF NNC LIR.</p> <p>We agree with both Local Impact Reports in that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• there would be an adverse impact upon the landscape• there would be an adverse impact upon the landscape character• the impacts would be greater that the applicant suggests• local roads need to be assessed for glint and glare not least because some are heavily used• the community benefit scheme should form a part of the DCO• funding for decommissioning must be secured	The Applicant notes this comment and refers to the Applicant's Responses to Local Impact Reports [REP2-049] .



Reference	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicants Response
BPC-004	Landscape and Visual Impacts	Viewpoint and Photomontage Locations	<p>In relation to Q.16.0.3 ExA First Questions.</p> <p>We feel that because of the chosen layout of the panels and in order to conform to the Rochdale Envelope it is necessary to relocate VP35 further along the footpath to where the footpath meets the access track between fields GF1 and GF4.</p>	<p>The LVIA has utilised a Receptor Based approach to Assessment, with Viewpoints used to represent views from locations within the receiving landscape. As such, individual viewpoints are used as representative views from receptors, in this case, representative of views from PRow MK Lavendon 005 (TP215). The location of VP35 was chosen as it is on an elevated position within the Site with open uninterrupted views across Site G. the location suggested is on lower lying land alongside the valley corridor that runs south through Site G where the proximity to the vegetation along the brook would limit the extents of the photography. Effects have been assessed to users of this section of PRow in the round, and as such, moving the VP to the suggested location would not change the overall assessment of effects.</p> <p>The selection of viewpoints was made on the basis of the following types of publicly accessible viewpoints, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Representative viewpoints (representative of views from a particular PRow);• Specific viewpoints (such as key views from a specific visitor attraction);• Illustrative viewpoints (chosen to demonstrate a particular effect/specific issue); <p>Viewpoint photography locations have been identified through desk studies and verified through fieldwork to illustrate visual baseline conditions in and around the Scheme. Views selected are representative of different receptors to aid the description of effects on both Landscape and Visual receptors.</p> <p>Viewpoints have been selected to represent the experience of different types of visual receptor, including users of PRow,</p>



Reference	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicants Response
				<p>residential properties, transport routes, heritage, and recreational sites. Selected viewpoints include specific locations that are popular vantage points or tourist destinations, and those suggested through Section 42 and Section 47 consultation.</p> <p>Locations of the required photomontages and Accurate Visual Representation (AVR) were agreed with the Landscape Officer representatives for North Northamptonshire Council, West Northamptonshire Council and Milton Keynes City Council and are illustrated in Figure series 8.14 [APP-334 to APP-400] and as set out within Table 8.6 of the ES Chapter 8 Landscape and Visual Impact [APP-045].</p> <p>Email correspondence was sent to MKCC on the 25th November 2025 confirming that in response to MKCC-012 within the Deadline 1 submissions, the Applicant will undertake the additional viewpoints and photomontages as requested.</p> <p>MKCC have confirmed locations of the 3 additional viewpoints with photography completed in December 2025. We aim to submit the updated photomontages by Deadline 4 or 5.</p>
BPC-005	Transport and Access	Highways Safety	<p>In relation to Q.20.0.9 ExA First Questions.</p> <p>The applicant's response to this does not acknowledge that the cemetery, the parking spaces for several Easton Lane properties, the new-build Ahern Close and a number of individual properties are on the opposite side of Link 81 to the footpaths meaning that pedestrians always have to cross</p>	<p>Table 13A1.1 of ES Appendix 13.1 Transport and Access Assessment Tables [APP-150] outlines the links and their associated sensitivity.</p> <p>Link 81 reflects the extent of Easton Lane and London Road through Bozeat and is considered to be of High sensitivity. Therefore, the matters highlighted such as access points and the need for people to cross roads has been fully considered and accounted for.</p> <p>The route towards East Maudit (Link 80) has similarly been assessed. Existing levels of traffic are presented in Table 13A1.3 of ES Appendix 13.1 Transport and Access Assessment</p>



