

Appendix 4.3

Scoping Opinion Response Matrix



EIA Scoping Opinion Response Matrix - PINS

Description of the Proposed Development				
ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Response
2.1.1	Paragraph 2.1.2	Installation, construction and decommissioning methods	The Scoping Report states that the installation, construction and decommissioning methods to be utilised will be determined by the appointed contractor(s) while the EIA will represent a 'worst case'. The ES should set out the construction and design parameters and the works that will be involved for each of the three sites comprising the Proposed Development to ensure a clear understanding of assumptions and cumulative construction impacts to ensure that the worst-case construction scenarios are understood.	The PEIR sets out indicative design principles and construction parameters for the Proposed Development. The PEIR assessment has been based on a reasonable worst-case scenario. The final design and construction parameters will be presented and assessed within the ES.
2.1.2	Section 2.2	Flexibility	The Inspectorate notes the Applicant's intention to apply a 'Rochdale Envelope' approach to maintain flexibility within the design of the Proposed Development, namely relating to the number of solar PV modules or construction methods. Scoping Report paragraph 2.2.7 also states that the design parameters will be further developed during statutory consultation. The Inspectorate expects that at the point an application is made, the description of the Proposed Development will be sufficiently detailed to include the design, size, capacity, technology, and locations of the different elements of the Proposed Development or where details are not yet known, will set out the assumptions applied to the assessment in relation to these aspects. This should include the footprint and heights of the structures (relevant to existing ground levels), as well as land-use requirements for all elements and phases of the development. The description should be supported (as	The PEIR sets out indicative design principles and construction parameters for the Proposed Development., including optionality within the current design. The ES will provide a full description of the Proposed Development, alongside the design, size, capacity, technology and locations of the different elements of the Proposed Development. In cases where the location of the element is not defined, the ES will clearly set out the assumptions and the relevant parameters that have informed the worst-case assessment.

Description of the Proposed Development

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Response
			<p>necessary) by figures, cross-sections, and drawings which should be clearly and appropriately referenced. The Inspectorate considers that early refinement of options will support a more robust assessment of likely significant effects and provide certainty to those likely to be affected. Where flexibility is sought, the ES should clearly set out and justify the maximum design parameters that would apply for each option assessed and how these have been used to inform an adequate assessment in the ES. The Inspectorate advises that each aspect chapter includes a section that outlines the relevant parameters / commitments that have informed the assessment</p>	
2.1.3	Paragraphs 2.5.9 and 2.5.10	Use of borrow pits	<p>The ES should provide details regarding the consideration of the proposed borrow pit locations. The potential environmental impacts should be considered, including cumulative effects arising from the working and restoration and where significant effects are likely to occur.</p>	<p>The Proposed Development has discounted the consideration for the use of borrow pits.</p>
2.1.4	Paragraph 2.5.16	Habitat creation	<p>Scoping Report paragraph 2.5.16 states that a programme of construction reinstatement and habitat creation will commence during the construction phase. The Inspectorate expects that these are included in the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP). The description of habitat creation measures should include the location, extent, type of habitat creation, timeframe for establishment, ongoing maintenance requirements and any accompanying plans. Should habitat creation be included off-site, the area should be included in the red line boundary of the Proposed Development.</p>	<p>The programme of construction reinstatement and habitat creation will be included in the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) and Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (oLEMP) which will be submitted in support of the DCO.</p>

Description of the Proposed Development

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Response
2.1.5	Section 2.7	Decommissioning	The ES should provide a description of the activities and works which are likely to be required during decommissioning of the Proposed Development, including the anticipated duration. Where significant effects are likely to occur as a result of decommissioning the Proposed Development, these should be described and assessed in the ES. Any proposals for restoration of the site to agricultural or other use should also be described.	The PEIR provides details on the activities and works which are likely to be required during decommissioning. The ES will provide further details on these activities, as well as the findings of the assessment of decommissioning activities.

EIA Methodology and Scope of Assessment

2.2.1	Section 4.5	Baseline conditions	It is noted that a number of surveys have been undertaken which have informed the Scoping Report however these have not been included or appended. Any information relied upon for the assessments in the ES should be appended to the ES in order for the Inspectorate to gain a full understanding of issues. The Applicant should ensure that surveys are up to date and adhere to current good practice	The PEIR is supported by a number of figures and reports which have relied and informed the assessment. All technical reports and figures relied upon for the assessments in the ES will be appended to the ES. All surveys that will inform the ES will be up to date and carried out in line with current best practice.
2.2.2	Section 4.8	Mitigation and monitoring	The Scoping Report refers to several mitigation plans which will be provided with the application documents. The draft mitigation plans provided with the application should be sufficiently detailed to demonstrate how significant effects will be avoided or minimised and the ES should clearly	The outline mitigation plans which will be submitted as part of the DCO will include sufficient detail to outline how any significant effects will be avoided and minimised. The ES will clearly outline how these plans are intended to be secured as part of the DCO.

Description of the Proposed Development

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Response
			demonstrate how the implementation of these plans will be secured. Any measures identified to minimise likely significant effects should be consulted on with relevant consultation bodies. Mitigation measures should be clearly identified and justified in the ES with an explanation provided on how this mitigation would be secured through the Development Consent Order (DCO) process.	Mitigation measures identified to mitigate any likely significant effects will be consulted on with the relevant consultation body. Details of consultation held to date are included within the PEIR.
2.2.3	Paragraph 2.4.61	Lighting	The Report states that the National Grid Substation (NGS) compound, Project Substation compound, Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) compounds, and Collector Compounds would include lighting, in accordance with relevant standards, but will not be permanently lit. External lighting should be assessed in a lighting assessment, for all elements and phases of the Proposed Development. It should be explained what measures are proposed to minimise light spill into the surrounding area and minimise impacts on sensitive human and ecological receptors.	A lighting scheme will be designed to reduce light spill and any effects to human and ecological receptors.
2.2.4	Section 5.11	Transboundary	The Inspectorate on behalf of the Secretary of State (SoS) has considered the Proposed Development and concludes that the Proposed Development is unlikely to have a significant effect either alone or cumulatively on the environment in a European Economic Area State. In reaching this conclusion the Inspectorate has identified and considered the Proposed Development's likely impacts including consideration of potential pathways and the extent, magnitude, probability, duration, frequency and reversibility of the impacts. The Inspectorate considers that the likelihood of transboundary effects resulting from the Proposed Development is so low that it does not warrant the	Noted

Description of the Proposed Development

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Response
			<p>issue of a detailed transboundary screening. However, this position will remain under review and will have regard to any new or materially different information coming to light which may alter that decision.</p>	
Environmental aspects to be scoped out				
2.3.1	Section 5.2	Glint and glare	<p>The Scoping Report proposes to scope out a Glint and Glare ES aspect chapter, however a detailed stand-alone glint and glare assessment is proposed to be submitted in support of the DCO application. A description of any relevant mitigation measures and safety considerations will be included in the Proposed Development Chapter in the ES. The Inspectorate is content with this approach, however the stand-alone glint and glare assessment should be included as a technical appendix to the ES as well. The stand-alone glint and glare assessment should assess the worse-case scenario. In the event that glint and glare effects are identified, it should be used to inform the relevant chapters in the ES, in particular for the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) aspect Chapter.</p>	<p>A preliminary assessment of glint and glare has been undertaken to inform the design of the Proposed Development and is included within PEIR. A glint and glare assessment will be included as a technical appendix to the ES and will inform the assessment of relevant topics.</p>
2.3.2	Section 5.3	Heat and radiation	<p>The Scoping Report proposes to scope out an assessment of impacts from heat and radiation during construction, operation and decommissioning as no significant sources are anticipated. The Inspectorate draws the Applicant's attention to the response from Ashby de la Launde, Bloxholm with Temple Bruer and Temple High</p>	<p>The ES will include a brief outline and signposting to any known identified sources of heat (and radiation) and detail how this has been considered in the design of the Proposed Development.</p>

Description of the Proposed Development

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Response
			<p>Grange Parish Council (Appendix 2) regarding heat and micro-climatic impacts. The agrees that this matter may be scoped out from further consideration, on the basis that the ES clearly signposts any identified sources of heat (and radiation), and how this has been considered with respect to site-selection, site layout, and mitigation design.</p>	
2.3.3	Section 5.4	Major accidents and disasters	<p>A standalone Chapter for major accidents and disasters is not proposed on the basis that the nature, scale, and location of the Proposed Development is not considered to be vulnerable to or to give rise to significant impacts in relation to the risk of accidents and major disasters. Scoping Report Table 5-1 presents a list of possible major accidents and disasters that will require consideration including flooding, fire risk, aircraft disasters, rail accidents and plant disease. The Report states that the above potential major accidents and disasters will be considered in the design of the Proposed Development and covered in the flood risk assessment, Battery Safety Commitments, glint and glare assessment and planting design and Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP). The Inspectorate has considered the characteristics of the Proposed Development and agrees with this approach. However, the ES should clearly signpost where these impacts are assessed in other relevant chapters and where any relevant mitigation measures are secured, if required.</p>	<p>The ES will signpost to the location of where this matter has been assessed within the other relevant chapters and where any relevant mitigation measures are secured, if required. A Battery Safety Commitments Plan will be submitted in support of the DCO application.</p>

Description of the Proposed Development

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Response
2.3.4	Section 5.5	Utilities	<p>The Scoping Report suggests that existing infrastructure will be identified through consultation and a desk-based study and will inform the design and protective provisions to avoid impacts on receptors. The oCEMP will include any additional mitigation measures to protect against interference with below ground utilities during construction. The Inspectorate is content that a standalone ES Chapter for utilities is not required. However, the ES should explain the findings of the desk-based study and signpost to where any required mitigation measures are secured.</p>	<p>The ES will outline the findings from the utility desk-based study and detail how this has informed the design of the Proposed Development. The ES will also signpost to any required measures, if required.</p>
2.3.5	Section 5.6	Human Health	<p>The Scoping Report proposes that impacts to human health will be considered in other relevant Chapters including Air quality; Landscape and visual; Noise and vibration; Traffic and transport. Potential human health effects from glint and glare will be considered in the glint and glare assessment. The Inspectorate is content with this approach, however the ES should clearly set out potential impacts to human health from the Proposed Development during construction, operation and decommissioning and cross-reference where impacts are assessed within the ES; this may extend beyond the chapters proposed above, e.g. Land Contamination.</p>	<p>The ES will clearly cross reference to those chapters where human health impacts (e.g. dust, noise) are assessed.</p>
2.3.6	Section 5.7	Material assets	<p>The Scoping Report proposes to include a description of the potential streams and volumes of construction and operation materials within the Project Description chapter of the ES, in lieu of a standalone chapter. The Report proposes to manage impacts through a Materials Management</p>	<p>Borrow Pits are no longer being considered as part of the Proposed Development. The ES will detail the proposed waste arisings and will confirm the cut and fill balance.</p>

Description of the Proposed Development

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Response
			<p>Plan required through an oCEMP. Scoping Report paragraph 5.7.6 states that it is not intended to remove significant quantities of excavated arisings from the site during construction and that where possible, soil arisings will be balanced through a cut and fill exercise to retain volumes on site. However, there is no reference to the potential use of borrow pits. The Inspectorate agrees that this can be scoped out as a specific chapter of the ES; however borrow pits should be considered within the ES Chapter on Land, soils and groundwater, and the ES Project Description should confirm the cut and fill balance.</p>	
2.3.7	Section 5.7	Waste	<p>The Scoping Report proposes to include a description of the potential streams and volumes of construction and operational waste disposal within the ES Project Description chapter and manage impacts through an outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan, and a Site Waste Management Plan required through the oCEMP.</p> <p>There is no commitment to recycle solar panels at decommissioning. The ES should include an assessment of waste impacts for the decommissioning phase and include and outline what measures, if any, are in place to ensure that components (e.g. batteries and panels) are able to be diverted from the waste chain and managed in line with the waste hierarchy based on available technology at the time. The ES should also consider the requirement for cumulative impacts to be assessed at decommissioning due to a number of solar farms in the local area also likely to be decommissioning in a similar timescale.</p>	<p>The ES will include further detail on the waste impacts for the decommissioning phase and outline how any impacts will be mitigated and managed through the implementation of an Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan and an Outline Site Waste Management Plan.</p>

