

# The Drovers Solar Farm

---

## Potential Main Issues for Examination

Prepared by: DWD

Date: November 2025

PINS reference: EN0110013

Document reference: APP/5.9 (Original)

APFP Regulation Reg 5(2)(q)

Planning Act 2008

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





## Contents

<u>1</u>	<u>Introduction.....</u>	<u>1</u>
1.1	Purpose of the Document.....	1
1.2	Potential Main Issues for Examination.....	2
<u>2</u>	<u>Environment Agency: Potential Main Issues .....</u>	<u>3</u>
<u>3</u>	<u>Borough Council of King’s Lynn &amp; West Norfolk: Potential Main Issues .....</u>	<u>4</u>
<u>4</u>	<u>Historic England: Potential Main Issues .....</u>	<u>5</u>
<u>5</u>	<u>Norfolk County Council: Potential Main Issues .....</u>	<u>6</u>
<u>6</u>	<u>Norfolk County Council Highways: Potential Main Issues .....</u>	<u>12</u>
<u>7</u>	<u>Breckland Council: Potential Main Issues.....</u>	<u>13</u>



# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 Purpose of the Document

- 1.1.1 This Potential Main Issues for Examination ('PMIE') document has been prepared by The Drovers Solar Farm Ltd ('the Applicant') in relation to the Development Consent Order (DCO) Application for the construction, operation, maintenance, and decommissioning of The Drovers Solar Farm (hereafter referred to as the 'Scheme').
- 1.1.2 This document has been prepared and submitted in compliance with the Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects: 2024 Pre-application Prospectus (September 2024) and Regulation 5(2)(q) of the Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009 ('the APFP Regulations') which states: "*The application must be accompanied by (...) any other documents considered necessary to support the application*".
- 1.1.3 The purpose of this document is to provide the Examining Authority ('ExA') with a summary of the main residual issues with key stakeholders remaining at the time of the DCO Application's submission.
- 1.1.4 As set out in the **Consultation Report [APP/5.1]**, this document has been prepared in consultation with relevant statutory bodies and local authorities. It has been shared and the contents agreed, where possible, prior to the submission of the DCO Application. This document has been presented in the format provided by the Planning Inspectorate. The issues set out in the tables below do not constitute a definitive list of matters likely to be raised during the DCO Application's examination and do not preclude stakeholders from raising further concerns during the planning process. The regard which the Applicant has had to responses to the statutory consultation is provided in the **Consultation Report Appendices [APP/5.2]** and summarised in the main **Consultation Report [APP/5.1]**. The Applicant is currently having ongoing engagement with the following stakeholders:
- Borough Council of King's Lynn & West Norfolk
  - Breckland District Council
  - Norfolk County Council
  - Ministry of Defence
  - Environment Agency; and
  - Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO).
- 1.1.5 It is anticipated that a number of the issues outlined in this document may be resolved between the submission of the DCO Application and examination, including once stakeholders have had an opportunity to review the DCO Application and through the evolution of matters, including the negotiation of 'protective provisions', where necessary. It is the Applicant's intention to continue to work with stakeholders throughout the DCO Application's examination to resolve issues wherever possible.



- 1.1.6 The Applicant envisages that these issues can be resolved during examination, including through the process of producing Statements of Common Ground. The information provided within the DCO Application will inform this process and progress the discussion with the stakeholders beyond what is possible at the time of submission.

## 1.2 Potential Main Issues for Examination

- 1.2.1 The tables below set out the remaining main issues with each of the corresponding stakeholders that have not been resolved prior to submission of the DCO Application.
- 1.2.2 The tables provide an overview of the issues held by these stakeholders, where this issue is addressed in the DCO Application and the Applicant's position on the likelihood of the issue being resolved prior to or during the examination. The tables include a Red/Amber/Green (RAG) rating to highlight the likelihood of each issue being resolved. The following consideration has been applied to each colour:
- **Red** – fundamental disagreements which are unlikely to be resolved during the Examination.
  - **Amber** – issues which are in discussion and may be resolved during the Examination.
  - **Green** – issues that are likely to be resolved prior to or during Examination.