Reference	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicants Response
			<p>the road. Residents of the Ahern Close development and the individual properties would have to do so to reach all facilities within the village including the village shop, school, churches, community church hall and playing fields.</p> <p>The applicant's response also does not address the safety of non-motorised users of the road to Easton Maudit.</p>	<p>Tables [APP-150] and this shows the route currently accommodates 136 two-way HGV movements per day. To the Green Hill F access, 7 two-way HGV movements per day are forecast, representing a negligible change in the volume of HGV traffic.</p> <p>Subject to the implementation of mitigation measures set out in the OCTMP Revision A [REP1-145] and OOTMP Revision A [REP1-157], the Applicant is confident that no significant adverse effects to users are anticipated during the construction or operational phases of the Scheme.</p> <p>The Applicant also refers to 8.2.5 Transport and Access Technical Note [REP2-055], which includes sensitivity testing of the worst-case scenario for HGV movements. The report provides a detailed explanation of how the potential for traffic and transport effects on highways, including Link 81 through Bozeat, have been assessed in relation to severance, non-motorised user delay and amenity, fear and intimidation, driver delay and road user and pedestrian safety, confirming a negligible effect in relation to all potential impacts to Link 81.</p>



2.2 CPRE Northamptonshire

Table 2.2: [\[REP2-068\]](#) and [\[REP2-069\]](#)

Reference	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicants Response
CPRE-001	Landscape and Visual Impacts	Viewpoint and Photomontage Locations	<p>In relation to Q.16.0.3 ExA First Questions.</p> <p>In our Representation we suggested that VP1 was not representative of the views experienced by visitors to Lamport Hall. We believe that the view from the hall or from the first floor function rooms and not at a lower point in the gardens should be provided to properly represent the impact on receptors at this heritage asset. The potential difference in visibility of the scheme is illustrated within the submission document where the DCO photograph from VP1 can be contrasted with a stitched photograph of the view from the Yellow Room of Lamport Hall.</p>	<p>The ES Chapter 8 Landscape and Visual Impact [APP-045] utilise a 'Receptor' based assessment, using viewpoint photography and photomontage to support the understanding of effects upon receptors within the receiving landscape. Viewpoint photography locations were identified through desk studies and verified through fieldwork to illustrate visual baseline conditions in and around the Scheme. Views selected are representative of different receptors to aid the description of effects on both Landscape and Visual receptors. Positions of viewpoint photography were agreed in consultation with Landscape Officers from North Northamptonshire, West Northamptonshire and Milton Keynes and fixed prior to verified photography being undertaken. Consultation with the relevant consultees and planning authorities has played an important part in selecting the viewpoints to support the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) process. Viewpoint selection follows good practice guidance and in particular paragraphs 6.18 to 6.20 of GLVIA3. The viewpoints proposed are used to aid the description of effects on both Landscape and Visual resources and have</p>



Reference	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicants Response
				<p>been utilised for visual assessment purposes. For the purposes of ES Chapter 8 Landscape and Visual Impact [APP-045] and in keeping with the approach set out within GLVIA3, all viewpoints have been taken from publicly accessible land during both summer and winter months to ensure a worst-case scenario is assessed and illustrated.</p> <p>As detailed in Appendix 1 of Appendix 12.1: Heritage Statement [APP-110 to APP-120] the Grade I Listed Lamport Hall was scoped out of the heritage assessment as the asset does not have any visual or historic relationship with land within the Scheme. Appendix 1 of ES Appendix 12.1 Heritage Statement [APP-110 to APP-120] was used during consultation and assets scoped out of assessment are considered to be agreed with the Historic England and the Local Planning Authorities (see ES Appendix 12.8 Consultation Tables [APP-148]).</p>
CPRE-002	General Matters	Response to Relevant Representation	<p>EN010170-001021-GH8.1.5_Applicant Responses to Relevant Representations.</p> <p>We were surprised to see that this refers to our Relevant Representation but note that it only superficially addresses the contents. We trust there will be updates in due course</p>	<p>The Applicant notes this comment and refers to the Applicant's Responses to Written Representations [REP2-048] at Deadline 2 for an updated response.</p>



