THE DROVES
SOLAR FARM

The Droves Solar Farm

Applicant's Response to ExQ3

Prepared by: DWD
Date: October 2026
PINS reference: EN0110013
Document reference: APP/8.29 (Original)
APFP Regulation Reg 5(2)(q)
Planning Act 2008
Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009



Contents

1 Introduction 1

2 Topic Questions 2

1 Introduction

1.1.1 This document responds to the Examining Authority's (ExA) third written questions which were issued on 29 September 2026 **[PD-011]**. This document responds to each of the questions posed to the Applicant.

1.1.2 **Section 2** of this report is tabulated to include the ExA's questions and a response to each question in the topics as follows:

- General and Cross-topic Questions;
- Aviation;
- Biodiversity and Ecology (including Habitat Regulations Assessment) Compulsory Acquisition, Temporary Possession and Other Land or Rights Considerations;
- Cultural Heritage and Archaeology;
- Draft Development Consent Order (DCO);
- Grid Connection;
- Landscape and Visual;
- Transport and Access; and,
- Other Planning Matters.

2 Topic Questions

Table 2.1: General and cross-topic questions

ExQ	Respondent	Question	Applicant's Response
Q1.0.1	The applicant Anglian Water Borough Council King's Lynn and West Norfolk Breckland District Council Defence Infrastructure Organisation Norfolk County Council Environment Agency Historic England Natural England National Energy System Operator National Grid Electricity Transmission plc National Highways Norfolk Wildlife Trust	**Statements of Common Ground** Further to the Rule 6 letter [PD-006], could the applicant and parties listed please ensure that up to date Statements of Common Ground (SoCG) are provided at deadline (D) 5?	The Applicant has submitted the following updated Statements of Common Ground (SoCGs) at Deadline 5: - **Statement of Common Ground with Breckland Council [APP/5.11.3]** - **Statement of Common Ground with Norfolk County Council [APP/5.12.3]** - **Statement of Common Ground with Environment Agency [APP/5.13.3]** - **Statement of Common Ground with Historic England [APP/5.14.1]** (final and signed) - **Statement of Common Ground with Natural England [APP/5.15.1]** - **Statement of Common Ground with National Grid Electricity Transmission Plc [APP/5.16.1]** - **Statement of Common Ground with National Highways [APP/5.17.2]** - **Statement of Common Ground with Anglian Water [APP/5.18.2]** (final and signed) - **Statement of Common Ground with Norfolk Wildlife Trust [APP/5.19.1]** - **Statement of Common Ground with Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk [APP/5.20.3]** - **Statement of Common Ground with National Energy System Operator Limited [APP/5.21.1]**; and - **Statement of Common Ground with Defence Infrastructure Operator Limited [APP/5.22.1]** (final and signed). The Applicant will endeavour to submit these SoCGs again at Deadline 6 to include further and final updates.
Q1.0.2	The applicant	**Local policy compliance** Policy Compliance Document [REP1-015] Tables 5 and 6 includes the applicant's assessment for compliance with Breckland District Council's (BDC) and Norfolk County Council's (NCC) development plan policies. Could the applicant comment on its compliance with the policies referred to in the Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk's (BCKLWN) local impact report (LIR) [REP1-076] sections 1.5 to 1.7 inclusive?	As outlined within paragraph 6.6.22 of the **Planning Statement [AS-076],** the **Policy Compliance Document [APP/5.6.2]** only considers relevant policies from the host authorities, which are Breckland Council and Norfolk County Council. However, as requested, the Applicant's comments on the policies set out within sections 1.5-1.7 of **King's Lynn and West Norfolk's (BCKLWN) Local Impact Report (LIR) [REP1-076]** are included below. These comprise: BCKLWN Local Plan (2025) • Policy LP06 (Climate Change Policy); • Policy LP18 (Design and Sustainable Development); • Policy LP19 (Environmental Assets- Green Infrastructure, Landscape character, Biodiversity and Geodiversity); • Policy LP20 (Historic Environment); • Policy LP21 (Environment, Design and Amenity); and