Description of the Proposed Development

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Response
2.3.8	Section 5.8	Population - private property and housing, community land and assets, and development land and businesses	<p>The Inspectorate agrees with the proposal to scope out an assessment of impacts on private property and housing, community land and assets, and development land and businesses as the Scoping Report states there are none of these types of assets located within the site boundary.</p> <p>The ES should ensure however that the socio-economic effect of amenity impacts (e.g. visual impacts on tourism/ recreational receptors, disruption/ diversion of Public Rights of Way (PRoW)) is clearly addressed in other relevant chapters and mitigated through management plans.</p>	<p>The ES will consider the socio-economic effects of the amenity impacts, for example, visual impacts on recreational receptors, which will be clearly detailed within the relevant technical chapter. Any required mitigation will be detailed in the ES and included within the relevant management plan.</p>
2.3.9	Section 5.8	Population - agricultural land holdings/ socio-economic benefits	<p>The Scoping Report proposes to scope out impacts to agricultural land holdings, considering that the loss of these agricultural operations is not expected to lead to a significant effect in relation to employment in the local area. Paragraph 5.8.19 of the Report anticipates various socio-economic benefits as a result of the Proposed Development and proposes to submit a Socio-Economic Benefits Statement with the DCO Application, separate from the ES, to highlight the positive impacts on the local and regional area.</p> <p>The Inspectorate considers that such an assessment should form part of a specific chapter of the ES which considers both the positive and negative socio-economic impacts of the development, including the cumulative loss of agricultural operations within the region.</p>	<p>Farmers will be reasonably compensated for any substantiated losses as a direct result of the Proposed Development. Any claims regarding compensation would be addressed outside of the EIA process. Preliminary assessment of impacts on best and most versatile agricultural land has been presented within the PEIR, with the final assessment to be reported in the ES.</p>

Description of the Proposed Development

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Response
2.3.10	Section 5.8	Population - walkers, cyclists and horse riders	<p>There are a number of PRow within the Site boundary some which would be temporarily diverted during the construction phase. The Applicant proposes to present these and detail relevant mitigation measures in a Public Rights of Way Commitments document, separate from the EIA process.</p> <p>The Inspectorate considers that surveys should be undertaken to provide baseline data in relation to the use of the PRowS affected by the Proposed Development and the ES should provide a figure clearly depicting the location of said PRowS. The ES should assess impacts to PRow and on walkers, cyclists and horse riders from the Proposed Development (and cumulatively with other developments) such as the need for temporary closures or diversions, or reduction in amenity, where significant effects are likely to occur.</p>	<p>.</p> <p>As set out in the PEIR, the Proposed Development is exploring several Rights of Way improvements and permissive paths within the Site.</p> <p>Figure 2-3 depicts the location of the Public Rights of Way network within and adjacent to the Site, alongside, proposed permissive paths.</p> <p>A management plan setting out the Public Rights of Way Commitments (PRWC) will be provided in support of the DCO application. The PRWC will include a schedule of public rights of way within the Site and outline the proposed measures to manage any requirements to temporarily close public rights of way within the Site during construction.</p>
2.3.11	Section 5.9	Water - flood risk	<p>The Scoping Report proposes to scope out increases in flood risk during construction (paragraph 5.9.14), operation (paragraph 5.9.24) and decommissioning (paragraph 5.9.31). However, a Flood Risk Assessment would be submitted with the application. Given the nature of the site and the development, and subject to ensuring no increase in flood risk and agreeing design and mitigation measures with Environment Agency, Lincolnshire County Council (the Lead Local Flood Authority) and the Witham First Internal Drainage Board, the Inspectorate is content to scope these matters out of the ES.</p>	<p>The drainage design and any associated mitigation measures will be agreed with the Environment Agency, Lincolnshire County Council and the Witham First Internal Drainage Board.</p> <p>A Flood Risk Assessment will be submitted as part of the DCO application.</p>

Description of the Proposed Development

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Response
2.3.12	Section 5.9	Water	<p>The Scoping Report proposes to scope out the following from the ES, on the basis of drainage design and mitigation measures controlled through an oCEMP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - sedimentation and pollution of watercourses as a result of silt laden runoff arising from construction (paragraph 5.9.16) - water pollution as a result of chemical spillages during construction (paragraph 5.9.17) and operation (paragraph 5.9.25); - watercourse pollution as a result of cements and concretes being mobilised in surface water runoff (paragraph 5.9.18); - alterations in the surface water regime during construction; - increased foul flows to the foul sewers network during operation (paragraph 5.9.28); - disposal of contaminated water in the event of a BESS fire (paragraph 5.9.29); - increased demand for drinking water during operation (paragraph 5.9.30); and - impact of the decommissioning works on water quality (paragraph 5.9.31). <p>The Inspectorate notes that impacts from herbicide and pesticide mobilisation have not been discussed in the Scoping Report and that horizontal directional drilling may be required but a breakout plan is not proposed. The Inspectorate does not consider enough evidence regarding the final design and control measures has been provided to scope impacts to water quality out during construction or decommissioning. The ES should identify relevant receptors and pathways of effect, the likely mitigation required to mitigate such effects and any monitoring required; this should</p>	<p>. Following further consideration, impacts on water quality have been considered as part of the preliminary assessment.</p>

Description of the Proposed Development

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Response
2.3.13	Section 5.9	Water resources	include a drilling fluid breakout plan which should also be submitted with the Application if trenchless techniques are employed.	Following further consideration, impacts on water resources have been considered as part of the preliminary assessment.
2.3.14	Section 5.9	Water Framework Directive	The Scoping Report identifies the potential for contamination of surface water and groundwater bodies. Given the geographic location of the Proposed Development, the ES should consider the potential impacts on Water Framework Directive (WFD) water bodies. The Applicant's attention is drawn to the Inspectorate's Advice Note Eighteen: The WFD in this regard. The ES should explain the relationship between the Proposed Development and any relevant water bodies in relation to the current relevant River Basin Management Plan.	Following further consideration, impacts on water framework directive water bodies have been considered as part of the preliminary assessment.
2.3.15	Section 5.10	Electric, magnetic and electromagnetic fields (EMF)	The Applicant proposes to scope out EMF on the basis that the Proposed Development would not require cables and infrastructure exceeding 132kV; a threshold set out by Department for Energy and Climate Change (DECC) Power Lines: Demonstrating compliance with EMF public exposure guidelines, A Voluntary Code of Practice	The Proposed Development is not anticipated to exceed the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection exposure guidelines, and the design of the Proposed Development will consider any infrastructure constraints and the location of the 400kVGrid

Description of the Proposed Development

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Response
			<p>2012 guidance. However, the project description at paragraph 2.4.1 of the Scoping Report includes "up to two new 400kV transmission towers to facilitate the electrical connection of the National Grid Substation to the existing 400kV transmission line". It is also noted that the location of the proposed 400kV National Grid Substation compound has not yet been determined. Given the uncertainty surrounding the location of the substation and proximity to receptors, the ES should address the risks to human health arising from EMF to the extent that it is relevant to the nature of the development, taking into account relevant technical guidance, and where significant effects are likely to occur. The Inspectorate considers that the ES should demonstrate the design measures taken to avoid the potential for EMF effects on receptors from the substation infrastructure.</p>	<p>Connection cable route, in relation to sensitive receptors.</p>

Air Quality

3.1.1	Paragraph 6.1.9	Site activities and road traffic exhaust emissions during operation	<p>The Scoping Report proposes to scope out these matters given that the site activities and movement of vehicles during operation are expected to be minimal. On this basis, the Inspectorate agrees that these matters can be scoped out. The ES must however provide information on the nature of vehicle movements during the operational phases (alone and cumulatively) and confirm these projections fall below the relevant thresholds set out in guidance. The ES project description should also confirm that there are no emissions from operational plant that require further assessment.</p>	<p>Operational phase traffic counts will be compared with the EPUK-IAQM 2017 guidance screening criteria in the ES to confirm that the traffic projections fall below the relevant thresholds. The ES project description will confirm that there are no emissions from operational plant that require further assessment.</p>
--------------	-----------------	---	--	--

Description of the Proposed Development

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Response
3.1.2	Paragraph 6.1.2	Study area - air quality	The Scoping Report states that the study area for sensitive ecological receptors will be up to 50m from the Site boundary or 50m from the edge of the roads. The ES should provide justification with reference to the relevant guidance for the study area for ecological receptors and agree with relevant consultation bodies.	Study area will be confirmed with North Kesteven District Council and Lincolnshire County Council.. Relevant guidance for the study area will be referenced in the ES.
3.1.3	Paragraph 6.1.11	Demolition	Scoping Report paragraph 6.1.11 refers to four sources of potential dust and particulate matter effects but only lists three: earthworks; general site activities; and trackout. Demolition is not scoped in. Given that there are no demolition works proposed during construction, the Inspectorate agrees that this can be scoped out during construction, however should the decommissioning phase entail demolition works then these should be assessed, where significant effects are likely to occur.	There is no demolition proposed during the construction phase, hence the assessment for demolition will not be included in the ES. A qualitative impact assessment of the potential dust emission for demolition during the decommissioning phase will be undertaken. Mitigation measures will be proposed, where appropriate.
3.1.4	n/a	Air quality - plan	The ES should be accompanied by a plan showing the location of sensitive air quality receptors within the vicinity of the Proposed Development to aid understanding of the extent of effects.	A figure showing the air quality study area will be included in the ES.

Biodiversity

3.2.1	Paragraph 6.2.9	Internationally and nationally statutory designated sites (all phases)	The Scoping Report seeks to scope out these receptors on the grounds that there are no internationally protected nature conservation sites within 10 km of the Site and no nationally protected statutory designated nature conservation sites within 2 km of the Site. The Inspectorate agrees that the proposal is unlikely to adversely impact any European or internationally designated nature	Noted.
-------	-----------------	--	---	--------

Description of the Proposed Development

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Response
			conservation sites or nationally designated sites and this matter can be scoped out of the ES.	
3.2.2	Paragraph 6.2.9	Local wildlife sites	The Scoping Report states that these sites would be avoided by the current Proposed Development design minimum offset distance of 15m from LWSs and they would also be protected by the oCEMP. It is not possible to locate these LWSs on the Environmental Features Plan in Appendix C of the Scoping Report as it is not accompanied with a schedule of sites. No site layout options have been presented and as such it is not confirmed that impacts have been avoided. The ES should consider any impacts upon local wildlife and geological sites, including local nature reserves with reference to the reasons for designation, and the findings of other impact assessment disciplines (noise, air quality, water resources). The ES should clearly present the location of LWSs and how they interact with the Proposed Development. The assessment of potential direct and indirect effects on LWSs needs to be made.	The site layout plan and LWS locations will be presented in the ES showing the location of LWSs and how they interact with the Proposed Development. The assessment of potential direct and indirect effects on LWSs will be presented in the ES.
3.2.3	Paragraph 6.2.9	Local wildlife sites	The Scoping Report seeks to scope these receptors out due to the distance from the Site and a lack of relevant links or impact pathways. The Scoping Report has not supported this with evidence regarding the sites and impact pathways, in light of this the Inspectorate is unable to scope these receptors out at this stage.	The assessment of potential direct and indirect effects on LWSs (including evidence regarding the sites and impact pathways) will be presented in the ES.