Reference	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicants Response
			that address the substantive issues raised by CPRE.	
CPRE-003	General Matters	Local Impact Reports	<p>We are pleased to note that the Local Impact Reports support our conclusions that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• there would be an adverse impact upon the landscape• there would be an adverse change to the landscape character• they judge that the landscape impacts would be greater than the applicant suggests• local roads need to be assessed for glint and glare not least because some are heavily used• the community benefit scheme should form a part of the DCO• a bond or other mechanism is required to secure decommissioning <p>However, we believe that WNC para 4.169 mistakenly suggests that the permissive paths could be a legacy because the Outline Decommissioning Statement states that they would be removed.</p>	<p>The Applicant notes this comment and refers to the Applicant's Responses to Local Impact Reports [REP2-049].</p> <p>The Applicant refers to WNC 4.170 to 4.175 in the Applicant's Responses to Local Impact Reports [REP2-049] regarding the permissive path and the Applicant has prepared an update to the Public Rights of Way Plan Revision C [EX3/GH2.6_C] as we have now been provided with the definitive map data layer.</p>



2.3 Wellingborough Walks Action Group Ltd

Table 2.3: [REP2-071]

Reference	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicants Response
WWAG-001	Consent Order	Hedgerow removal	<p>Whilst it is a relief to hear that the developer plans to clear no more than 350m of hedgerow across the entire scheme it is concerning that the clearance of thousands of meters of hedgerow could be noted and 'accepted' given the inclusion of this schedule in the agreement if this DCO application is accepted by the Planning Inspectorate.</p> <p>We are concerned that this 'acceptance' within the DCO (should it happen) may confer direct permission to the developer to do much more hedgerow clearance than presently stated (or expected), and having this permission will enable or embolden the developer to go much further than initially planned. We have seen locally that once developers have permission for action, many planning conditions, let alone smaller agreements, are often over looked by overstretched planning departments and in developer's eagerness to deliver scheme areas often at pace.</p>	<p>The Draft DCO Revision C [EX3/GH3.1_C] provides the Applicant with the power to remove hedgerows within the Order Limits. As the exact location of any hedgerow removal cannot be determined until the detailed design stage post consent, the extent of the removal is controlled by the OLEMP Revision B [EX3/GH7.4_B], which sets out at section 1.2 the approach to construction and maintenance access gaps at hedgerows. The OEPMS Revision A [REP1-140], Method Statement 6, also provides mitigation to ensure hedgerow removal is reduced to a minimum. The provisions set out in these documents are secured through Requirements 7 and 8 (respectively) of Schedule 2 to the Draft DCO Revision C [EX3/GH3.1_C]. It is also noted that a failure to comply with the DCO, including its Requirements, is a criminal offence under the Planning Act 2008.</p> <p>Hedgerow loss has been minimised by the Scheme, and all losses of hedgerow associated with the Cable Route Corridor are temporary and will be reinstated. Overall, a substantial net gain</p>



Reference	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicants Response
				in the extent of hedgerow will be realised, alongside in-fill planting and sensitive management of existing hedgerows. As detailed in ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Biodiversity Revision A [REP1-033] , following their establishment, it is anticipated that the Scheme will result in the creation of approximately 15.9km of new hedgerow, and approximately 7.9km of lines of trees. Details of hedgerow losses and gains are also provided within ES Appendix 9.13: BNG Assessment Revision A [REP1-043] . Broader impacts on ecology and biodiversity are discussed in detail within the ES Chapter 9 Ecology and Biodiversity Revision A [REP1-033] .
WWAG-002	Consent Order	Hedgerow removal	We request that not such open-ended permission is given to the Applicant at this stage (ie within the DCO process), and instead, should the DCO be approved, the Applicant should seek permission for Hedgerow removal during the detailed delivery stage (via the Local Planning Authority) once the precise requirements of each site are known, and exact plans for field opening a cable channel crossings are more clearly known.	The Applicant refers to the response to 'WWAG-007' in The Applicant's Responses to Written Representation at Deadline 1 [REP2-048] . The Draft DCO Revision B [EX3/GH3.1_B] provides the Applicant with the power to remove hedgerows within the Order Limits. As stated above, the exact location of any hedgerow removal cannot be determined until the detailed design stage post consent. The extent of the removal is controlled by the Outline Landscape and Ecological