ExQ	Respondent	Question	Applicant's Response
			• Policy LP24 (Renewable Energy). Castle Acre Neighbourhood Plan (2022) • HE.1 (Protecting Historic Assets); • HE.2 (Conservation Area); • HE.4 (Important Views); and • NE.1 (Protection of Landscape Setting) Other Relevant Local Policy: • Castle Acre Conservation Area Character Statement (Revised 2009) • Kings Lynn and West Norfolk Economic Strategy (West Norfolk's economic vision and strategy report (2024)) **BCKLWN's LIR [REP1-076]** refers to Policy LP06 (Climate Change Policy) which supports the importance of meeting the challenges of climate change and the transition to net zero. Policy LP18 (Design and Sustainable Development) and LP24 (Renewable Energy) of the Local Plan also support renewable energy proposals subject to no unacceptable other impacts. As outlined within the **BCKLWN's LIR [REP1-076]** these considerations are expanded upon within Policies LP06, LP18, LP19, LP20 and LP21 of the Local Plan, and include consideration of impacts upon ecology, landscape, heritage, amenity, contamination, public safety, tourism and other economic activity and the loss of agricultural land. The Scheme has carried out an environmental impact assessment which assesses key impacts of the Scheme, including those set out in the policies above, with the findings presented in the **Environmental Statement (ES) [APP/6.1 - 6.5]** As summarised in **ES Chapter 18: Summary of Effect [APP/6.2.1]** significant adverse effects remain in relation to landscape and visual receptors, cumulative effects on BMV and cumulative effects on landscape. These are the residual effects that have been assessed as remaining after the consideration of embedded mitigation measures, and implementation of any additional mitigation measures. The submitted **Planning Statement [AS-076]** and the **Statement of Need [APP-042]** outline the Scheme's contribution to the achievement of both the national renewable energy targets and to the UK's contribution to global efforts to reduce the effects of climate change compliant with the policy aims of BCKLWN's Local Plan. As concluded within Chapter 9 of the **Planning Statement [AS-076],** the substantial benefits of the Scheme clearly outweigh the residual harms that would arise, including the Scheme's contribution to meeting Government targets on Net Zero by 2050, together with more localised beneficial effects that are anticipated during the construction, operational and decommissioning phases of the Scheme, such as beneficial effects to ecology and biodiversity, jobs and permissive paths. The residual adverse effects would be localised, short-term, temporary and/or reversible at the end of the Scheme's lifetime. Further, the CNP presumption, detailed further within Chapter 9 of the **Planning Statement [AS-076]**, requires that the urgent need outweighs the residual impacts. With regards to Castle Acre Neighbourhood Plan heritage policies (HE1, HE2 and HE4) and the Castle Acre Conservation Area Character Statement, cited within the **BCKLWN LIR [REP1-076],** which relate to the protection of designated and non-designated heritage assets, conservation areas and key views, it is considered that Table 1 of the **SoCG with Breckland Council [APP/5.11.3]** provides the latest position from both parties on these policies. With regards to the Castle Acre Neighbourhood Plan Policy NE1 which relates to the protection of the landscape, this has been fully considered within the assessment. **ES Chapter 6: Landscape and**