Description of the Proposed Development

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Response
3.2.4	Paragraph 6.2.9	Lowland Meadow Priority Habitat (all phases)	<p>The Scoping Report proposes to avoid the grassland parcels assessed as priority habitat. Lowland meadow by design, and protect them through the oCEMP. No site layout options have been presented and as such it is not confirmed that impacts have been avoided. The Inspectorate is unable to agree to scope this receptor out at this stage.</p>	<p>The site layout plan will be presented in the ES - showing that the areas of good quality grassland will be avoided by the Proposed Development.</p>
3.2.5	Paragraph 6.2.9	Hedgerows and hedgerow trees (all phases)	<p>The Scoping Report states that the Proposed Development would be designed to include a buffer from panels to boundary features including hedgerows and trees and measures in the oCEMP would safeguard their protection. It also states that mitigation for any habitat loss will be included in the oLEMP.</p> <p>A commitment to provide habitat mitigation/compensation cannot be relied upon to scope habitats out. An assessment should identify the relative nature conservation value of receptors, any impact pathways, the extent and significance of effects, and should demonstrate that the mitigation hierarchy has been applied. The Inspectorate is unable to agree to scope this receptor out at this stage.</p>	<p>Hedgerow surveys have been carried out in August 2023, (of those hedgerows which may be impacted by the development), to assess their value using the ecological criteria for 'Important Hedgerows'. The hedgerows, where sections may need to be removed for cable installation, will be replanted after works and any hedgerow loss is not anticipated to have a likely significant effect as it will be mitigated or compensated. However as it is currently unknown what quantity of hedgerow will need to be removed for internal access tracks an assessment of the likely effect of this cannot be determined at present until the access design details are confirmed. Therefore sections of hedgerows which may need to be removed for internal access tracks have been scoped in, at present, until a quantifiable assessment can be made.</p>
3.2.6	Paragraph 6.2.9	Ponds (all phases)	<p>The Scoping Report states that no ponds would be lost to the Proposed Development and the implementation of the oCEMP would include standard practice pollution prevention measures. No site layout options have been presented and as such it is not confirmed that impacts have been avoided. No detail has been provided regarding the</p>	<p>Plans will be presented in the ES to show how ponds will be avoided by the Proposed Development. Detail regarding the proposed mitigation measures will be presented in the oCEMP.</p>

Description of the Proposed Development

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Response
			<p>proposed mitigation measures. Insufficient information has been provided to enable the Inspectorate to scope out ponds at this stage.</p>	
3.2.7	Paragraph 6.2.9	Semi-improved grassland (all phases)	<p>The Scoping Report states that the oLEMP would include measures to sufficiently compensate for habitat loss and to protect any retained areas of this habitat during construction. A commitment to provide habitat mitigation/compensation cannot be relied upon to scope habitats out. An assessment should identify the relative nature conservation value and apply the mitigation hierarchy. The Inspectorate is unable to agree to scope this receptor out at this stage.</p>	<p>Plans will be presented in the ES to show how all identified good quality semi-improved grassland will be avoided by the Proposed Development. Detail regarding the proposed mitigation measures will be presented in the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (OCEMP). .</p>
3.2.8	Paragraph 6.2.9	Invasive species (all phases)	<p>"The Scoping Report seeks to scope out this receptor as no invasive species were identified during the Preliminary Ecological survey and that if any are found during further survey, then an invasive species method statement would be implemented to prevent the spread of this species during construction.</p> <p>The Inspectorate agrees that this matter can be scoped out if no invasive species are identified. Should invasive species be identified during further survey work, an assessment of the effects arising from the spread of invasive species during construction and decommissioning should be included within the ES and biosecurity measures incorporated into the oCEMP where necessary."</p>	<p>No invasive species have been found on Site during surveys. If any are identified during further survey work, an assessment of the effects arising from the spread of invasive species during construction and decommissioning will be included within the ES and biosecurity measures incorporated into the oCEMP where necessary.</p>

Description of the Proposed Development

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Response
3.2.9	Paragraph 6.2.9	Invertebrates (all phases)	The Scoping Report proposes to scope out invertebrates due to a lack of records of protected species and a lack of high-quality habitat within the Site that could support an important invertebrate assemblage. The Inspectorate notes that the fields at the northern and southern edges of Springwell West have not been surveyed. This matter can be scoped out if the Applicant can demonstrate that no protected species or high-quality habitat are observed following completion of the surveys, with agreement from the relevant consultees.	No high-quality invertebrate habitat has been observed following completion of the PEA surveys (of fields at the northern and southern edges of Springwell West). Therefore invertebrates remain scoped out.
3.2.10	Paragraph 6.2.9	Reptiles (all phases)	"The Scoping Report argues that the majority of the site is unsuitable for reptiles and seeks to scope them out on this basis. It suggests that precautionary measures would be detailed in the oCEMP to safeguard low numbers of reptiles that may be present in semi-improved grassland areas. The Inspectorate considers that further reptile surveys should be undertaken but restricted to the areas of suitable habitat identified in the PEA."	As the areas considered potentially suitable for reptiles will be excluded from development no reptile surveys are proposed. A plan will be presented in the ES showing how areas identified as suitable for reptiles will be avoided.
3.2.11	Paragraph 6.2.9	Non-ground nesting birds (all phases)	"The Scoping Report argues that through the retention of boundary hedgerows and trees and implementation of precautionary measures detailed in an oCEMP, nests would be safeguarded during construction. The Scoping Report does not anticipate any effects during operation and does not mention decommissioning. No site layout options have been presented and as such it is not confirmed that habitats will be retained. No detail has been provided regarding the proposed precautionary mitigation measures. Insufficient information has been provided at this stage to enable the Inspectorate to scope out this matter."	Plans will be presented in the ES to show buffer zones between hedgerows and trees and the Proposed Development. For the construction phase, detail regarding the mitigation measures will be presented in the oCEMP and for the operational phase habitat enhancement measures for nesting and foraging birds will be detailed in the oLEMP.

Description of the Proposed Development

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Response
3.2.12	Paragraph 6.2.9	Wintering birds (all phases)	<p>"The Scoping Report states that the site is not considered of importance for overwintering waders and wildfowl due to distance from coast and any significant wetland areas (i.e. it is more than 35 km from the Wash Special Protection Area).</p> <p>The Inspectorate agrees that the site is not likely to represent functionally linked habitat to any European sites, nevertheless the site could still have value for wintering birds and impacts could arise from the substantive land use change for the proposed development; therefore this matter should be scoped in."</p>	<p>The Site was not considered of importance for overwintering waders and wildfowl due to distance from coast and any significant wetland areas. However, following consultation with North Kesteven District Council and Lincolnshire County Council, wintering bird surveys will be carried out to determine presence or likely absence. If wintering birds are present, construction would cause temporary loss of foraging habitat. Construction and decommissioning could also cause noise and visual disturbance. However, mitigation measures will be documented within and secured by the oCEMP.</p>
3.2.13	Paragraph 6.2.9	"Barn owl (all phases) Marsh harrier (all phases)	<p>"The Scoping Report states that disturbance arising from construction and decommissioning to these species would be mitigated by buffer zones and measures detailed within the oCEMP and oLEMP, and any loss of foraging habitat would be mitigated through habitat creation and enhancement secured through the oLEMP. The Scoping Report does not anticipate any significant effects to these species during operation.</p> <p>A commitment to provide habitat mitigation/compensation cannot be relied upon to scope habitats out. The ES should assess impacts on these species during construction and decommissioning as well as operation and this should include impacts from habitat loss, disturbance and lighting."</p>	<p>There is not anticipated to be any significant impacts from habitat loss, disturbance or lighting. The assessment for justification will be detailed within the ES and mitigation measures will be detailed within the oCEMP.</p>

Description of the Proposed Development

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Response
3.2.14	Paragraph 6.2.9	Water vole (all phases) Otter (all phases) European eel (all phases)	"The Scoping Report states that no ponds or watercourses will be lost to the Proposed Development but where small sections of watercourses may be affected, 'standard mitigation' and pollution prevention measures (secured with the oCEMP) would be implemented. Given the potential for watercourses to be affected, and the lack of detail regarding the proposed mitigation measures, the Inspectorate is unable to scope these species out at this time."	No direct or indirect impacts on waterbodies are anticipated so these species, if present, should not be significantly affected. Mitigation measures will be implemented and detailed in the oCEMP.
3.2.15	Paragraph 6.2.9	Badger (all phases)	The Scoping Report states that all known setts would be retained with an appropriate buffer and implementation of precautionary measures detailed in an oCEMP would mitigate for any residual risk. No site layout options have been presented and as such it is not confirmed that habitats will be retained. No detail has been provided regarding the proposed precautionary mitigation measures. Insufficient information has been provided at this stage to enable the Inspectorate to scope out this matter.	Plans are presented in Figure 2-3 of the PEIR and will be presented in the ES. Detail regarding the proposed mitigation measures will be presented in the oCEMP. As badgers are highly mobile update badger surveys will be carried out within 6 months prior to any works.
3.2.16	Paragraph 6.2.9	Deer and other mammals (all phases)	The Scoping Report proposes to scope out the impact of fencing on foraging and dispersal for deer and other unspecified mammals on the grounds that the fencing will be designed to be 'semi-permeable' allowing movement across the site. The Inspectorate agrees that no likely significant effects are anticipated for deer and therefore an assessment can be scoped out of the ES. The application should provide further details regarding fencing design.	Further details regarding fencing design will be presented in the ES and mitigation measures will be detailed in the oCEMP.

Description of the Proposed Development

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Response
3.2.17	Paragraph 6.2.7	Impact pathways	Scoping Report paragraph 6.2.7 refers to habitat loss/ degradation but fails to describe any other impact pathways (e.g. disturbance, lighting, habitat fragmentation/ severance, collision risk). The Proposed Development would entail a range of activities with the potential to generate ecological impacts. The ES Ecology chapter should consider all potential impact pathways and assess any impacts arising from the Proposed Development which are likely to result in significant effects on ecological receptors. Justification for scoping out any ecological impact should be provided.	The ES Biodiversity chapter will consider all potential impact pathways and assess any impacts arising from the Proposed Development which are likely to result in significant effects on ecological receptors. Full justification for scoping out any ecological impact will be provided in the ES.
3.2.18	n/a	Plants, veteran and ancient trees	Notable flora is not specifically addressed within the survey scope. Consideration should be given to scarce arable flora that could occur in arable fields and be adversely affected by changes in land use. There is no information on veteran and ancient trees in the Scoping Report. The ES should identify any veteran trees and assess any significant effects on these receptors where they are likely to occur and propose adequate mitigation where identified.	No veteran trees have been identified on Site. The Site being mostly intensively farmed arable and improved pasture is considered of low suitability for notable arable plants. Rare or notable arable (non-crop) plant surveys are proposed to be carried out in 2024.
3.2.19	n/a	Brown hare, hedgehog	Scoping Report paragraph 6.2.5 notes the presence of brown hare and hedgehog in the study area but these have not been proposed to be scoped into the assessment. The ES should consider effects on these species and be supported by robust survey data, unless otherwise agreed with relevant consultation bodies.	Numbers of hares seen were noted during surveys. There is not anticipated to be any significant effect on hedgehog and hares. Justification will be presented in the ES and mitigation will be detailed in the oCEMP. Habitat enhancement measures will be detailed in the oLEMP.

Climate

3.3.1	Paragraph 6.3.9	Climate resilience during construction,	Scoping Report Table 5-1 states that the majority of the site is located within Flood Zone 1 and the	Noted.
-------	-----------------	---	--	--------

Description of the Proposed Development

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Response
		operation and decommissioning – flooding	vulnerability of the Proposed Development to flooding will be covered in the Flood Risk Assessment appended to the ES. On this basis, the Inspectorate agrees that significant effects are not likely to occur and an assessment of resilience to flooding can be scoped out of the Climate chapter of the ES. The Inspectorate agrees that given the distance of the site to the coastline, sea-level rise is not a relevant consideration.	
3.3.2	Paragraph 6.3.9	Climate resilience during construction, operation and decommissioning – high heat, wind speeds	The Inspectorate agrees that this can be scoped out of the assessment on the basis of embedded resilience of solar PV modules to high heat and wind speeds. However, the ES project description should explain how the development has been designed to be resilient to such effects.	Noted.
3.3.3	n/a	In-combination Climate Change Impact (ICCI) Assessment	The Scoping Report has not proposed to scope in/out an ICCI assessment. Solar panels have potential to alter precipitation runoff rates and patterns. In light of this, and in the absence of more detailed information regarding drainage design and controls, the Inspectorate considers that the ES should consider effects arising from a change in precipitation as a result of climate change in-combination with the scheme, where significant effects are likely to occur.	A preliminary in-combination assessment has been undertaken to assess the impact of precipitation change on run off rates and patterns as part of the Climate Chapter presented within the PEIR, with the final assessment to be presented within the ES

Cultural Heritage

3.4.1	Paragraph 6.4.9	Setting effects on all heritage assets within the study area (construction)	The Scoping Report argues that the construction phase effects resulting from changes in the setting of heritage assets will be temporary and no worse than the operational phase effects, therefore, it is not considered necessary to repeat the settings assessment for the construction phase. Given that setting can be negatively affected through more	The DBA and Stage 1 Setting Assessment that has informed the PEIR has not found any heritage assets that would be adversely affected by noise, dust etc. and these effects therefore remain scoped out for the construction phase.
-------	-----------------	---	--	--

Description of the Proposed Development

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Response
			than simply visual effects (e.g. noise, dust) the Inspectorate does not agree with the assumption that the construction phase effects would be no worse than the operational phase effects and therefore does not agree to scope out this phase.	
3.4.2	Paragraph 6.4.9	Impacts on the setting of listed dwellings within settlements over 1 km from the Site (operation)	The impacts on setting to these receptors are proposed to be scoped out on the basis that the positive contribution made by setting to the significance of residential listed buildings within settlements is typically confined to their immediate street scene. The Scoping Report does not justify why and how the 1km reference has been derived. The Inspectorate considers there is insufficient evidence provided to scope out this matter at this stage.	The DBA and Stage 1 Setting assessment which has informed the PEIR provides the justification for scoping out these assets.
3.4.3	Paragraph 6.4.9	Listed K6 telephone kiosks (operation)	These receptors are proposed to be scoped out on the grounds that their surroundings make a neutral contribution to their significance as they are found in a variety of contexts throughout the UK. The Inspectorate agrees that significant effects on such assets are unlikely to arise and this matter can therefore be scoped out of the ES.	Noted.
3.4.4	Paragraph 6.4.9	Various findspots recorded by LCC HER (listed in Scoping Report) (construction and operation)	The Scoping Report explains that as findspots, these have been removed from the Site and the heritage significance of their former locations would not be harmed by the Proposed Development. The Inspectorate agrees that the findspots can be scoped out of the ES.	Noted.
3.4.5	Paragraph 6.4.9	Milepost 20 metres south of Ashby Lodge Farm (Grade II Listed) (operation)	The Scoping Report argues that the positive contribution made by setting to the significance of the milepost derives from its relationship with the road network, and this would not be altered by the Proposed Development during operation. The	Noted.