## 2 Environment Agency: Potential Main Issues

Ref	Environmental Aspect	Description of Issue	Stakeholder Position	Applicant's Position and Signposting	Likelihood of the issue being resolved during the Examination
EA1	Water Resources	EA has raised concerns about the potential impacts the Scheme may have on groundwater.	It is recommended that the operator of the site obtains a groundwater investigation consent (under Section 32(3) of the Water Resources Act 1991) so they can find out whether there is adequate water available.	<p>Triangulation of hydrometric monitoring data available on Hydrology Data Explorer shows that groundwater levels under the CSA are generally not within 15m of surface level, with the exception of a small section of Work No. 2: BESS, Work No. 3: Customer Substation and Work No. 4: new National Grid Substation. The northwestern section of Work Nos. 2 to 4 are located in an area where the maximum piled foundation depth (15m) could directly interact with the maximum recorded groundwater level by approximately 0.1 to 3m. It should be noted that <b>ES Figure 5.1: Concept Masterplan [APP/6.3]</b> shows that only the BESS Units are located in this area. Figures 12-13 to 12-15 of <b>ES Chapter 12: Water Resources [APP/6.2]</b> show the potential direct interaction with the groundwater unit underlying Work Nos. 2 to 4.</p> <p>Once the detailed design is complete, and if the required piling depth exceeds the highest recorded groundwater level, a precast piling solution will be adopted, and installation will only occur when groundwater levels are not at a depth to interact with the piling solution.</p> <p>Measures secured in the <b>outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) [APP/7.6]</b>, such as spill pads and impermeable geotextile membranes will effectively limit the uncontained release of chemicals to minor fugitive releases. Further details of these measures are set out in the <b>oCEMP [APP/7.6]</b>.</p>	Likely to be resolved before the close of the examination stage.



---

### 3 Borough Council of King's Lynn & West Norfolk: Potential Main Issues

- 3.1.1 In their correspondence to the Applicant, the Borough Council of King's Lynn & West Norfolk confirmed that they have not identified any issues with the Scheme that require logging for consideration at Examination.



## 4 Historic England: Potential Main Issues

Ref	Environmental Aspect	Description of Issue	Stakeholder Position	Applicant's Position and Signposting	Likelihood of the issue being resolved during the Examination
HE1	Cultural Heritage and Landscape	The potential impact on the setting of the heritage assets, the landscape character, and the visual impacts from the existing and new pylons.	<p>As the overhead line layout and pylon positions have yet to be confirmed, they have not yet been fully considered in the visual impact assessment of the proposed development. We recommend that visualisations and assessment of the visual impacts of the proposed development are revisited once the proposed overhead line layout and pylons are known.</p> <p>At this stage, HE therefore cannot say whether these are likely to be resolved before the close of the examination. Once we receive the full documentation, we will review it and welcome the opportunity to discuss it with you.</p>	<p>Full assessments can be found within both <b>ES Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual [APP/6.2]</b> and <b>ES Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [APP/6.2]</b>.</p> <p><b>ES Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual [APP/6.2]</b> considers the potential effects of new pylons situated within the Order limits. These have been visualised within <b>ES Figure 6.14: PM8, PM12 and PM14 Winter Photomontages - Illustrative Scheme [APP/6.3]</b> and <b>ES Figure 6.15: PM8, PM12 and PM14 Summer Photomontages - Illustrative Scheme [APP/6.3]</b>. The new pylons will not present any long term significant adverse visual effects (in EIA terms) upon visual receptors, as detailed within <b>ES Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual [APP/6.2]</b>.</p>	Likely to be resolved before the close of the examination stage.