ExQ	Respondent	Question	Applicant's Response
			Visual [APP/6.2.2] notes that viewpoints have included any of the 'important views' listed within the Castle Acre Neighbourhood Plan, where the Site may be visible. It is considered that the position on lighting is agreed with the Council within Table 2-2 of the **SoCG with Breckland Council [APP/5.11.3],** and therefore Policy NE4 Dark Skies of the Castle Acre Neighbourhood Plan has been fully considered. Policy HD3 of the Castle Acre Neighbourhood Plan, which relates to design, has also been fully considered. As detailed in Section 2 of the **Planning Statement [AS-076]** good design has been a fundamental consideration from the outset of the Scheme. The **Design Approach Document [AS-009 - AS-011]** demonstrates how the design of the Scheme has been developed in accordance with a clear design framework, based on the criteria for good design set out in NPS EN-1. This has included the adoption of project level design principles (Project Principles) to guide decision making and embed good design outcomes to the Scheme. The **Works Plans [REP3-004]** and the **Design Principles, Parameters and Commitments [APP/5.8.5]** secure the design of the Scheme through the **draft DCO [APP/3.1.5].** Kings Lynn and West Norfolk Economic Strategy, which is titled West Norfolk's economic vision and strategy report (2024) is also referred to within the **BCKLWN LIR [REP1-076].** It is considered that the Scheme would contribute to the aims of this report, which recognises renewable energy as a growth lever. Furthermore, compliant with the aim of the report to promote the area's economic prosperity, **ES Chapter 14: Socio-Economics [AS-078]** concludes that the Scheme is not anticipated to result in any residual adverse effects on socio-economic receptors across the Scheme's construction, operational and decommissioning phases. There is a significant beneficial effect anticipated on the provision of education, skills, training and supply chain as a result of the Scheme's construction, operational and decommissioning phases, independently, as well as cumulative.

Table 2.2: Aviation

ExQ	Respondent	Question	Applicant's Response
Q2.0.1	The applicant	**Environmental Statement – assessment of Precision Approach Radar (PAR) mitigation** Item 3-1, post hearing note in Written Summary of Applicant's Oral Submissions and Responses to Action Points at ISH2 and ISH3 [REP4-035] refers to the applicant considering an update to ES Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual [AS-016] in respect of PAR mitigation and will provide this, if deemed necessary, at Deadline 5. Given the concerns raised by NCC in paragraph 5.1 [REP4-044], BDC in paragraph 3.3 [REP-043] and BCKLWN in paragraph 1.1 [REP-042] in their respective D4 submissions, could the applicant provide further evidence to demonstrate that the effects from the proposed PAR mitigation have been fully assessed for all relevant topics in the Environmental Statement (ES)?	The Applicant has submitted the following documents at Deadline 5 that demonstrate that the effects from the proposed PAR Mitigation have been fully assessed for all relevant topics in the ES: • **ES Chapter 5: The Scheme [APP/6.1.3]** • **ES Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual [APP/6.2.2]** • **ES Chapter 12: Water Resources [APP/6.2.4]** • **ES Chapter 18: Summary of Effects [APP/6.2.1]** • **ES Figure 6.10: PP1-16 and PPa-g Winter Photograph Panels (Part A) [APP/6.3.2]** • **ES Figure 6.11: PP1-16 and PPa-g Summer Photograph Panels (Part A) [APP/6.3.2]** • **ES Appendix 6.7: Residential Visual Amenity Assessment [APP/6.4.1]** • **ES Appendix 6.8: Amenity and Recreation Assessment [APP/6.4.1]** • **ES Appendix 12.2: Flood Risk Assessment [APP/6.4.5]** • **Technical Information Note - Landscape and Visual [APP/8.18.1]; and** • **PAR Mitigation Environmental Technical Note [APP/8.32]**
Q2.0.2	The applicant Defence Infrastructure Organisation	**Mitigation for PAR** Table 3-1, Design Principles, Parameters and Commitments [REP4-020] refers to the PAR mitigation structures that would be implemented prior to the construction of any part of Work No. 1(a) within the areas shown as Mitigation Area 1, Mitigation Area 2 and Mitigation Area 3 on RAF [Royal Air Force] Marham Mitigation Areas Plan [REP4-039]. (i) Could the applicant and the Defence Infrastructure Organisation (DIO) clarify if a process has been agreed to test and certify the effectiveness of the proposed PAR mitigation structures, prior to construction of any part of Work No. 1(a)? If so, how would this process be secured in the draft Development Consent Order (dDCO)? (ii) Issue Specific Hearing 3, Item 3-1, post hearing note, Written Summary of Applicant's Oral Submissions and Responses to Action Points at ISH2 and ISH3 [REP4-035] refers to if mitigation acceptable to the Ministry of Defence (MoD), could not be achieved within those parameters [referred to above], the [PV] panels in the affected areas would not be built. Could the applicant and DIO clarify how this restriction would be secured in the dDCO?	i) The Applicant and the DIO have agreed, through discussions between the technical representatives of both parties, that the PAR Mitigation must consist of non-reflective shielding structures (i.e. fences and/or bunds). It is understood that this approach has been taken, and successfully implemented, in respect of other projects to the satisfaction of the DIO. The Applicant has agreed wording with the DIO for a DCO requirement to address PAR Mitigation, which has been included in Schedule 2 of the **draft DCO [APP/3.1.5]** at Deadline 5 and which requires a detailed plan for this mitigation to be submitted by the Applicant to the relevant planning authority for approval (in consultation with the DIO) prior to the commencement of any part of Work No. 1(a) within the specifically-identified mitigation areas. Therefore, the relevant planning authority (in consultation with the DIO) must approve the effectiveness of this proposed mitigation before such works can take place, all of which will be secured via the DCO requirement. ii) As noted above, the DCO requirement for PAR Mitigation requires a detailed plan for this mitigation to be submitted by the Applicant to the relevant planning authority for approval (in consultation with the DIO) prior to the commencement of any part of Work No. 1(a) within the specifically-identified mitigation areas. That plan must include details of the dimensions, layout and material composition of the mitigation, and the mitigation must be in accordance with the relevant parameters of the **Design Principles, Parameters and Commitments [APP/5.8.5]**. Therefore, given it would be a criminal offence for the Applicant to not comply with the DCO requirement for PAR Mitigation and/or the parameters within the **Design Principles, Parameters and Commitments [APP/5.8.5]**, it is appropriately secured in the **draft DCO [APP/3.1.5]** that the Applicant cannot build PV panels in the affected areas if the mitigation is not acceptable to the DIO.