Description of the Proposed Development

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Response
			Inspectorate agrees on this basis that this asset can be scoped out of this phase.	
3.4.6	Paragraph 6.4.9	Avro Lancaster crash site (operation)	This receptor is proposed to be scoped out on the basis that its significance does not draw on its wider surroundings. The Inspectorate agrees this asset can be scoped of the operational assessment.	Noted.
3.4.7	Paragraph 6.4.9	Hawker Hurricane crash site (operation)	This receptor is proposed to be scoped out on the basis that its significance does not draw on its wider surroundings. The Inspectorate agrees this asset can be scoped of the operational assessment.	Noted.
3.4.8	Paragraph 6.4.9	Sites of former extractive pits in Ashby de la Launde and Bloxholm, and Rowston (construction and operation)	These receptors are proposed to be scoped out on the grounds that they have negligible importance and significant effects upon them are therefore unlikely. The Scoping Report has provided no justification/evidence to support its assessment of 'negligible importance' and therefore the Inspectorate is unable to scope this matter out at this stage.	The DBA and Stage 1 Setting assessment which has informed the PEIR provides the justification for scoping out these assets.
3.4.9	Paragraph 6.4.9	All heritage assets within the study area during decommissioning	"The Scoping Report seeks to scope out the decommissioning phase on the basis that it would not result in impacts to any additional heritage assets not affected during construction and operation, and changes in the setting of heritage assets in the surrounding area will be no worse than the construction or operational phase effects. The Inspectorate considers that there is potential for decommissioning stage effects on buried archaeological resource, such as the potential for harm due to compaction, removal of piles, and subsequent potential changes in drainage patterns. In addition, given that the potential effects	The DBA and Stage 1 Setting Assessment that has informed the PEIR has not found any heritage assets that would be adversely affected by noise, dust etc. and these effects therefore remain scoped out. Decommissioning would not result in compaction of archaeological remains. Removal of piles will not cause materially more disturbance than their insertion and solar arrays have avoided areas of known archaeological sensitivity.

Description of the Proposed Development

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Response
			<p>on setting during decommissioning are likely to be similar to those experienced during construction the Inspectorate is of the opinion that this matter cannot be scoped out at this stage. Cultural heritage should be a consideration as part of any outline decommissioning plans."</p>	
3.4.10	Paragraph 6.4.1	Consultation	<p>The Applicant is also advised to liaise with the Heritage Trust of Lincolnshire who act on behalf of North Kesteven District Council, especially in relation to the scope of and timing of any intrusive evaluation following completion of the geophysical survey.</p>	<p>Consultation with these bodies regarding further evaluation is ongoing.</p>
3.4.11	Paragraph 6.4.2	Study area - cultural heritage	<p>The Scoping Report proposes a 2 km study area for non-designated assets. For the assessment of setting, the study area should be agreed with the relevant stakeholders and informed by the visual analysis.</p>	<p>Study area for setting has been informed by the ZTV.</p>
3.4.12	Paragraph 6.4.3	Data sources	<p>The Applicant is advised to also consider the North Kesteven District Council's local list of non-designated heritage assets and the Scopwick and Kirkby Green Neighbourhood Plan which contains schedules and descriptions of heritage assets within the Plan area.</p>	<p>This information has been reviewed for the DBA.</p>
3.4.13	Paragraphs 6.4.4 and 6.4.6	Intrusive evaluation	<p>The Scoping Report proposes a programme of archaeological investigation and recording secured by a DCO Requirement. Measures to mitigate risk to buried archaeological remains such as exclusion zones/ avoidance routes and concrete shoes rather than piles require a robust understanding of archaeological risk to be effective. These considerations should be factored into the programme and scope of intrusive evaluation (if required), to be agreed with the statutory</p>	<p>The layout has been informed by geophysical survey to avoid impacts to areas of archaeological sensitivity. The scope of further evaluation is still being discussed with North Kesteven District Council and Lincolnshire County Council.</p>

Description of the Proposed Development

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Response
3.4.14	Paragraph 6.4.8	Receptors to be scoped in	<p>consultees. Noting the responses from North Kesteven District Council and Lincolnshire County Council indicating the potential need for intrusive field evaluation to understand the full extent of any potential impact, and inform a fuller programme of archaeological investigation and ultimately the scheme design, the Inspectorate advises that further discussions are held with the relevant consultation bodies to discuss the detailed findings of desk studies and geophysical surveys, and whether these area adequate to inform design, assess the effects of the scheme and demonstrate that any potential significant effects can be adequately mitigated. Pending the results of the non-intrusive surveys the Inspectorate is not in a position to agree that a programme of intrusive archaeological investigation is not required to inform the ES.</p>	<p>The DBA and Stage 1 Setting Assessment has considered the effects on these conservation areas, the layout has been designed to minimize effects and the PEIR concludes that significant effect are unlikely.</p>
Landscape and Visual				
3.5.1	Paragraph 6.5.9	<p>Assessment of impacts to Lincolnshire Wolds Area of Outstanding National Beauty (AONB) during construction,</p>	<p>The Scoping Report states that the Lincolnshire Wolds AONB is located over 20km away from the Proposed Development. Due to the distance and intervisibility, an assessment of impacts on the AONB is proposed to be scoped out of the LVIA. Considering the nature and characteristics of the Proposed Development and the distances</p>	<p>An assessment of impacts on the AONB has been scoped out of the ES.</p>

Description of the Proposed Development

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Response
3.5.2	Paragraph 6.5.9	Assessment of impacts to Lincoln Cliff Area of Great Landscape Value (AGLV) during construction, operation and decommissioning	involved, the Inspectorate agrees that an assessment of impacts on the AONB can be scoped out of the ES.	An assessment of impacts on the Lincoln Cliff Area of Great Landscape Value has been scoped out of the ES. The ZTVs presented in Figures 9.5 to 9.8 of the PEIR demonstrate that visibility of the Proposed Development would not extend to the AGLV. At the request of Lincolnshire County Council /North Kesteven District Council a number of potential viewpoints were visited and photographed during field work but having established that there would be no view of the development from these locations it was agreed in a meeting with Lincolnshire County Council /North Kesteven District Council on 3 rd July 2023 that it was not necessary to include a viewpoint in the LVIA from within the AGLV. Lincolnshire County Council /North Kesteven District Council confirmed in a letter dated 15 th August 2023 that the viewpoint selection was 'proportional to the project and extent of potential visual receptors.'
3.5.3	Paragraph 6.5.9	Other Landscape Character Areas (LCAs) in the North Kesteven Landscape Character Assessment during construction, operation and decommissioning	Although some distant visibility is indicated by the Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV), the Scoping Report proposes to scope out this matter on the basis that the field work has established that there would be no intervisibility between the site and any other LCAs. The Inspectorate is content for these receptors to be scoped out, however the ZTV should be reviewed with the final scheme and presented in the ES to demonstrate that there is no intervisibility.	Landscape Character Areas (LCAs) other than the two host LCAs in which the Proposed Development is located have been scoped out of the ES. The ZTVs presented in Figures 9.5 to 9.8 of the PEIR demonstrate that there would be negligible visibility of the Proposed Development from within any other LCA. Lincolnshire County Council /North Kesteven District Council confirmed in a letter dated 15 th August 2023 that ' <i>LCA 6 Lincoln Cliff and LCA 13 Fenland sit to the fringes of the proposed study areas, and are unlikely to experience significant effects and</i>

Description of the Proposed Development

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Response
3.5.4	Paragraph 6.5.9	"View from Villages/ hamlets of Bloxham [sic], Digby, Dorrington, Ruskington, Leasingham, Cranwell, RAF Cranwell, Wellingore and Navenby and other settlements along the A607 during construction, operation and decommissioning	The Scoping Report proposes to scope out this matter on the basis that it is highly unlikely there would be any views of the Proposed Development from these settlements when taking into account intervening hedgerows and other vegetation, stating that any glimpses would be distant, filtered and negligible. The ES should demonstrate there is no intervisibility, otherwise the potential effects on views and visual amenity within the ZTV where significant effects are likely to occur should be assessed.	<i>subsequently are acceptable to be scoped out, however we would recommend these LCAs are identified in the LVIA, and if scoped out a brief statement is provided that recognises their proximity to the red line boundary and the rationale as to why they have been scoped out.'</i> Chapter 9 provides a brief statement to this effect.
3.5.5	Paragraph 6.5.9	Assessment of impacts to PRoW and local roads beyond 3km from the site during construction.	The Scoping Report proposes to scope out these receptors in the LVIA due to the distance and intervisibility. The Inspectorate considers that these matters may be scoped out on the basis of the relatively short duration of any potential effect.	An assessment of impacts on PRoW and local roads beyond 3km from the site during construction has been scoped out of the ES.
3.5.6	Paragraph 6.5.9	Assessment of impacts to isolated residential properties over 1km from the	The Scoping Report proposes to scope out this matter on the basis that it is a matter of private visual amenity which would not give rise to an overbearing effect on residential amenity.	Appendix 9.5 of the PEIR presents the analysis undertaken to date on residential visual amenity. A detailed RVAA will be provided in the ES once final details of the Proposed Development have

Description of the Proposed Development

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Response
		site during construction, operation and decommissioning	Insufficient information has been provided regarding the nature of these receptors and extent of visibility, therefore the Inspectorate is unable to scope out this matter out at this stage.	been established; including any mitigation measures adopted as appropriate. The study area for the RVAA is fully justified in Appendix 9.5. For the avoidance of doubt, visual effects on residential properties not included in the RVAA including those beyond 1km are considered in the LVIA; the RVAA goes one step beyond this to consider whether the effect at any individual dwelling is so great that the impacts are more than a matter of just private visual amenity.
3.5.7	Paragraph 6.5.9	Assessment of impacts to users of the rail network, specifically the section between Metheringham and the level crossing on the B1191 during construction, operation and decommissioning	The Scoping Report proposes to scope out these receptors in the LVIA due to their sensitivity being medium/ low. The Inspectorate considers that these matters may be scoped out on the basis of the relatively short duration and intermittent nature of any potential effect.	An assessment of impacts on the rail network, specifically the section between Metheringham and the level crossing on the B1191 has been scoped out of the ES.
3.5.8	Paragraphs 6.5.2 and 6.5.7	Study area - landscape and visual impact	The Scoping Report paragraph 6.5.2 proposes that the LVIA study area will be within 3km of the site boundary of the Proposed Development and extended to 5km for the National Grid and Project Substation and National Grid connecting towers. However, the full extent of potential visibility of the Proposed Development is not yet fully known and the ZTV mapping contained within Appendix F identified potential visibility beyond these extents. The ES should justify the extent of the study area/s with reference to recognised professional guidance and the extent of the likely impacts, informed by fieldwork and relevant models or approaches such	Updated ZTVs are presented in Figures 9.5 – 9.8 based on the 'worst case scenario' of visibility which could occur in accordance with the height parameters plan shown in Figure 2.4. The study area has been discussed with LCC/NKDC and on 15 th August 2023 they confirmed that <i>'The proposed 3km study area is appropriate from the solar PV development and 5km from the National Grid and Project Substation and National Grid connecting towers. However, the LVIA should clearly state the justification for these study areas, and thoroughly assess and confirm no significant views are available from beyond the</i>

Description of the Proposed Development

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Response
			<p>as the ZTV. The Applicant should agree the study areas with relevant consultation bodies.</p>	<p><i>study area. Also, as it is not confirmed as to whether the National Grid Substation and National Grid connecting towers are to be included within the redline boundary, and if so both the final location and design of these elements, and the Project Substation, is yet to be confirmed, therefore while every effort has been made to accommodate this with the viewpoint selection, additional viewpoints and extension of the 5km study area may be required subject to confirmation of these aspects.'</i></p> <p>The ZTVs demonstrate that in the worst case scenario there would be negligible visibility of the Proposed Development beyond the study area proposed above. Any landscape or visual effects beyond this distance would not be significant. For the purposes of the PEIR the above study area has been adopted but will be reviewed again once the final layout is fixed before completion of the ES.</p>
3.5.9	Paragraph 6.5.6	Mitigation	<p>The Scoping Report states that an oLEMP will be developed to secure the long-term management of the landscape and biodiversity strategy. The ES should cover the establishment period of any Landscape Scheme. The Inspectorate draws the Applicant's attention to the comments of Lincolnshire County Council regarding the establishment period and content of the management plan (see Appendix 2 of this Opinion).</p>	<p>The comments are noted and will be taken into consideration when the oLEMP is prepared at ES stage.</p>