## 5 Norfolk County Council: Potential Main Issues

Ref	Environmental Aspect	Description of Issue	Stakeholder Position	Applicant's Position and Signposting	Likelihood of the issue being resolved during the Examination
NCC1	Cultural Heritage and Landscape	The potential impact on the setting of the heritage assets, the landscape character, and the visual impacts from the existing proposed and new pylons; and the new substations (both customer substation/s and the National Grid substation). There needs to be further detail on the proposed Substation/s and the landscape mitigation needed to accompany this element of the Scheme.	As the overhead line layout and pylon positions have yet to be confirmed, they have not yet been fully considered in the visual impact assessment of the proposed development.	<p>Full assessments can be found within both <b>ES Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual [APP/6.2]</b> and <b>ES Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [APP/6.2]</b>.</p> <p><b>ES Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual [APP/6.2]</b> considers the potential effects of new pylons situated within the Order limits. These have been visualised within <b>ES Figure: PM8, PM12 and PM14 Winter Photomontages - Illustrative Scheme [APP/6.3]</b> and <b>ES Figure 6.15: PM8, PM12 and PM14 Summer Photomontages - Illustrative Scheme [APP/6.3]</b>. The new pylons will not present any long-term significant adverse visual effects (in EIA terms) upon visual receptors, as detailed within <b>ES Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual [APP/6.2]</b>.</p>	Likely to be resolved before the close of the examination stage.
NCC2	Lack of Strategic Approach	There is no coordinated county-wide strategy guiding where solar farms may be sited.	The County Council is concerned about the lack of a strategic approach to the siting of solar farms across the County.	<p>As set out in the <b>Consultation Report [APP/5.1]</b>, the Applicant is in regular engagement with RWE, on behalf of High Grove Solar.</p> <p>As set out in <b>ES Chapter 2: EIA Process and Methodology [APP/6.1]</b>, a Cumulative Effects Assessment (CEA) has been undertaken as part of the EIA in accordance with PINS Advice on Cumulative Effects Assessment (September 2024) and has considered two types of cumulative effects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• In combination effects: the combined effect generated by individual effects on a particular receptor (presented within <b>ES Chapter 17: In-Combination Effects [APP/6.2]</b>); and</li><li>• Cumulative effects: effects generated by the Scheme and other planned or approved developments on the same receptor (presented in <b>ES Volume 2, Chapters 6 to 17 [APP/6.2]</b>).</li></ul> <p>The assessment of likely cumulative effects is provided in each of the <b>ES Topic Chapter [APP/6.2]</b> and is summarised in <b>ES Chapter 18: Summary of Effects [APP/6.2]</b>, which concludes the following significant residual adverse impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Landscape and Visual:</li></ul>	Likely to be resolved before the close of the examination stage.





					<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ E6: North Pickenham Plateau LCA: there are significant adverse effects across all phases of the Scheme with High Grove Solar; and</li><li>○ VRG4: Great Palgrave and Little Palgrave: there are significant adverse effect for users of PRoW Sporle with Palgrave BR5 across the construction and decommissioning phases of the Scheme with High Grove Solar.</li></ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Noise and Vibration:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ The Off Barn: there are significant adverse effects across the operational phase of the Scheme cumulatively with High Grove Solar. However, the cumulative effects assessment concludes that it is likely that noise levels can be controlled through the implementation of additional mitigation measures to suitable levels at 'The Off Barn' receptor when considered cumulatively with the neighbouring High Grove Solar Farm, such that residual levels would represent at most a minor impact, which is considered not significant, in EIA terms.</li></ul></li><li>• Soils and Agriculture:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ BMV Land: there are significant adverse effects across the decommissioning phase of the Scheme cumulatively with High Grove Solar, East Pye Solar, Norfolk Vanguard Offshore Windfarm onshore elements and Norfolk Boreas Offshore Windfarm onshore elements.</li></ul></li></ul> <p>The assessment of likely cumulative effects, provided in each of the <b>ES Topic Chapters [APP/6.2]</b>, concludes the following significant residual beneficial impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Socio-Economics:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Provision of education, skills and training: there are significant beneficial effects across all phases of the Scheme cumulatively with High Grove Solar.</li></ul></li><li>• Human Health:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Provision of education, skills and training for the General Population: there are significant beneficial effects across the construction phase of the Scheme cumulatively with High Grove Solar.</li></ul></li></ul>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--