Q2.0.3	The applicant Defence Infrastructure Organisation	**Effects on aviation from the proposed development** Could the applicant and the DIO ensure that the Statement of Common Ground at D5 presents their latest positions on all outstanding matters of concern, resulting from the proposed development alone and for cumulative effects, to include: (i) Proposed wording for new requirements for Precision Approach Radar (PAR) mitigation and Glint and Glare Management (including reference to a Glint and Glare management plan) (ii) Whether agreement has been reached in the wording of the outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) regarding: a) the methodology for the possible use of cranes, high reaching plant equipment or temporal structure during the construction phase; b) birdstrike safeguarding measures before construction; and c) aerodrome height safeguarding, once the transmission line details are available. (iii) Whether agreement has been reached in the wording of the outline Operational Environmental Management Plan (oOEMP) regarding birdstrike hazard to ensure that the proposed development does not increase the risk of impact.	The Applicant has submitted a **SoCG with the DIO [APP/5.22.1]** at Deadline 5, which confirms that all matters are agreed.
Q2.0.4	The applicant	**Policy compliance** (i) In light of the proposed PAR mitigation for the aviation effects from the proposed development, could the applicant update the Policy Compliance Document [REP1-015] to include its assessment of compliance with the following paragraphs: • NPS EN-1 Paragraphs 4.1.7, 4.2.15, 4.7.12, 5.5.37 to 5.5.44, 5.5.49 to 5.5.50, 5.5.53, 5.5.55 and 5.5.59 • NPS EN-3 Paragraph 2.10.59 (ii) Could the applicant update the relevant parts of its Environmental Statement (ES) as required in paragraph 5.5.37 above.	The Applicant has updated the **Policy Compliance Document [APP/5.6.2]** for Deadline 5 to include assessment of compliance with the paragraphs referenced by the ExA in relation to the updated PAR Mitigation and aircraft safety. Please note it is understood that NPS EN3 reference is paragraph 2.10.159 of the January 2024 NPS, instead of paragraph 2.10.59 which relates to design. The Applicant has updated the ES, with specific reference to the PAR Mitigation within the following documents: • **ES Chapter 5: The Scheme [APP/6.1.3]** • **ES Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual [APP/6.2.2]** • **ES Chapter 12: Water Resources [APP/6.2.4]** • **ES Chapter 18: Summary of Effects [APP/6.2.1]** • **ES Figure 6.10: PP1-16 and PPa-g Winter Photograph Panels (Part A) [APP/6.3.2]** • **ES Figure 6.11: PP1-16 and PPa-g Summer Photograph Panels (Part A) [APP/6.3.2]** • **ES Appendix 6.7: Residential Visual Amenity Assessment [APP/6.4.1]** • **ES Appendix 6.8: Amenity and Recreation Assessment [APP/6.4.1]; and** • **ES Appendix 12.2: Flood Risk Assessment [APP/6.4.5]** As well as the updates to the ES, the Applicant has updated the **Technical Information Note - Landscape and Visual [APP/8.18.1]** with specific reference to the PAR Mitigation. The Applicant has also prepared a **PAR Mitigation Environmental Technical Note [APP/8.32]** that provides an explanation of why the PAR Mitigation does not affect the conclusions of the ES chapters, with the exception of **ES Chapter 6: Landscape and Visual [APP/6.2.2]**.