Description of the Proposed Development

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Response
Land, soils and groundwater				
3.6.1	Paragraph 6.6.9	Land contamination and minerals (all phases)	<p>"The Scoping Report justifies scoping out impacts to land based on the findings of a Preliminary Risk Assessment (PRA), embedded mitigation measures and industry best practice procedures. The Scoping Report states that any negative implications for the Mineral Safeguarding Areas would be minimised and considered as part of the Proposed Development design.</p> <p>The findings of the PRA have not been presented in detail within the Scoping Report and paragraph 6.6.5 seems to suggest some risk of contamination. In light of this, there is insufficient evidence to scope this matter out at this stage. The ES should be supported by the findings of a PRA and where land contamination is identified, the ES should assess significant effects where they are likely to occur.</p> <p>Potential risks of soil and water contamination from leaks, improper storage, or spills during the construction phase, should be mitigated through implementation of standard best practice measures secured via the oCEMP.</p> <p>The Inspectorate considers that a Minerals Assessment should be undertaken to inform and influence the design and layout of the development and demonstrate how impacts to Mineral Safeguarding Areas have been minimised. The ES should also confirm if borrow pits are proposed, assess the impacts, and identify the location of these within the Order Limits. The ES should demonstrate that the Minerals Planning Authority has been consulted in respect of all of the proposals and that the proposed development</p>	<p>A Preliminary Risk Assessment has been undertaken to assess potential land contamination sources and geotechnical constraints to the Proposed Development. The Preliminary Risk Assessment report is presented as part of the PEIR.</p> <p>A Mineral Safeguarding Assessment, to demonstrate how impacts to Mineral Safeguarding Areas have been addressed will be reported within the ES once further baseline information has been obtained and further consultation with Lincolnshire County Council has been undertaken.</p> <p>The Proposed Development has discounted the consideration for the use of borrow pits due to the environmental impacts.</p>

Description of the Proposed Development

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Response
3.6.2	Paragraph 6.6.9	Groundwater (all phases)	<p>does not impact on future ambitions for minerals extraction within the region."</p> <p>"The Scoping Report argues that the quality of groundwater in Source Protection Zones (SPZs) would be appropriately protected by embedded mitigation measures, and the project surface water strategy would mirror the existing surface water regime, so having minimal effect on the existing groundwater conditions.</p> <p>The site overlies an SPZ and a Principal Aquifer of high vulnerability and construction activities may lead to a creation of contamination pathways e.g. piling, trenching, borrow pits. The ES should assess impacts from all phases of the development to groundwater where significant effects are likely to occur. Best practice measures should be employed and secured via the DCO to ensure any potential pollution impacts are minimised."</p>	<p>Following further consideration, impacts on groundwater have been considered as part of the preliminary assessment.</p>
3.6.3	Paragraph 6.6.9	Soils (operation)	<p>"The Scoping Report proposes to scope out operational impacts to soils as significant vehicle movements within the Site during operation are not anticipated and therefore the potential for compaction is considered limited. The Inspectorate agrees that impacts from compaction could be scoped out of the operational phase.</p> <p>However, there is no reference in the Scoping Report as to whether or how agricultural land use would be continued across the site alongside the operation of the solar farm. Changes to the hydrogeological regime as a result of the Proposed Development may also affect the quality of soils within the Site and this should be assessed within the ES."</p>	<p>An Outline Soil Management Plan will be submitted in support of and secured by the DCO to manage any potential impacts to the soil (and agricultural land) during and on completion of the construction phase. The Outline Soil Management Plan will identify those areas within the Site which may be more susceptible to damage, for example, the temporary access tracks, construction compounds and steep slopes and qualities of the soil, for example when it is wet or after periods of heavy rainfall or high winds and it will advise on when soils are suitable for being handled or trafficked. The Plan will also detail measures for soil management and follow the principles of best practice to maintain the physical properties of the soil, with the aim of restoring the</p>

Description of the Proposed Development

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Response
				land to its pre-construction condition following the temporary construction use and at the end of the lifetime of the Proposed Development.
3.6.4	Paragraph 6.6.9	Soils (decommissioning)	"The Scoping Report argues that any effects on soils during decommissioning would not be expected to be significant as the number of vehicle movements is anticipated to be less than during the construction phase, limiting the potential for compaction of soils to occur. Decommissioning works are also less likely than construction works to adversely impact on agricultural field drains as there would be no requirement for piling etc., so are less likely to result in deterioration of soil quality. The Inspectorate agrees with the rationale for scoping this matter out."	Noted.
3.6.5	Paragraph 6.6.5	Agricultural Land Classification (ALC)	The Scoping Report explains that an ALC survey is currently underway. The scope of the survey should align with the Natural England 'Technical Information Note TIN049: Agricultural Land Classification: protecting the best and most versatile land, 2nd edition (2012)'.	The ALC survey was undertaken in line with the Natural England 'Technical Information Note TIN049: Agricultural Land Classification: protecting the best and most versatile land', 2nd edition (2012).
3.6.6	Paragraph 6.6.5	Unexploded Ordnance (UXO)	The Scoping Report notes that the proximity of RAF Digby suggests that there is the potential for unexploded ordnance to have been present at the Site. The ES should assess the risk of disturbing UXO through piling and other works.	Detailed Unexploded Ordnance (UXO) Risk Assessment has been undertaken for the Site and deemed the majority of the Site as being at a Low Risk from items of allied UXO. The risk of UXO will be managed by the implementation of a UXO Risk Management Plan for intrusive works and site specific awareness briefings, alongside, attendance by a UXO specialist on-site support for intrusive works in areas of medium risk.

Description of the Proposed Development

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Response
3.6.7	Paragraph 6.6.8	Agricultural land (operation)	The Report proposes to scope in the operational impacts of the proposed development in terms of the loss of agricultural and BMV land because of the removal of this land from productive use. The assessment should also include and detail mitigation measures to remove, reduce or minimise such impacts.	Preliminary assessment of impacts on BMV land has been undertaken and is presented within the PEIR, with full assessment to be presented within the ES.

Noise and Vibration

3.7.1	Paragraph 6.7.9	Operational vibration	The Scoping Report proposes to scope out this matter on the basis that fixed plant items or structures would not emit discernible levels of vibration during the operational phase. Based on the nature and characteristics of the Proposed Development, the Inspectorate agrees that operational vibration may be scoped out from further assessment. The ES project description should demonstrate that operational plant and equipment is of a type and to be used in locations unlikely to result in significant vibration impacts on sensitive receptors.	The ES will provide a full description of the operational sources, their locations and whether they are vibration inducing.
3.7.2	Paragraph 6.7.9	Operational road traffic noise	"The Scoping Report proposes to scope out an assessment of noise associated with operational traffic on the basis that once operational the Proposed Development would generate minimal traffic. Considering the characteristics of the Proposed Development, the Inspectorate is content that this matter can be scoped out. The ES project description should confirm the anticipated trip generation (including number and type of vehicles) required for routine maintenance during operation to justify this."	The ES will provide an assessment of likely vehicle movements during routine maintenance activities. This is however expected to be undertaken by isolated vehicles on a periodic basis.

Description of the Proposed Development

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Response
3.7.3	Paragraph 6.7.2	Study area and sensitive receptors - noise and vibration	Scoping Report paragraph 6.7.2 states that the study area will be defined based on the Applicant's experience of solar farm developments and proposed locations of operation equipment/structures and construction/decommissioning pathways. The ES should explain how the study area and sensitive receptors have been selected with reference to relevant supporting evidence, such as noise modelling/ noise contour mapping.	<p>The study area for the construction and decommissioning phase assessments will consider noise and vibration sensitive receptors that are located within 300 metres of the site boundary. This has been determined based on the guidance set out in BS 5228-1: 2009+A1: 2014, BS 5228-2: 2009+A1: 2014 and DMRB document ref. 'LA 111 - Noise and Vibration'.</p> <p>For the assessment of operational phase noise levels, the Study Area will extend out to the nearest or most exposed noise sensitive receptors to the site boundary.</p>
3.7.4	Paragraph 6.7.4	Baseline survey	The Scoping Report proposes the baseline noise monitoring to be undertaken along the site boundary. The ES should explain how the baseline noise monitoring locations were chosen and how they are deemed to be representative of nearby receptors.	The ES will provide a full narrative of the baseline monitoring locations, the nearest sensitive receptors which the baseline monitoring represents and full details of the measured levels and their impact on the derived design targets (to be applied at receptor locations) in noise terms.
3.7.5	Paragraph 6.7.5	Sensitive receptors	The Scoping Report states that the receptors likely to be incorporated into the assessment are all residential in nature. The ES should also consider if there are any ecological receptors that require consideration in respect of noise related impacts.	The nearest sensitive receptors are within close proximity or adjacent to the site boundary; SSSI's are no nearer to the Project Development and would have a higher design target (in comparison to those residential receptors) applied to them. Further description will be provided in the ES.
3.7.6	n/a	Plans - noise and vibration	The ES should provide a plan showing the location of all sensitive receptors identified for assessment overlaid with noise contour mapping to aid understanding of the potential for significant effects relating to noise.	Plans and contour mapping will be provided in the ES.

Description of the Proposed Development

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Response
Traffic and transport				
3.8.1	Paragraph 6.8.9	Operational traffic	The Scoping Report states that the effect of operational traffic is likely to be minimal. The Inspectorate has considered the characteristics of the operational phase of the Proposed Development and based on the low levels of anticipated traffic generation is content that this matter can be scoped out. The ES description of development should clearly set out the operational vehicle types and numbers (with reference to thresholds within guidance) to justify this position.	The ES will describe and quantify the operational traffic requirements, justifying their exclusion from the assessment.
3.8.2	Paragraph 6.8.2	Study area	The scoping report suggests a study area to include the B1189, B1188, B1191, and A15. The ES should also describe how the Proposed Development is likely to affect the Strategic Road Network; significant effects should be assessed where they are likely to occur.	The nearest part of the Strategic Road Network to the Site is the A1. It is anticipated that construction traffic volumes will have substantially dispersed by the time it reaches the A1. However, the ES will consider the likely volumes of traffic that will be travelling along the Strategic Road Network to confirm.
3.8.3	Paragraph 6.8.6	Mitigation - highway improvements	If highways works/improvements are required as part of the mitigation for significant effects arising from construction transport, these should be fully explained within the ES and an assessment of any likely significant effects as a result of these works should also be presented, as relevant. This should include consideration of any potential impacts to railway assets, such as bridges and level crossings, located on HGV routes.	The ES will consider the need for mitigation, such as off-site highway works, for all routes carrying construction traffic. This will include approach routes from the Strategic Road Network and will encompass sensitive and/or restrictive assets such as structures and level crossings. Full details of mitigation proposals will be set out within the ES including an assessment of their impacts.
3.8.4	Paragraph 6.8.11	Impact assessment methodology	The impact assessment is proposed to be based on the methodology outlined in the Guidelines for the Environmental Assessment of Road Traffic (1993). The Inspectorate understands that this guidance is planned to be updated by the Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment	Given the publication of the revised IEMA guidelines in July 2023, the ES will now be assessed using this revised methodology.

Description of the Proposed Development

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Response
			(IEMA). The ES should take account of future updates where relevant.	
Cumulative effects				
3.9.2	n/a	Other projects	The study areas, methodologies (including other projects included in the assessment) particularly with respect to impacts on 'best and most versatile' agricultural land and landscape, should be agreed with the statutory consultation bodies and any exclusions should be clearly justified and explained with reference to PINS Advice Note 17: Cumulative effects assessment.	The study area, methodologies and the short-list of developments will be agreed with the statutory consultation bodies prior to undertaking the assessment of cumulative effects which will form part of the ES.