NCC3	Cumulative Impact on the Landscape & Ecology, and socio-economic environment	The Scheme will have cumulative impacts, cumulatively with the consented Norfolk Vanguard and Norfolk Boreas offshore wind farms; and the proposed new High Grove Solar Farm nearby.	County Council is concerned about the cumulative impacts of this proposal sitting alongside other approved and proposed NSIPs in Breckland. This includes the major grid connection works being carried out at Necton associated with the consented Norfolk Vanguard and Norfolk Boreas offshore wind farms; and the proposed new High Grove Solar Farm nearby.	<p>As set out in <b>ES Chapter 2: EIA Process and Methodology [APP/6.1]</b>, a Cumulative Effects Assessment (CEA) has been undertaken as part of the EIA in accordance with PINS Advice on Cumulative Effects Assessment (September 2024) and has considered two types of cumulative effects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• In combination effects: the combined effect generated by individual effects on a particular receptor (presented within <b>ES Chapter 17: In-Combination Effects [APP/6.2]</b>); and</li><li>• Cumulative effects: effects generated by the Scheme and other planned or approved developments on the same receptor (presented in <b>ES Volume 2, Chapters 6 to 17 [APP/6.2]</b>).</li></ul> <p>The assessment of likely cumulative effects is provided in each of the <b>ES Topic Chapters [APP/6.2]</b> and is summarised in <b>ES Chapter 18: Summary of Effects [APP/6.2]</b>, which concludes the following significant residual adverse impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Landscape and Visual:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ E6: North Pickenham Plateau LCA: there are significant adverse effects across all phases of the Scheme with High Grove Solar; and</li><li>○ VRG4: Great Palgrave and Little Palgrave: there are significant adverse effect for users of PRoW Sporle with Palgrave BR5 across the construction and decommissioning phases of the Scheme with High Grove Solar.</li></ul></li><li>• Noise and Vibration:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ The Off Barn: there are significant adverse effects across the operational phase of the Scheme cumulatively with High Grove Solar. However, the cumulative effects assessment concludes that it is likely that noise levels can be controlled through the implementation of additional mitigation measures to suitable levels at 'The Off Barn' receptor when considered cumulatively with the neighbouring High Grove Solar Farm, such that residual levels would represent at most a minor impact, which is considered not significant, in EIA terms.</li></ul></li><li>• Soils and Agriculture:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ BMV Land: there are significant adverse effects across the decommissioning phase of the Scheme cumulatively with High Grove Solar, East Pye Solar, Norfolk Vanguard Offshore Windfarm onshore elements and Norfolk Boreas Offshore Windfarm onshore elements.</li></ul></li></ul>	Likely to be resolved before the close of the examination stage.
------	--	--	---	--	--



				<p>The assessment of likely cumulative effects, provided in each of the <b>ES Topic Chapters [APP/6.2]</b>, concludes the following significant residual beneficial impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Socio-Economics:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Provision of education, skills and training: there are significant beneficial effects across all phases of the Scheme cumulatively with High Grove Solar.</li></ul></li><li>• Human Health:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Provision of education, skills and training for the General Population: there are significant beneficial effects across the construction phase of the Scheme cumulatively with High Grove Solar.</li></ul></li></ul>	
NCC4	PV Panel Options	The Applicant retains flexibility in the use of Tracker Solar PV Tables or Fixed Solar PV Tables for the Scheme.	The County Council would favour the option with the least visual and landscape impact (i.e. the fixed panels). However, it is accepted that through further design work and appropriate mitigation, there may be opportunities for combining both fixed and tracking arrays.	<p>The impact assessment within <b>ES Topic Chapters [APP/6.2]</b> has been based on the worst-case parameters for each technical topic, and justification is presented within the relevant technical chapter.</p> <p>Due to the fast-evolving pace of Solar PV technology, the Scheme has allowed for flexibility in the design, allowing opportunity to utilise specific technology closer to construction within the parameters outlined in <b>ES Chapter 5: The Scheme [APP/6.1]</b> and the <b>Design Approach Document [APP/5.7]</b>.</p> <p>As set out in <b>ES Chapter 5: The Scheme [APP/6.1]</b>, each PV Panel would be mounted on a metal rack, known as a Mounting Structure. The Applicant retains flexibility in the use of Tracker Solar PV Tables or Fixed Solar PV Tables for the Scheme. The Tracking Panels would be aligned in north-south rows and would rotate to the east and west to maximise output, whereas the Fixed Panels would be aligned in eastwest rows and secured to fixed south facing Solar PV Tables. As set out in <b>ES Chapter 5: The Scheme [APP/6.1]</b>, a tracker system involves attaching the Solar PV Panels to a motorised table that can move in relation to the sun. This allows for optimal power generation throughout the day.</p>	Likely to be resolved before the close of the examination stage.
NCC5	Loss of Agricultural Land	The Scheme will use agricultural land.	Norfolk County Council expresses concerns that the Scheme could result in the loss of more traditional patterns of farming leading to reduced food security.	<p>Agricultural land quality was a key consideration in the Applicant's site selection process. As set out in <b>ES Chapter 4: Reasonable Alternatives and Design Evolution [APP/6.1]</b>, the Applicant has sought to identify non-BMV agricultural land in its site selection for the Scheme. <b>Appendix 1</b> of the <b>Planning Statement [APP/5.5]</b> provides an overview of the site evaluation process, which sets out that the Site's suitability is due to the lack of landscape and environmental statutory designations, limited residential receptors, the absence of BMV on the published "provisional" ALC maps, and the Likelihood of BMV maps and accessibility from a major highway network.</p>	Likely to be resolved before the close of the examination stage.