			The Applicant has engaged with the DIO and considers that the PAR Mitigation parameters and commitments, as secured within the **Design Principles, Parameters and Commitments [APP/5.8.5],** along with the DCO requirement wording (as agreed with the DIO) which is now included within Schedule 2 of the **draft DCO [APP/3.1.5]** as referenced in response to Question Q2.0.2 above, are adequate to avoid impacts that would affect the performance of civil or military aviation communication, navigation and surveillance, meteorological radars and/or other defence assets. The Applicant therefore considers that an assessment of potential effects on such equipment does not need to be set out in the ES, to the extent the Applicant has not done so already (including in respect of the updates referenced earlier in this response).

Table 2.3: Biodiversity and Ecology (including Habitats Regulations Assessment)

ExQ	Respondent	Question	Applicant's Response
Q3.0.1	Breckland District Council – part (i) The applicant – part (ii)	**Tree Preservation Order (TPO) covering existing woodlands adjoining the Order limits** During Issue Specific Hearing 3 (ISH3) [EV7-002], in response to item 3.1, question 2 concerning landscape and visual effects, BDC referred to possible future consideration of a woodland [tree] preservation order to protect the existing woodlands, which provide screening for the proposed development, adjoining the Order limits. For this scenario: (i) Could BDC explain what further steps it would need to undertake for consideration of TPOs covering the above existing woodlands (adjoining the Order limits) and what further information would be required to inform such consideration? (ii) Could the applicant signpost any relevant information in the application documents that could be required for a scenario whereby TPOs covering the above existing woodlands (adjoining the Order limits) could be considered by BDC in future?	The DCO Application contains details of the principal species within the woodland and the mapped extents of the woodland in **ES Appendix 16.4: Arboricultural Impact Assessment [REP2-014]**, but no further information relevant to the making of a TPO.

Table 2.4: Climate Change

ExQ	Respondent	Question	Applicant's Response
Q4.0.1	The applicant	No further questions at this stage.	

Table 2.5: Compulsory acquisition, temporary possession and other land or rights considerations

ExQ	Respondent	Question	Applicant's Response
Q5.0.1	The applicant	**Option agreements** Further to the applicant's response to ExQ1 Q5.0.1 [REP1-069], could the applicant provide an update on whether it has the consent it requires to be able to confirm the durations of the lease included in the Option Agreements for the Solar Photo-voltaic (PV) Site, the Battery Energy Storage System	The Applicant has obtained the agreement of the relevant option holder(s) to disclose the duration of the lease term, which is up to 40 years for the Solar Photo-voltaic (PV) Site, the Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) and the National Grid and Customer Substations.

		(BESS) and the National Grid and Customer Substations, before the end of the examination?	