Reference	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicants Response
				<p>Management Plan Revision B [EX3/GH7.4_B], which sets out at section 1.2 the approach to construction and maintenance access gaps at hedgerows.</p> <p>The final landscape and ecological management plan (LEMP) must be substantially in accordance with the outline plan and will be approved by the relevant planning authority pursuant to Requirement 7 in the Draft DCO before that part of the Scheme may be commenced.</p> <p>The Outline Ecological Protection Mitigation Strategy Revision A [REP1-140], Method Statement 6, also provides mitigation to ensure hedgerow removal is reduced to a minimum. The detailed EPMS must also be approved by the relevant planning authority, pursuant to Requirement 8, before that part of the Scheme may be commenced.</p>
WWAG-003	Arboriculture Ecology and Biodiversity	Hedgerow removal	In our previous submission we talked about our concerns about the potential high level of tree loss across the site. Having further checked with the GHS Team about our estimates of tree loss, it appears that their initial estimates did not include smaller trees in hedgerows. Given this, depending on the level of	The Scheme will inevitably result in some habitat loss; however, the design has sought to avoid and minimise losses wherever practicable. Especially valuable hedgerows and trees will also be avoided via the use of Horizontal Directional Drilling or other trenchless techniques when laying the cable route.



Reference	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicants Response
			hedge clearance works the Applicant ultimately decides upon. It is likely (regardless of the level of extent) that even more trees will also be lost as hedgerows are cleared. This will worsen our original tree loss estimates and create further impacts on top of hedgerow loss upon the local landscape, flora and fauna, and bio-diversity net gain assumptions by the applicant.	Losses of individual standalone trees, and hedgerows, have been calculated separately, in accordance with Biodiversity Net Gain assessment methodology. Hedgerows fall under an overarching linear 'hedgerow units' category, whilst individual trees which sit outside of hedgerows are 'area-based units'. Where hedgerows contain mature trees, this is captured by a higher hedgerow value in the assessment. Ancient and veteran trees are irreplaceable habitat and are all retained. Overall, with substantial new planting proposed across the Scheme, there will be a significant net gain in both area-based and hedgerow units, which will outweigh the hedgerow and tree losses incurred. This is detailed in ES Appendix 9.13 Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment Revision A [REP1-043] .
WWAG-004	Other Environmental Matters	Cumulative Impact of hedgerow removal	Given the above, the points we raised in our last submission regarding hedgerow removal and its negative impact on the landscape, other species, and communities, as well as flood and climate impacts through loss of these CO2e storage 'sinks', will be further heightened if the Applicant is given permission to include the full list of hedge removal noted in schedule 12 of	Tree removals will be avoided as far as practicable with a commitment from the Applicant to not remove Category A (high quality) trees or veteran or ancient trees within the Cable Route Corridor. The majority of potential tree removals are associated with the Cable Route corridor whereby techniques such as micrositing around trees and Horizontal Directional Drilling underneath trees will



Reference	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicants Response
			the draft DCO. And whilst is hoped they would exercise significant restraint, this could not be guaranteed. We hope then that you will heed our request to limit permission at this stage.	<p>be utilised to avoid tree removals as far as practicable. These mitigation measures are secured in the ES Appendix 19.2 Arboricultural Impact Assessment and Outline Arboricultural Method Statement [APP-171] and OCEMP Revision A [REP1-131].</p> <p>Significant tree planting and woodland planting, as well as maintenance measures, are proposed within the OLEMP Revision B [EX3/GH7.4_B]. ES Chapter 7: Climate Change [APP-044] has assessed the impact of GHG emissions and savings arising from a lifecycle assessment of the Scheme on the climate over its lifetime (See section 7.8).</p>



2.4 Jacob Hinson

Table 2.4: [REP2-070]

Reference	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicants Response
JH-001	General Matters	Objection	I write to object to the Green Hill Solar Farm proposal on the grounds of agricultural impact, community impact and local character. My points relate directly to matters the Inspectorate can consider during an appeal.	The Applicant notes this comment.
JH-002	Agriculture and Soils	Agricultural land quality	The proposed site sits on productive clay arable land and grazing land used for livestock. If this land falls within Grades 1–3a, it meets the definition of best and most versatile agricultural land. National Planning Policy requires strong justification for using such land and states that developers should demonstrate why lower-grade land is not suitable. The loss of this land reduces local food production capacity and removes an established agricultural resource from the area.	<p>The land quality of the parcels within the Site includes land of BMV quality. Policy does not require that solar development avoid the use of land of BMV quality, but that where BMV land is included this should be justified.</p> <p>The Farming Report [APP-571] describes in section 3 and section 9 how the predicted land quality of the area is a mixture of mostly 20 – 60% BMV and >60% BMV. The identified land quality across the Site overall is 65% BMV, which is in keeping with the mix across the wider area. Land quality can only be identified by field survey, which is an intrusive and slow process, and given the mixed land grades identified across the sites, there is no reason to anticipate that other land nearby would be other than a mix of BMV and non-BMV quality. Therefore, the use of BMV land has been justified and</p>