				<p><b>ES Appendix 11.2: Agricultural Land Classification [APP/6.4]</b> demonstrates that 51.7% of the land is BMV and although the Scheme does include land with potential arable value, the <b>Design Approach Document [APP/5.7]</b> demonstrated how the Applicant has sought to minimise the amount of BMV land by adopting a sequential approach in its site evaluation and can justify its inclusion given the significant wider benefits that the Scheme will bring.</p> <p>That said, 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>With taking the site out of any intensive farming practices for 60 years, the Applicant anticipates the biodiversity across the site and soil health is likely to improve therefore securing a more meaningful contribution to food production once the scheme is decommissioned and returned to the landowner.</p>	
NCC6	Energy Generation	The Drovers Solar Farm Limited need to actively engage with Norfolk County Council and other key stakeholders.	Norfolk County Council states that The Drovers Solar Farm Limited need to actively engage with Norfolk County Council and other key stakeholders, including National Grid and UKPN, to explore and provide clarity as to how the above strategic benefits for the County can be realised.	<p>The Applicant continues to engage with NGET, as stated in the <b>Grid Connection Statement [APP/7.1]</b>. The <b>Works Plan [APP/2.3]</b> accurately reflects this recent engagement, whilst the illustrative material submitted together with this DCO Application (for example, <b>ES Figure 5.1: Concept Masterplan [APP/6.3]</b> and <b>ES Appendix 5.1: Illustrative Technical Information [APP/6.4]</b> will be revised as the micro-siting and orientation of the new National Grid Substation within Work No. 4A continues to be discussed.</p> <p>As confirmed in the <b>Consultation Report [APP/5.1]</b>, the Applicant consulted with UKPN, but UKPN did not provide comment.</p>	Likely to be resolved before the close of the examination stage.
NCC7	Compensation	Compensation is payable to anyone whose rights are extinguished, suspended or interfered with.	Norfolk County Council would like The Drovers Solar Farm Limited to consider appropriate compensation packages for those homes and businesses directly affected by both the construction works, and any long-term impacts.	<p>The <b>Funding Statement [APP/4.2]</b> confirms that the Applicant has the ability to procure the financial resources required for the Scheme, including the cost of acquiring any land and rights and the payment of compensation, as applicable.</p> <p>As set out in the <b>Statement of Reasons [APP/4.1]</b>, the Applicant is not aware of any interests within the Order land in respect of which a person may be able to make a blight claim, but in the event this did occur the Applicant has sufficient funds to meet any compensation due.</p> <p>The Applicant therefore considers that the SoS can be satisfied that the requisite funds for payment of compensation will be available at the appropriate time.</p>	Likely to be resolved prior to or during the examination stage.