Table 2.6: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology

ExQ	Respondent	Question	Applicant's Response
Q6.0.1	The applicant	**Impact on heritage assets** With reference to the Policy Compliance Document [REP1-015], NPS EN-1 Paragraphs 5.9.23 to 5.9.28, the applicant's assessment refers to embedded mitigation with the oCEMP which includes: "the locations of permanent above-ground assets have been selected to reduce/remove impact on heritage assets from construction works to the north." Could the applicant provide a more detailed explanation to support the above statement to include separate identification of which assets have been selected to remove or reduce the impact on heritage assets from construction works to the north?	The permanent (i.e. those that will not be removed as part of the decommissioning phase) above ground asset referred to comprises only the National Grid Substation; however, for the avoidance of doubt, other large above ground assets that will not remain following the decommissioning phase and which have been located specifically to reduce and/or remove impacts on heritage assets (as detailed in **Design Approach Document [AS-009 - AS-011]**) to the north include the Customer Substation and the BESS. All of these assets are to be sited to the south of Bartholomew's Plantation in order to utilise the existing screening provided by both topography and the trees within the plantation in views from the north, which are available from a number of designated heritage assets, particularly Castle Acre Castle, Priory and Conservation Area.

Table 2.7: Draft Development Consent Order (DCO)

ExQ	Respondent	Question	Applicant's Response
General			
Q7.0.1	The applicant	**Explanatory Note** Further to the applicant's response to ExQ1 Q7.6.1 [REP1-069], could the applicant provide an update on its progress with confirming the location referred to as "[TBC]"?	The Applicant has updated the **draft DCO [APP/3.1.5]** to confirm this location.
Part 2 - Principal Powers			
Q7.1.1	The applicant	**Requirement (R) 2** The Secretary of State for Energy Security and Net Zero has removed time limit extensions in other recently made DCOs, for example Peartree Hill Solar Farm. (i) In light of this, could the applicant explain further the purpose of introducing the term 'applicable period' in this requirement rather than providing a fixed time limit in years? (ii) Could the applicant provide any examples of precedents where this approach has been used for recently made Solar DCOs?	The Applicant agrees that this wording should be updated and has amended the **draft DCO [APP/3.1.5]** in this regard to mirror the wording preferred by the Secretary of State in the recently-made Green Hill Solar Farm Order 2026.
Q7.1.2	The applicant	**R5 - Detailed design approval** Further to the applicant's response to ExQ2 Q7.4.1 [REP3-088], could the applicant clarify whether the vertical limits of deviation for the proposed pylons are included in the parameters within the Design Principles, Parameters and Commitments document?	The **Design Principles, Parameters and Commitments [APP/5.8.5]** submitted at Deadline 5, at Table 3-5, sets out the maximum parameter height of the new electricity pylons and the overhead line as "*maximum height Above Existing Ground Level (AGL) 55m (broadly similar to existing pylons)*".

Table 2.8: Flood risk, Hydrology and water resources

ExQ	Respondent	Question	Applicant's Response
		No further questions at this stage	

Table 2.9: Grid Connection

ExQ	Respondent	Question	Applicant's Response
Q9.0.1	The applicant	**Notification of Gate 1 connection offer** With reference to National Grid Electricity Transmission plc's (NGET) written representation [REP1-090] paragraph 3.7, could the applicant confirm whether it has received notification from the National Energy Systems Operator (NESO) that it will receive a Gate 1 connection offer? If so, could a copy be provided with its response?	The Applicant has responded to this matter in full in the **Applicant's Response to Deadline 4 Submissions [APP/8.28]** (specifically with reference to AM-8, AM-9 and AM-10) and therefore refers the ExA to the full information provided in that document.