EIA Scoping Opinion Response Matrix – Statutory Consultees

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
Anglian Water			
Anglian Water	Water	<p>Anglian Water notes that at 5.5.2 (page 51) the promoter identifies Anglian Water pipeline (clean) from the utility search. We would support efforts to minimise and potentially remove impacts on water and water recycling assets through project layout, design and construction approaches. At 5.9.26 (page 64) the promoter indicates that sewerage supply and capacity will be assessed with Anglian Water. The statement that ‘The Proposed Development is expected to have an impact on the public foul water sewers in the vicinity of the Site due to the increase in foul flows arising from the Proposed Development’ means we do not agree that the impact of foul flows can be scoped out (para 5.9.28, page 64). It may be possible to scope out the impact once that assessment work has been undertaken and following consultation by the promoter with the Environment Agency.</p>	<p>Water has been assessed and further detail is provided within Chapter 13 of this PEIR.</p>
Anglian Water	Water	<p>Anglian Water also does not agree (para. 5.9.32) with the promoter scoping out water from the EIA. Anglian Water is progressing its Water Resources Management Plan and as a water scarce area designated by the Environment Agency and following detailed assessment work, we are now advising that new non household water supply requests (construction and operational phases) may be declined as these could compromise our regulatory priority</p>	<p>Water has been assessed and further detail is provided within Chapter 13 of this PEIR.</p> <p>Consultation with Anglian Water is ongoing to determine the feasibility of a supply.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		<p>of supplying existing and planned domestic growth. The flows needed to fill water storage tanks – in the event that the promoter decides not to use rain water harvesting on site to meet this non potable demand – will need to be assessed by Anglian Water to advise whether a supply is feasible with jeopardising domestic supply or at a significant financial or environmental cost. Our new position on non- household supply is due to our joint aim with the Environment Agency of reducing abstraction to protect habitats and the wider environment. The promoter will need to submit a request for water supply setting out the new daily demand for each stage of the project.</p>	
Anglian Water	Water	<p>The open position at para 5.9.11 on water use during construction means that the promoter will need to establish whether concrete production, for example, would be offsite or would need an on-site supply in order to assess the water supply options with Anglian Water. Further advice on water and wastewater capacity and options can be obtained by contacting Anglian Water’s PreDevelopment Team at: planningliasion@anglianwater.co.uk</p>	<p>Concrete production is anticipated to be off-site.</p> <p>Consultation with Anglian Water is ongoing and will help inform the development of the design.</p>
Anglian Water	Flood Risk	<p>On the question of Flood Risk Assessment (para. 5.9.32) we would welcome engagement on Anglian Water’s existing drainage apparatus. However, we would advise that in accordance with the drainage hierarchy, surface water should first look to be managed by Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS). Only if the promoter could demonstrably prove that infiltration rates for example</p>	<p>Sustainable Drainage Systems will be used at the Springwell Substation to manage surface water.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		<p>precluded SuDS in a specific location would Anglian Water consider surface water connections to the public sewer. We consider that SuDS should be used at the Substation compound (para. 2.4.65) and Anglian Water would currently resist a provision providing for a surface water connection to the public sewer in the draft DCO Order.</p>	
Anglian Water	water supply, water resources and water recycling	<p>In view of the guidance in the National Policy Statements we would have anticipated that the scoping would have included and then considered the approach to water supply, water resources and water recycling assets. Anglian Water requests that these points are assessed early in the EIA to set out how the project will be supplied with water, its wastewater managed, how water assets serving residents and business will be protected and how design has been altered to reduce the need for new water infrastructure or the diversion of existing assets.</p>	<p>Water resources have been 'Scoped in' for further assessment and have been assessed in Chapter 13 of the PEIR.</p> <p>Engagement with Anglian Water on the supply and management of water is ongoing and will be detailed within the ES.</p>
Anglian Water	Inclusion of water	<p>We support the inclusion of water (5.9.16 onwards) in a Construction Environment Management Plan (CEMP). The CEMP and a Surface Water Management Plan should include steps to remove the risk of damage to Anglian Water assets from plant and machinery including haul roads. Further advice on minimising and then relocating Anglian Water existing assets can be obtained from: connections@anglianwater.co.uk</p>	<p>Noted. An Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (OCEMP) will be provided in support of the DCO.</p>

Statutory Consultee		Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
Anglian Water	Water Resources	The site is in the Central Lincolnshire Water Resource Zone (WRZ), which supplies water to area from the Humber and Scunthorpe to Grantham and Sleaford including Lincoln. We have flagged above the new position on water resources and note that whilst the scoping considers water environment impacts it does not look at water resources. As the site is within an area of 'serious water stress' designated by the Environment Agency and water is used in the project construction and operation this indicates that water resources should be assessed in the EIA.		Water resources have been 'Scoped in' for further assessment and have been assessed in Chapter 13 of the PEIR.
Anglian Water	Engagement	Anglian Water would welcome the instigation of discussions with Springwell Energy Farm Limited as the prospective applicant, in line with the requirements of the 2008 Planning Act and guidance. Experience has shown that early engagement and agreement is required between NSIP applicants and statutory undertakers during design and assessment and well before submission of the draft DCO for examination. Consultation at the statutory PEIR stage would in our view be too late to inform design and may result in delays to the project. We would recommend discussion on the following issues: 1. Requirement for potable and raw water supplies if rainwater harvesting and other resources within the site are not used 2. Impact of development on Anglian Water's assets including abstraction 3. Requirement for water recycling (sewer) connections 4. The design of the project to minimise interaction with Anglian Water assets and specifically to		Engagement is ongoing with Anglian Water and will inform the iterative design.

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		<p>avoid the need for diversions which have carbon costs 5. Confirmation of the project's cumulative impacts (if any) with Anglian Water projects 6. Draft Protective Provisions A set of draft Protective Provisions will be sent to the promoter to include in the draft DCO.</p>	
Ashby de la Launde, Bloxholm with Temple Bruer and Temple High Grange Parish Council			
<p>Ashby de la Launde, Bloxholm with Temple Bruer and Temple High Grange Parish Council</p>	<p>Inappropriate use of agricultural land</p>	<p>Food security is of paramount importance and protected via government policy. • Research by Campaign for Rural England reveals that almost 14,500 hectares of the country's best agricultural land, which could grow at least 250,000 tons of vegetables a year based on typical yields, has been permanently lost to development since 2010. This research highlights the following consequences of the reduced use of land for agriculture as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two million fewer people can be fed 'five a day' from vegetables homegrown in England, as prime farmland is lost to development. • Food security concerns are increasing, with 60% of England's finest agricultural land at the highest risk of flooding from climate change. • Nearly 300,000 homes have been built on prime farmland, with an extra 1,400 hectares used for renewable energy projects; despite the availability of previously developed brownfield land waiting for regeneration. • The East of England has lost 3,232 ha of Best, Most Versatile (BMV) land since 2010 — the greatest absolute loss within a single region. 	<p>A preliminary assessment of Agricultural Land and Land Use is presented in Chapter 10 of the PEIR. A detailed assessment will be presented in the ES and the Planning Statement at the time of submission.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The National Planning Policy Framework makes the protection of BMV land a priority; the need clearly evidenced by the increase in food poverty within the UK, and the food shortages experienced during the recent pandemic. 	
Ashby de la Launde, Bloxholm with Temple Bruer and Temple High Grange Parish Council	Agricultural Land	<p>Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) is a system used in England and Wales to grade the quality of land for agricultural use; aiding planning decisions affecting greenfield sites, in-order to protect good quality land from development. The system classifies land into five grades, with grade 1 being the best quality. Planning policies state that the 1 valuable grades 1, 2 & 3a should be protected from development not associated with agriculture or forestry.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ The negative impact of the Springwell proposal on English food security is massive. The whole development is on grade 2 and 3 land (primarily grade 2), highly productive agricultural land. If this land is developed, more food imports will be inevitable, with increased costs and uncertainty regarding food availability. ❖ The development would result in the loss of agricultural land for 40 years, with little hope of the land ever being returned to agricultural use. The location of the proposed solar farm strikes at the heart of Lincolnshire’s stunning and highly productive agricultural land – this must be protected 	A preliminary assessment of Agricultural Land Clarification data is presented in Chapter 10 of the PEIR. A detailed assessment will be presented in the ES and the Planning Statement at the time of submission.

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
<p>Ashby de la Launde, Bloxholm with Temple Bruer and Temple High Grange Parish Council</p>	<p>Flooding</p>	<p>Research into global warming and climate change has predicted that vast areas of UK land will be lost to the sea over the next 30 to 40 years; Lincolnshire being most at risk of all UK counties. (Reference Coastal Climate Central). In addition, the UK will see a significant increase in flooding. This data analysis provides further evidence of the importance of protecting prime agricultural land.</p>	<p>A preliminary assessment of flooding and climate change effects is presented in Chapter 13 of the PEIR. A detailed assessment, including a Flood Risk Assessment in line with DEFRA guidance, will be presented in the ES and relevant policy tests will be presented in the Planning Statement at the time of submission.</p>
<p>Ashby de la Launde, Bloxholm with Temple Bruer and Temple High Grange Parish Council</p>		<p>In response to a petition titled ‘Ban development on agricultural land to increase food self-sufficiency’ DEFRA made the following statement:</p> <p>“This Government has committed to broadly maintaining current levels of food production in the Food Strategy, to ensure our continued levels of food security.</p> <p>There will always be multiple pressures on land which require individual landowners, managers and Government to make decisions about trade-offs. DEFRA and DLUHC are working on striking the right balance. The National Planning Policy Framework aims to protect the best and most versatile agricultural land from significant, inappropriate or unsustainable development proposals; recognising the economic and other benefits of this land. It</p>	<p>Noted. Relevant policy tests will be presented in the Planning Statement at the time of submission.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		<p>sets out a clear presumption away from the use of high-quality agricultural land for development where possible.</p> <p>DEFRA are committed to making the most of brownfield land and existing policy for protecting greenfield remains firmly in place.</p> <p>Recognising the importance of food security, in the Agriculture Act 2020 the Government made a commitment to produce an assessment of our food security at least once every three years. The first UK Food Security Report was published in December 2021. The report recognises the contribution made by British agriculture to our resilience, and the importance of strong domestic production to our food security. It considers the UK's food supply sources overall, noting that domestic production and diversity of supply are both important to our food security”</p>	
<p>Ashby de la Launde, Bloxholm with Temple Bruer and Temple High Grange Parish Council</p>	<p>Soil Testing</p>	<p>A recent leaflet produced by Springwell, informed local residents of imminent soil testing within the proposed site, over a 6-week period. It is imperative that an independent, government appointed organisation, confirms the findings</p>	<p>Noted - There is ongoing engagement with the Local Authorities and Statutory Bodies to discuss methodology and assessments. The Agricultural Land Clarification data is presented in Chapter 10 of the PEIR.</p>
<p>Ashby de la Launde, Bloxholm with Temple Bruer and Temple</p>	<p>Wildlife</p>	<p>Regardless of mitigation, there is no doubt the project will have a detrimental effect on wildlife and habitats. The site area is heavily populated with wildlife, including deer, muntjac, hares, rabbits, foxes, badgers and birds of prey.</p>	<p>Preliminary Assessment and Ecology surveys are presented in Chapter 6 of the PEIR. A detailed assessment will be present in the ES, and mitigation will be</p>

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
High Grange Parish Council			secured through requirements within the Development Consent Order.
Ashby de la Launde, Bloxholm with Temple Bruer and Temple High Grange Parish Council	Landscape	The scale of harm in this location is such that, it would not be outweighed by the wider benefits of the renewable energy provision.	A preliminary assessment of landscape and visual effects is presented in the PEIR. A detailed assessment will be presented in the ES. The relevant policy tests will be presented in the Statement of Need and Planning Statement at the time of submission.
Ashby de la Launde, Bloxholm with Temple Bruer and Temple High Grange Parish Council	Landscape	The Secretary of State, Planning Inspectors and Planning Officers have identified that solar farm developments do invariably detract from the unspoiled character and appearance of the landscape	A preliminary assessment of landscape and visual effects is presented in the PEIR. A detailed assessment will be presented in the ES.
Ashby de la Launde, Bloxholm with Temple Bruer and Temple High Grange Parish Council	Landscape	The solid structures of the proposed solar arrays would form a strong physical presence of industrial appearance which would change the character of the rural fields in which they are located and be significantly out of proportion	A preliminary assessment of landscape and visual effects is presented in the PEIR. A detailed assessment will be presented in the ES.
Ashby de la Launde, Bloxholm with Temple Bruer	Landscape	The proposed development would be an incongruous industrial and alien intrusion that would be harmful to the landscape character of the area, and a discordant feature	A preliminary assessment of landscape and visual effects is presented in the PEIR. A detailed assessment will be presented in the ES.