NCC8	Community Benefits	The existence of a Community Benefit Fund.	Norfolk County Council states that the Applicant will need to provide and take forward a Community Benefit Fund outside of the DCO process.	As outlined in Section 5.5 of the <b>Planning Statement [APP/5.5]</b> , the Applicant has committed to establishing a Community Benefit Fund. The Community Benefit Fund does not form part of the DCO Application, and this funding is not required to mitigate the impacts of the Scheme. Therefore, it cannot be considered in the decision-making process for determining the DCO Application. The Community Benefit Fund is also therefore not taken into account in consideration of the planning balance within the <b>Planning Statement [APP/5.5]</b> . However, it will be available to fund local projects.	Likely to be resolved prior to or during the examination stage.
------	--------------------	--	---	--	---



## 6 Norfolk County Council Highways: Potential Main Issues

Ref	Environmental Aspect	Description of Issue	Stakeholder Position	Applicant's Position and Signposting	Likelihood of the issue being resolved during the Examination
NCCH1	Transport and Access	Potential issue between cumulative impact around the construction access point on the A1065, if the construction timescale changes on either The Drovers and/or High Grove Solar	Norfolk County Council (NCC) raised concerns about the proximity of the proposed southern access onto the A1065 and the proximity of the High Grove Solar access onto the A1065, in the event that the construction periods overlap and there are construction vehicles going into and out of each access.	The Applicant notes NCC's concern. However, both of the access points onto the A1065 associated with the Scheme and High Grove Solar are existing which is preferable to creating new construction access points. In addition, the southernmost access of the Scheme onto the A1065 exceeds the junction spacing requirements provided by NCC of 50m, with the High Grove Solar access point sitting approximately 100m north, meaning there is unlikely to be any interaction or conflict, even in the unlikely event that if there is minor overlap between the construction programmes of the two schemes. The approach to the cumulative assessment is included within <b>ES Chapter 9: Transport and Access [APP/6.2]</b> whilst <b>ES Appendix 9.2: Traffic Assessment [APP/6.4]</b> includes a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit of the proposed access junctions which raised no concerns about the access proximity to the High Grove Solar access further north. In the event there is overlap, coordination between the two sites will be secured through a detailed Construction Traffic Management Plan that is secured by way of a requirement in the DCO.	Likely to be resolved before the close of the examination stage.





## 7 Breckland Council: Potential Main Issues

Ref	Environmental Aspect	Description of Issue	Stakeholder Position	Applicant's Position and Signposting	Likelihood of the issue being resolved during the Examination
BC1	Cultural Heritage, Landscape and Visual Impacts	The potential impact on the setting of the heritage assets, the landscape character, and the visual impacts from the existing and new pylons as well as the proposed new customer and National Grid Substations. The landscape impact and mitigation for this part of the proposal also needs to be detailed.	As the overhead line layout and pylon positions have yet to be confirmed, they have not yet been fully considered in the visual impact assessment of the proposed development.	<b>ES Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual [APP/6.2]</b> considers the potential effects of new pylons situated within the Order limits. These have been visualised within <b>ES Figure 6.14: PM8, PM12 and PM14 Winter Photomontages - Illustrative Scheme [APP/6.3]</b> and <b>ES Figure 6.15: PM8, PM12 and PM14 Summer Photomontages - Illustrative Scheme [APP/6.3]</b> . The new pylons will not present any long term significant adverse visual effects (in EIA terms) upon visual receptors, as detailed within <b>ES Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual [APP/6.2]</b> .  An assessment of both scenarios (retaining or removing the existing pylons) is available in <b>ES Chapter 8: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology [APP/6.2]</b> .	Likely to be resolved before the close of the examination stage.
BC2	Landscape and Visual	BC raised concerns during the site visit about the number of visualisations and the location of the visualisations provided as part of the DCO application.	There would undoubtedly be character impacts resulting from the siting of solar panels, electrical apparatus, BESS and substations. Landscape character impacts are also said to arise from the introduction of temporary compounds, lighting, stockpiles, machinery and associated fencing topsoil stripping and temporary storage.	The Applicant believes the visualisations supporting <b>ES Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual [APP/6.2]</b> are appropriate and proportionate.  The visualisations, along with extensive fieldwork and consideration of embedded mitigation measures, have informed the judgements of potential effects for both individual viewpoints that have been selected for modelling and also for wider visual receptor groups, in which those visualised viewpoints are situated. The specific details on what models and plans the visualisations are modelled upon are included in individual figures. All visualisations are modelled in accordance with <b>ES Figure 5.1: Concept Masterplan [APP/6.3]</b> .	Fundamental disagreements which are unlikely to be resolved during the examination.
BC3	Landscape and Visual Transport and Access	BC raised concerns about the closest and potential impacts on the Public Right of Way and their effects in the short and medium term. The viability and incentive for users to continue to use the PROW together with retaining the character of those PROW needs to be assessed and evidenced.	The proposed panels will be located on either side of public rights of way. This has the strong potential to reduce the attractiveness of the PROW by urbanising the PROW and significantly altering its character.	Full assessments can be found within both <b>ES Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual [APP/6.2]</b> and <b>ES Chapter 9: Transport and Access [APP/6.2]</b> . The <b>outline Public Right of Way and Permissive Path Management Plan (oPROWPPMP) [APP/7.12]</b> sets out measures to mitigate the impacts to PROW users.  <b>ES Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual [APP/6.2]</b> concludes that there is a significant short and medium term effects in EIA terms. The proposed mitigation measures, mean there is no significant long term effect. Where existing hedgerow and trees are intact and mature, the existing vegetation within the Order limits helps to limit adverse visual effects from the majority of PROW within the Site, by filtering views towards Solar PV, BESS and lower level elements of the proposed substations. The upper extents of the substations and Grid	Likely to be resolved before the close of the examination stage.