Table 2.10: Land and Soil

ExQ	Respondent	Question	Applicant's Response
		No further questions at this stage	

Table 2.11: Landscape and Visual

ExQ	Respondent	Question	Applicant's Response
Q11.0.1	The applicant	**Design of mitigation areas for RAF Marham's precision approach radar** (i) Could the applicant comment in detail on how the design of the RAF Marham Mitigation Areas Plan [REP4-039] would be integrated with each of the existing and proposed features shown in the existing Appendix 1 – Green Infrastructure Strategy Plans, outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) [REP3-070] and provide updated plans for Appendix 1 to take account of the PAR mitigation areas? (ii) What factors would be considered to determine the design choice of bunds and/or fencing for the mitigation at each location and how would transitions be designed between different types of bunds and/or fencing? (iii) How would the above design choice align with the Design Principles in the Design Approach Document [AS-009] to [AS-011], and the oLEMP's ten strategic landscape and ecological opportunities (referred to in applicant's response to ExQ1 Q1.0.4 [REP1-069], which set a framework for the operational landscape and ecological management of the Scheme)?	(i) The **RAF Marham Mitigation Areas Plan [APP/8.26.1]** will have no bearing on the green infrastructure strategy plan set out in Appendix 1 of the **outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) [APP/7.11.3]**. The PAR Mitigation would be located within Work No. 1(a), which is shown as 'Grassland under Solar PV modules' on the Green Infrastructure Strategy Plans. As set out in the **Design Principles, Parameters and Commitments [APP/5.8.5]**, bunds, if used, would be seeded to grass, therefore the Green Infrastructure Strategy Plans are not subject to any changes as a result of the PAR Mitigation. The management measures set out for "*Wildflower Grassland (within fence line and beneath Solar PV Array habitat) – Management"* within Annex A of the **oLEMP [APP/7.11.3]**, would be implemented to manage the grassland on bunds (if used) within Works No. 1(a). (ii) The **Design Principles, Parameters and Commitments [APP/5.8.5]** has been updated at Deadline 5 to include the following Design Principles to inform the design and specification of the PAR Mitigation at the detailed design stage: Solar PV Arrays will be located between the PAR Mitigation and the western edge of River Road and Petticoat Drove. In the scenario where the Applicant specifies bunds as part of the PAR Mitigation strategy, the following design principles will apply: • Bunds will be specified instead of a fence in locations where there is no intervening PV Tables located between the position of the PAR Mitigation bund

ExQ	Respondent	Question	Applicant's Response
			and the visual receptors users of Petticoat Drove, River Road and Keepers Cottage. • Transitions between a bund and a fence will not occur directly opposite and in direct line of sight from users of Petticoat Drove and River Road. Oblique views of the transition between from existing field accesses or gaps in vegetation would be acceptable. • Fencing will not be located along the crest of bunds. (iii) The PAR Mitigation would fully align with the Design Principles described in Section 8 of the **Design Approach Document [AS-009 - AS-011]**, and the ten Strategic Landscape and Ecological Opportunities (SLEO) described in the **oLEMP [APP/7.11.3]**. The PAR Mitigation is to be located within Work No. 1(a) and, therefore, all offsets/buffers from existing landscape features including hedgerows, trees, ditches, ponds and Public Rights of Way (PRoWs) described in **ES Chapter 5: The Scheme [APP/6.1.3]**, at Table 5.2, and Table 3.1 of **Design Principles, Parameters and Commitments [APP/5.8.5]** would remain unchanged. The PAR Mitigation design principles, parameters and commitments, as set out in **Design Principles, Parameters and Commitments [APP/5.8.5]**, have been introduced to accord with Design Principles 2.8 and 2.9 which are to consider the experience of users of adjacent roads and PRoWs. The following paragraphs provide an explanation of how the PAR Mitigation aligns with the oLEMP's ten strategic landscape and ecological opportunities. SLEO 1, which relates to the retention and enhancement of existing vegetation to maintain the Order limits' fabric and assimilate development into its context would still apply. No existing or proposed vegetation would be lost within Work No. 1(a) as a result of the PAR Mitigation, and existing and proposed hedgerows would continue to be maintained to a minimum height of 3m as set out within the **oLEMP [APP/7.11.3]** to provide visual screening to the Scheme. With regards to SLEO 2, measures to retain the distinctive and unique local character of the Order limits would still be observed. As noted in the **Design Principles, Parameters and Commitments [APP/5.8.5]** measures would be taken to ensure that the external finishes are *"in keeping with the prevailing surrounding environment";* fencing would consist of "non reflective material and if bunds are introduced; and the slopes should *"not exceed 1:3 and will be seeded with grass only".* The maximum height of the PAR Mitigation, whether this is a bund and / or fencing, would be a maximum of 4.5m which would align with the maximum parameter of the single axis tracker panels of 4.5m. In terms of biodiversity, measures to extend, enhance and improve connectivity of local wildlife sites / priority habitats (SLEO 3), create new grassland habitats to support farmland birds (SLEO4) and use locally native species wherever possible to create new habitats including pollinator species and food sources (SLEO5) would all still be implemented. Such opportunities would still be considered alongside commitments within the **Design Principles, Parameters and Commitments [APP/5.8.5]** which seek to ensure that, if fences are specified, *"clearances above ground or mammal gates will be included within the fence to permit the passage of wildlife".* Equally, new planting would still be established at the earliest opportunity