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
and Temple High Grange Parish Council		within the pastoral setting. It would clearly cause harm to the visual enjoyment of those that live in, or visit the area	
Ashby de la Launde, Bloxholm with Temple Bruer and Temple High Grange Parish Council	Landscape	The proposed development is out of keeping with rural character of the area. The solid structures of the arrays would form a strong physical presence of industrial appearance which would change the character of the rural fields in which they are located. The development would be visible in wider views, and would form an incongruous expanse of metal structures out of keeping with the intimate and rural character of the area, and would be disproportionate to the scale of other landscape features. The solar farm would significantly adversely impact the character and appearance of the landscape. The expansive tranquil landscape of open green fields with far reaching views would turn into a semi-industrial, utility-grade power complex, with fields of 3m high dark solar panels, shipping containers containing electrical equipment and security fencing. As such, we consider the proposed development contravenes Local Planning Policy, which requires that development proposals protect, enhance or restore the landscape character for its own intrinsic beauty, for future generations.	A preliminary assessment of landscape and visual effects is presented in the PEIR. A detailed assessment will be presented in the ES. The relevant policy tests will be presented in the Statement of Need and Planning Statement at the time of submission.
Ashby de la Launde, Bloxholm with Temple Bruer and Temple	Comments in relation to the Scoping Report	Springwell have commissioned RSK Environment Ltd to prepare the Environment Impact Assessment but they are not an independent body. They are owned by a major US private Equity firm called Ares who are directly involved in the Green Energy Market. The whole report would appear	Noted.

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
High Grange Parish Council		to give the developers one sided viewpoint only, with little effort made to investigate negative impacts in any respect, which we find completely unacceptable	
Ashby de la Launde, Bloxholm with Temple Bruer and Temple High Grange Parish Council	Description of the Proposed Development	Our research has highlighted that the land is highly unlikely to be returned to agricultural land, indeed, how can the land be 'returned to agricultural land' as stated in the original Springwell consultation booklet, when only the above ground infrastructure is proposed to be removed? More information needs to be provided detailing what exactly will remain subsurface and how will the developers a) return the land to be used again for agriculture, b) reinstate lost habitats and c) reintroduce lost species. 40 years cannot be viewed as temporary	As part of the Development Consent Order there will be legal requirements to ensure the site is returned to agricultural land and a decommissioning management plan is approved.
Ashby de la Launde, Bloxholm with Temple Bruer and Temple High Grange Parish Council	Approach to EIA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The mitigation claims that the development will avoid any wildlife site by 15m, however this does not allow for the impact of removing open space from adjacent woodland. • Regarding all mitigation in relation to bio diversity, how have all the distances been decided? We seek evidence relating to the effectiveness of the distances chosen. • The scale and variety of wildlife in the area has not been given adequate inclusion within the scoping document; nor has the impact and threat the development would pose on wildlife. The scoping document is dismissive, when in reality the impact on local wildlife is huge, warranting significant consideration and inclusion 	The potential effects in relation to Biodiversity are addressed within Chapter 6 of the PEIR.

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
Ashby de la Launde, Bloxholm with Temple Bruer and Temple High Grange Parish Council	Factors to be scoped out	Due to this development being unprecedented due to size (over 6 times bigger than any previous project), there is no available comparable data. As such, ALL factors should be considered and not scoped out. Mitigating factors should be thoroughly investigated to relate to the sheer size of this development and current data and guidelines should be regarded as irrelevant.	Noted. The scope of the PEIR and EIA has been determined by the EIA Scoping Opinion received from PINS.
Ashby de la Launde, Bloxholm with Temple Bruer and Temple High Grange Parish Council	Glint and Glare	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This should not be scoped out. There are no guidelines setting out a particular methodological approach to delivering a glint and glare assessment. The paragraph says the Secretary of State should assess the potential impact on glint and glare on nearby homes and motorists. Clearly this should be included, with particular emphasis on the panels facing houses, horses and oncoming traffic. • There are operational military bases in close proximity to the development; RAF Cranwell, RAF Waddington, RAF Conningsby. In addition, the area also a number of private airfields, all of which should be consulted and considered. • The Lincs & Notts Air Ambulance is based at RAF Waddington. As such they would have to fly over the site for any emergencies to the south east of their headquarters. It is imperative that they are consulted to discuss the impact of glint and glare while flying over the area, and possible landing difficulties. • There are a number of isolated properties within the site that rely on the Air Ambulance as their fastest emergency response 	A preliminary assessment of Glint and Glare has been presented in Chapter 14 of the PEIR.

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
<p>Ashby de la Launde, Bloxholm with Temple Bruer and Temple High Grange Parish Council</p>	<p>Heat and radiation</p>	<p>The scale of the solar farm is extensive and indeed unprecedented. The expansive volume of PV panel arrays with battery storage units and substations (also emitting heat from cooling systems) will inevitably create its own microclimate. The geographic extent of this must be determined. In combination with the free draining quality of the heathland soils, it has potential to cause failure of proposed mitigating landscaping measures due to heat stress and this could easily impact crops grown within adjacent land. Increased heat and change of environment might also prove harmful to local flora and fauna which could in turn be detrimental to pollinating insects and the life cycle of many species. In addition, the potential for localised temperature rises due to heat radiating from the installation, could also negatively affect local residents (health and amenity concerns). ‘ The impact of heat and radiation should therefore be ‘scoped in’ to the EIA. The potential impact also feeds into considerations of human health (section 5.6), the scope of which needs to be expanded accordingly and included within the EIA.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While the black surfaces of solar panels absorb most of the sunlight that reaches them, only a fraction (around 15 percent) of that incoming energy gets converted to electricity. The rest is returned to the environment as heat. The panels are usually much darker than the ground they cover, so a vast expanse of solar cells will absorb a lot of additional energy and emit it as heat, affecting the climate. • In a recent study, Pavao-Zuckerman, lead author Greg Barron-Gafford of the University of Arizona School of 	<p>Noted.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		<p>Geography and Development, and their research colleagues recently published their findings in the journal Nature Scientific Reports in a paper titled "The Photovoltaic Heat Island Effect: Larger solar power plants increase local temperatures." For this study, the team defined the heat island effect as the difference in ambient air temperature around the solar power plant compared to that of the surrounding landscape. Findings demonstrated that temperatures around a solar power plant were 5.4-7.2 °F (3-4 °C) warmer. The result demonstrates that there are potential heat costs to generating green power and should be investigated further.</p>	
<p>Ashby de la Launde, Bloxholm with Temple Bruer and Temple High Grange Parish Council</p>	<p>Major Accidents and Disasters (5.4</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is crucial that attention be brought to the recent battery explosion in Liverpool (supported by multiple sources including solarpowerportal.co.uk, energy-storage, News reports and many major media platforms). The explosion at the BESS facility at Carnegie Road, Liverpool was a result of a failure within one of the battery racks in one container which led to a thermal runaway which in turn produced gases within the container culminating in a large explosion with parts of the container being blown across the compound to a distance of 23m. The main fire took 6 hours to bring under control but the continual recycling of heat from the Li-ion batteries remained an issue and defensive fire-fighting continued on-site for a total of 59 hours. The fire and explosion were deemed to have been caused by the failure of one or more battery units, but the root cause of the battery failure remains unknown. The report stated there was a significant risk to emergency responders. 	<p>Battery Safety Commitment Plan will be produced and submitted in support of the DCO. This document will outline commitments to manage and mitigate this risk.</p> <p>Consultation with Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue is ongoing to help inform the design development.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		<p>Battery safety is a serious consideration which should be thoroughly investigated before mitigating factors can be applied.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue need to be consulted regarding this factor to ensure they have both the manpower and resources to tackle any such emergency and to ensure an action plan is created / plausible 	
<p>Ashby de la Launde, Bloxholm with Temple Bruer and Temple High Grange Parish Council</p>	<p>Utilities (5.5)</p>	<p>There is a need to consult Connexin</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>Ashby de la Launde, Bloxholm with Temple Bruer and Temple High Grange Parish Council</p>	<p>Human Health</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No mention of the well-being and mental health implications of any aspect of the project; noise, privacy, vibration, visual impact, traffic, air pollution and physical health. To be completely surrounded by an industrialised landscape can have nothing but a detrimental effect on residents' mental health. Whilst 'property value' is not usually classed as a material consideration, feedback from local residents has been significant in this respect. The implications of such should be considered within the scope of human health: 	<p>Noted.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ The development will create huge stress for residents wishing to sell their property with property prices and potential buyers both likely to be significantly decreased. ❖ Worries associated with the consequences of decreased property value: less financial stability, less inheritance for children, owners less able to financially help children with first home/university etc. • The report must take into account the possible risk to health, both during construction and long term, from magnetic fields and radiation (such as childhood cancer risk) to the huge increase in traffic during construction (such as residents with existing cardio pulmonary conditions). • Reassurance and evidence are required to prove that the physical and mental health of local residents and visitors will not be impacted by the proposal. • A lack of data covering a 40-year period, plus the lack of a comparable sized solar farm, is extremely worrying in this regard. 	
Ashby de la Launde, Bloxholm with Temple Bruer and Temple High Grange Parish Council	Public rights of way (ProW)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The development will significantly reduce recreational use (not increase it, as insinuated in the proposal). Even if reinstated, it is very unlikely that anyone will want to use ProW between fields full of panels and deer fencing. • The Planning Inspectorate’s report on the refusal of a solar Farm in Alfreton, Derbyshire included the buzzing created would distract from the enjoyment of walkers using the footpaths and possibly be heard at night by residents. 	A preliminary assessment of landscape and visual effects is presented in the PEIR. This Includes a consideration of effects on PROWs. A detailed assessment will be presented in the ES.

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence is needed that people will continue to use footpaths, cycle and ride in an industrial landscape. Currently scoped out and justification and dismissed – inclusion needed. • Feedback from local residents supports the above unanimously. 	
Ashby de la Launde, Bloxholm with Temple Bruer and Temple High Grange Parish Council	Impact on local businesses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Using the term “within the site boundary” is an inaccurate way of deciding if businesses will be affected. The impact ‘outside of the site boundary’ has been ignored completely. Venues off all kinds for miles around, will undoubtedly see a reduction in business. • Tourism will be adversely affected. It is highly likely to be a reduction of occupancy in hospitality venues when construction is complete, which has not been mentioned. • People will venture out for the day to enjoy the countryside, not however a solar farm. • A development of the nature and scale will have a tangible socio-economic impact upon surrounding businesses and the propensity for people to visit/engage in countryside recreation. It is reasonable to anticipate that the visual impact will prove detrimental to the character of wider locality (land within the development’s anticipated zone of visual influence and surroundings), which will in turn prove damaging to local businesses that benefit from tourism/countryside recreation. Significant research and justification are needed in this area. • The suggested socio-economic benefits have not been properly investigated or justified; there are no shops to 	Socio-economic impacts will be detailed within a Socio-economic statement which will be submitted in support of the DCO.

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		<p>benefit. The area is agricultural and as such, the “temporary benefit to local economy” referred to in the document is inaccurate.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The socio-economic consequences of the development should be examined more broadly 	
<p>Ashby de la Launde, Bloxholm with Temple Bruer and Temple High Grange Parish Council</p>	<p>Electric, Magnetic and Electromagnetic fields (5.10)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no data outlining the “power size/ output” of the panels, battery storage and inverters. • The guidelines referenced in the report (REF 5-11) also contain information about studies linking magnetic fields with cancer, specifically childhood cancer and leukaemia. These findings need to be thoroughly reported on. • The guidelines referenced are 25 years old and whilst may still be relevant regarding electrical power lines, there is no mention whatsoever of solar or pv panels. Due to the changes and advances in technology, these guidelines are not adequate to warrant scoping out E, M, EMF. More studies and investigations are needed to ensure the long term safety of residents and produce a safe and more accurate report. This should especially apply to fields in close proximity to residential properties where there will be almost constant exposure. • Are there any studies on the dangers of exposure for 40 years? What level of research and insurances have been taken to date to ensure health safety? What level of assurances can local residents expect? • If this factor is not deemed worthy of inclusion within the scoping document, why does the inclusion of plans to have “ongoing consultation with RAF Digby to avoid any 	<p>The Proposed Development is not anticipated to exceed the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection exposure guidelines, and the design of the Proposed Development will consider any infrastructure constraints and the location of the 400kV Grid Connection cable, in relation to sensitive receptors.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		interference with their operations” remain, especially considering there is a buffer zone around the camp	
Ashby de la Launde, Bloxholm with Temple Bruer and Temple High Grange Parish Council	Air Pollution (6.1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 48 months of construction traffic whilst temporary could have an adverse effect on residents with cardio pulmonary conditions as well as a potential increased risk of childhood asthma and should be added to the report. • “Given the nature of the Proposed Development, no site activities resulting in significant emissions to air are anticipated during operation” Surely this is incorrect, more research is needed regarding the number of vehicles needed to build the site. • Accurate data needs to be provided in order to calculate the possible environmental impact of diesel emissions, dust, fumes etc. • Quoting The British Heart Foundation: ‘When you breathe in poor quality air, the air pollutants can travel deep into your bloodstream through your lungs, and to your heart. This can damage blood vessels by making them narrower and harder, increasing the risk of developing heart and circulatory diseases’. • Reassurances urgently required. 	Detail construction and operational phase traffic data will be available at the ES stage and traffic counts will be compared with the EPUK-IAQM 2017 guidance screening criteria in the ES to determine the significance of traffic exhaust impacts.
Ashby de la Launde, Bloxholm with Temple Bruer and Temple High Grange Parish Council	Biodiversity (6.2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data from the PEA must reflect monitoring location rather than being representative of populations on the whole site. There would likely have been a lot more recording if this project had been known about. If more widespread monitoring had commenced at the time of the PEA (April and May 2022) the results would be very different. 	Preliminary Assessment and Ecology surveys are presented in Chapter 6 of the PEIR. A detailed assessment will be present in the ES, and mitigation will be secured through requirements within the Development Consent Order.