				<p>Connection Infrastructure would likely be prominent in the short and medium term.</p> <p><b>ES Chapter 9: Transport and Access [APP/6.2]</b> conclude that with the appropriate mitigation set out, the impact of PRow users would be not significant in EIA terms.</p>	
BC4	Landscape and Visual	BC raised concern over the operational lighting around the Substations and BESS. BC has requested a lighting Impact Assessment.	There would undoubtedly be character impacts resulting from the siting of BESS and substations. Landscape character impacts are also said to arise from the introduction of temporary compounds, lighting, stockpiles, machinery and associated fencing topsoil stripping and temporary storage.	<p>Nighttime effects and lighting have been scoped out of the LVIA (previously PEIR Table 6.2). Further detail on lighting is provided in <b>ES Chapter 5: The Scheme [APP/6.1]</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant discusses the impact of lighting in <b>ES Chapter 5: The Scheme [APP/6.1]</b>. This sets out that during the construction phase temporary site lighting would be used during construction to enable safe working during construction in hours of darkness or where natural lighting is unable to reach (such as sheltered/confined areas). During the operation phase lighting is not required within the Solar PV Site during the operation phase of the Scheme. The Applicant does not believe that a Lighting Impact Assessment is required. The Applicant has assessed the impact of operational emergency lighting associated with the Substation and BESS with <b>ES Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual [APP/6.2]</b>. <b>ES Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual [APP/6.2]</b> concludes that with the appropriate mitigation set out, the impact of PRow users would be <b>not significant</b> (in EIA terms) as the use of lighting would be minimal during the construction phase and there would be no lighting required during the operation phase.</p>	Likely to be resolved before the close of the examination stage.
BC5	Cumulative Impact on noise	Potential issue on the cumulative noise impacts from High Grove and the Drovers.	There are concerns regarding noise but considers that impacts can be made acceptable with suitable mitigation measures established and agreed by the relevant stakeholders.	<p>Section 10.11 of <b>ES Chapter 10: Noise and Vibration [APP/6.2]</b> presents an assessment of cumulative effects between the Scheme and other existing and/or approved developments on noise and vibration. The cumulative effect assessment finds that the Scheme, cumulatively with the High Grove Solar, could result in a significant adverse effect at the 'The Off Barn' highly sensitive receptor. However, the cumulative effects assessment concludes that it is likely that noise levels can be controlled through the implementation of additional mitigation measures to suitable levels at 'The Off Barn' receptor when considered cumulatively with the neighbouring High Grove Solar Farm, such that residual levels would represent a <b>Short-term Minor Adverse</b> impact which would be subject to monitoring in the event of a noise complaint.</p>	Likely to be resolved before the close of the examination stage.



**THE DROVES**  
SOLAR FARM