ExQ	Respondent	Question	Applicant's Response
			(SLEO6) and a biodiversity net gain beyond the minimum of 10% would still be delivered (SLEO7). The PAR Mitigation would not affect SLEOs regarding PRoW and interpretation. This includes the retention of PRoW and protection of their amenity (SLEO 8), improvements in PRoW connectivity and creation of new routes (SLEO 9) as well as the provision of interpretation facilities (SLEO 10), all of which are located outside of Work No. 1(a).

Table 2.12: Need, site selection and alternatives

ExQ	Respondent	Question	Applicant's Response
		No further questions at this stage.	

Table 2.13: Noise and Vibration

ExQ	Respondent	Question	Applicant's Response
		No further questions at this stage.	

Table 2.14: Population

ExQ	Respondent	Question	Applicant's Response
		No further questions at this stage.	

Table 2.15: Transport and access

ExQ	Respondent	Question	Applicant's Response
Q15.0.1	The applicant	**Temporary speed limit changes** The dDCO [REP4-004], Schedule 8 refers to Traffic Regulation Measures for the A1065 between reference points 2s and 4f and shaded green on sheets 2 and 4 of the streets plan [APP-010], whereas paragraph 5.9.2 of the outline construction traffic management plan [AS-083] refers to implementing a temporary 40 miles per hour speed limit restriction, during construction, between the two access points onto the A1065. Could the applicant confirm the extent of the temporary speed limit and update any relevant document(s) for consistency?	The **outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP) [APP/7.7.4]** has been updated to clarify that the temporary speed limit reduction to 40mph will extend beyond the two access points on the A1065, to match the extent shown on sheets 2 and 4 of the **Streets Plan [APP-010]** between points 2s and 4f, which is effectively the length of the Order limits along the A1065, to reduce vehicle speeds in the vicinity of the access junctions and the extent of their visibility splays up to the next junction.

Table 2.16: Other Planning Matters

ExQ	Respondent	Question	Applicant's Response
Q16.0.1	The applicant	**Wildfire risk** Further to concerns raised by Sporle with Palgrave Parish Council at ISH2, item 3-3 [EV6-004], regarding the risk of wildfires, could the applicant review its assessment relating to NPS EN-1 paragraph 4.10.8, in the Policy Compliance Document [REP1-015], to include consideration of how this risk would be mitigated?	The Applicant has updated the **Policy Compliance Document [APP/5.6.2]** for Deadline 5 to include assessment of compliance with paragraph 4.10.8 of NPS EN-1 in relation to the risk of wildfires, as requested by the ExA. This refers to an update of the **outline Operational Environmental Management Plan (oOEMP) [APP/7.8.5]** at Deadline 5 to include a commitment to the production of an emergency response plan.

THE DROVES

SOLAR FARM