Reference	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicants Response
				<p>any losses minimised where reasonably possible.</p> <p>The Farming Report [APP-571] also reviews the policy and the factual position regarding food production and the effect of the proposed development on that locally and nationally.</p>
JH-003	Landscape and Visual Impacts	Impact on local character	The change from open arable and grazing land to a large solar installation would alter the rural character of the Mears Ashby area. The scale and nature of the development would change views and the way the countryside is used by the community.	<p>The Applicant acknowledges that there would be some level of change to community perception of their surroundings, and some level of change to how people access the countryside. These have been assessed in ES Chapter 18: Human Health [APP-055] which assesses their being up to a long-term minor adverse effect on 'open space, leisure and play' (which considers use of PRowS in the countryside) and up to a long-term temporary minor adverse effect on 'community identity and culture' during the early years of the Scheme's operational lifetime. Neither of these effects are considered significant.</p> <p>ES Chapter 8 Landscape and Visual Impact [APP-045] of the Environmental Statement (ES) takes into account the effects on landscape character and visual amenity in detail, and acknowledges that there would be an immediate change to the character of the Sites themselves and their</p>



Reference	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicants Response
				<p>immediate surroundings as they change from an area of arable farmland to solar infrastructure resulting in Significant adverse effects to landscape character and visual amenity.</p> <p>NPS EN-1 recognises that impacts and effects are likely to be experienced with large scale ground mounted solar developments.</p>
JH-004	Socio-economics, tourism and recreation	Cultural and community impact	<p>The land in question has been the setting for the Mears Ashby family shoot for over 50 years, with the shoot itself running for more than 75 years. This activity forms part of the community's identity and social life. The development would end this long-standing tradition, which contributes to relationships between local families, neighbouring farms and rural businesses. While the shoot is not a designated heritage asset, its removal has a measurable effect on the social and cultural fabric of the area, which the Inspectorate can weigh as a material consideration</p>	<p>The Applicant has spoken with one of the landowners of Site E and they have confirmed that the Mears Ashby Shoot syndicate shoot takes place over a large area.</p> <p>The landowner involved with the Scheme advises that the shoot would be able to continue by adapting the areas used for the shoot to avoid solar panel or bird mitigation areas, and taking on alternative land if required. This demonstrates that the Scheme would not result in the running of the shoot coming to an end.</p> <p>The Scheme therefore is not anticipated to significantly impact upon the ability for this event to occur, nor on its local significance to the community's social calendar.</p>
JH-005	Consent Order	Insufficient consideration of alternatives	No adequate evidence has been presented to show that lower-grade land, or less sensitive land, has been explored. Current	The Applicant has followed a step-by-step site selection process which confirms the location of the Scheme is suitable for a



Reference	Theme	Issue	Comments/Issue Raised	Applicants Response
			planning policy expects developers to show that good agricultural land is avoided wherever possible. In this case, the choice of site appears to prioritise developer convenience over agricultural value and community impact.	<p>large-scale solar farm. This has included the avoidance of sensitive landscape and environmental designations in confirming site suitability and consideration of alternative sites. Details of the process are set out in ES Appendix 5.1: Site Selection Assessment Revision A [REP1-037] Please also refer to ES Chapter 5: Alternatives and Design Evolution [APP-042].</p> <p>The site selection process widened the search to consider Best and Most Versatile (BMV) Agricultural Land within a 20km search area ES Appendix 5.1 Site Selection Assessment Revision A [REP1-037] in compliance with National Policy Statement for Energy (EN 1) and National Policy Statement for renewable energy infrastructure (EN-3), which is the furthest distance that the Applicant sought to locate the Scheme from the Point of Connection on commercial feasibility and the efficiency of the transmission of electricity to the grid, to avoid the use of BMV land as much as possible.</p>