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The development has the potential to result in the direct loss of habitat needs of protected and notable species. A significant number of extra surveys are required including a year-round ecological survey covering mating, nesting/breeding, migration and habitat at the very least. • Natural England recommends the avoidance of solar developments in or near to areas of high ecological value. The area proposed has numerous endangered species, for example; residents have reported multiple sightings of brown hares and many species of deer (including a white stag). In the same report it was stated that “the lack of evidence available relating to the ecological impact of solar farms is concerning”. • Government legislation for an EIA (legislation.gov.uk) requires a ‘description of the reasonable alternatives studied by the developer, which are relevant to the proposed development and its specific characteristics, and an indication of the main reasons for the option chosen, taking into account the effects of the development on the environment’ There is no mention of this in the scoping report; this needs to be included. 	<p>The surveys carried out to date follow best practice guidelines, are considered sufficient survey effort and without significant limitation. We have sought agreement with Natural England and the North Kesteven District Council ecologist regarding the scope of surveys and consultation will remain ongoing to ensure agreement on survey scope and method.</p> <p>The design principles are to avoid habitats of high ecological value and enhance/ or create habitats where possible to mitigate habitat loss and provide benefit to priority and notable species.</p> <p>Strategic fencing design, should enable access across the site for animals including deer, brown hares, hedgehogs and badgers for foraging and dispersal.</p>
Ashby de la Launde, Bloholm with Temple Bruer and Temple High Grange Parish Council	Areas requiring inclusion within the scoping document	Government legislation relating to scoping reports (legislation.gov.uk), requires the inclusion of the appraisal of alternative reasonable options, together with justification for the chosen option; taking into account the impact on the local environment. This requirement is lacking and needs to be included.	A detailed assessment will be presented in the ES. The relevant legislation and policy tests will be presented in the Statement of Need and Planning Statement at the time of submission.

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
Ashby de la Launde, Bloxholm with Temple Bruer and Temple High Grange Parish Council	Financial Justification over alternatives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no reference to cost v benefits analysis, nor justification in respect of the use of alternative Off Shore Wind Turbines (research highlights off shore wind turbines are a favoured alternative, due to increased productivity, lower costs per unit and reduced impact). <p>Ref. Regan Power ‘The wind is a more efficient power source than solar. Wind turbines release less CO2 to the atmosphere. A wind turbine produces 4.64 grams of CO2/1kWh while the solar panel produces 70 grams of CO2/1kWh. Wind power consumes less energy and produces more energy compared to solar panels. By comparison with off-shore wind, solar farms are hugely inefficient. • A 140-acre solar park is said to be capable of supplying electricity to about 9,000 homes. One wind turbine in the North Sea has the capacity to power 16,000 homes. • In terms of efficiency rating i.e., the amount of power exported to the grid, solar’s rating is between 11 and 15% whereas for off-shore wind the figure is 50%+. • On one day last year it has been reported that 78% of the UK’s electricity came from off-shore wind.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All costs need to be incorporated, including the costs associated with importing additional food products, shielding, lighting, maintenance, security etc 	The DCO application will assess alternatives, which will be presented within the ES, the Statement of Need and Planning Statement as part of the DCO submission.
Ashby de la Launde, Bloxholm with	Impact on local residents	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The impact on local residents has been dismissed, alarmingly so. The impact will be huge, with an array of differing implications, including disruption, traffic, visual 	A detailed assessed of visual effects on residential amenity will be presented in the ES. Analysis undertaken to date on

Statutory Consultee		Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
Temple Bruer and Temple High Grange Parish Council		<p>impact, noise, vibration, light pollution and health. Significant consideration of all impacts affecting local residents is required.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Security implications – CCTV, lighting, fencing etc. How will this affect local residents? • The welfare of horses and livestock should be scoped into the document. • Affecting the quality of life for our serving RAF personnel in Digby, is unacceptable for many reasons, including mental health issues and the ability to recruit 		<p>residential visual amenity is presented in Appendix 9.5. TBC</p>
Ashby de la Launde, Bloxholm with Temple Bruer and Temple High Grange Parish Council	<p>Wildlife</p>	<p>The impact on local wildlife is currently seriously under represented and needs further inclusion.</p>		<p>Preliminary Assessment and Ecology surveys are presented in Chapter 6 of the PEIR. A detailed assessment will be present in the ES.</p> <p>The design principles are to avoid habitats of high ecological value and enhance/ or create habitats where possible to mitigate habitat loss and provide benefit to priority and notable species.</p> <p>The surveys carried out to date are considered sufficient to provide baseline information on the importance of habitats and species on site to enable an informed assessment of impact. Further targeted surveys may need to be carried out once design details are confirmed to inform</p>

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
			<p>impact and inform the design and mitigation in order to avoid significant adverse impact.</p>
<p>Ashby de la Launde, Bloxholm with Temple Bruer and Temple High Grange Parish Council</p>	<p>Ecological Impact</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Natural England recommends the avoidance of solar developments in or near to areas of high ecological value. In the same report it was stated that “the lack of evidence available relating to the ecological impact of solar farms is concerning”. The rural nature of the proposed area, inevitably creates a high ecological value to both humans and nonhumans alike. Inclusion required. 	<p>Preliminary Assessment and Ecology surveys are presented in Chapter 6 of the PEIR. A detailed assessment will be present in the ES.</p> <p>As stated above - the design principles are to avoid habitats of high ecological value and enhance/ or create habitats where possible to mitigate habitat loss and provide benefit to priority and notable species.</p>
<p>Ashby de la Launde, Bloxholm with Temple Bruer and Temple High Grange Parish Council</p>	<p>Negative visual impact for users of the footpath and bridleway across the site</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed plans insinuate advantages will be generated by newly created footpaths; however, this is extremely misleading in our view. • Currently there are extensive open views of green fields and agricultural farmland. The development would create significant adverse visual impact along any footpath or bridleway within the area, with arrays of 3 m high dark coloured solar panels which would tower above walkers blocking those views. Any footpath or bridleway would be separated from the site by a high security fence. The solar panels and fencing would destroy the wide, open views and 	<p>A preliminary assessment of landscape and visual effects is presented in the PEIR. This Includes a consideration of effects on PROWs. A detailed assessed will be presented in the ES.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		<p>create an unpleasant tunnel along the footpath and bridleway, degrading the amenity value.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The solar farm development would turn a pleasant and rural area into an industrialised area, protected by CCTV cameras, lighting, high fencing and warning signs – a far cry from the current beauty of the area. • Detailed analysis of how the proposal meets current planning policy relating to the protection of rights of way, is required. 	
<p>Ashby de la Launde, Bloxholm with Temple Bruer and Temple High Grange Parish Council</p>	<p>Road networks</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The current road networks are inadequate and would not cope with the increased heavy traffic during development (already overburdened and unsuitable for large vehicles). • Lincolnshire is the only county in the UK without a motorway. • The B1191 (we reiterate the 'B' classification), is already a busy road providing the majority of vehicular access to RAF Digby from the A15. • Lincolnshire County Council already struggle to find funds to repair the roads which become rife with potholes every year, consequently causing issues for motorists and cyclist with damaged tyres and road traffic accidents. Details of how these issues can be managed, if at all, need to be incorporated within the scoping report. • Recognition of the road network limitations, need to be included within the scoping 	<p>A preliminary assessment of the local road network has been undertaken and presented in Chapter 12 of the PEIR. A detailed assessment will be present in the ES.</p>
<p>Ashby de la Launde,</p>	<p>In relation to heritage, the</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is an outstanding collection of older buildings within the vicinity of the site area, many of which are one of a 	<p>All heritage assets within 2km and all designated historic assets within 5km have</p>

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
Bloxholm with Temple Bruer and Temple High Grange Parish Council	development would harm the settings of many historic and listed buildings within the area	<p>kind, which need to be preserved and protected in their own right. Development of such buildings involve close scrutiny by Heritage England and local planning policies relating to the preservation of historic assets. Associated legislation is both numerous and extensive. The omission of detail in this area within the scoping report is unacceptable and inclusion essential.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The lack of local knowledge in this respect is clearly evident and objectionable on many counts. • The scoping report states that ‘whilst there may be glimpse from individual properties over 1km from the site; this does not give rise to an overbearing effect on residential amenity’. We wholeheartedly disagree with this statement. Further research and inclusion required. 	<p>been included in the DBA and Stage 1 Setting Assessment.</p> <p>A detailed assessed of visual effects on residential amenity will be presented in the ES. Analysis undertaken to date on residential visual amenity is presented in Appendix 9.5.</p>
Ashby de la Launde, Bloxholm with Temple Bruer and Temple High Grange Parish Council	Size of development – VAST	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An unacceptable and unprecedented scale – generating overriding harm. • Inappropriate sizing; fundamentally changing the tranquil character of the area. • The unknown consequences of a development of this size, will need major government input and review – it cannot be viewed in the same light as smaller proposals - timescales need to be incorporated for this work to be completed. 	Noted.
Ashby de la Launde, Bloxholm with Temple Bruer and Temple	Conclusion	We do not believe that the scoping document describes accurately, or fully represents the views of the affected local community.	The DBA and Stage 1 Setting Assessment has informed the masterplan and the PEIR. The PEIR has also taken account of the aerial investigation and mapping report and the geophysical survey results.

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
<p>High Grange Parish Council</p>		<p>The scoping document is incomplete, dismissive of key impacts and inaccurate in some areas; this is completely unacceptable.</p> <p>There is a critical need to preserve agricultural land and UK food safety. The need to protect the site's productive agricultural land (a finite resource), is undoubtedly of prime importance. Lincolnshire has England's best food producing land – future food security has to be protected. 40 years is not temporary; the argument that the land can be returned to agriculture after decommissioning is misleading (the construction of a solar farm this size and the associated costs involved, make it very unlikely that the site will ever be returned to its' current agricultural use). There is no weight to any claims that the development is temporary and can be reversed.</p> <p>The Loss of productive arable land is disastrous long term, escalating inflation and causing an increased reliance on imported food.</p> <p>We believe there is a policy conflict (where government seeks to protect and enhance our domestic production to maintain food security, while also encouraging the growth of solar energy production). We recognise the need to balance both energy and food security, but solving one problem whilst affecting the other, is NOT the answer.</p> <p>The list of negative impacts is extensive (impact on local residents and wildlife, the industrialisation of the countryside, loss of key agricultural land, the need for increased food imports, lack of adequate road networks, lost opportunities to enjoy recreation in the area etc. etc.)</p>	<p>A preliminary assessment of landscape and visual effects is presented in the PEIR. A detailed assessed will be presented in the ES. TBC</p>

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		<p>The adverse effects would demonstrably outweigh any benefits from this scheme; whilst alternative options are available. The scoping document fails to address each and every impact adequately. Indeed, we feel the dismissive nature of key issues (suggesting they are unworthy of attention), denotes deception.</p> <p>Any solar farm developments should be limited to brownfield land and poorer quality unproductive land; located on already industrialised land, on roof tops or adjacent to motorways, not on productive agricultural land, or in an area which will cause significant visual impact to the residents and visitors.</p> <p>Off Shore Wind Turbines offer a favourable solution to energy generation, a view supported by many senior government ministers.</p> <p>All of the villages and hamlets affected, exude an abundance of quintessentially English charm; the cream stone buildings, a rare victorian walled garden, the open countryside and the abundance of wildlife. The area is popular with walkers, cyclist, pedestrians, and horse riders.</p> <p>This unique beauty represents history with an abundance of older properties, built using local materials, never to be replaced. The need to safeguard this English heritage for future generations is undeniable and absolutely essential.</p> <p>Placing a solar farm next to such valuable heritage assets is not only out of character, but incomprehensible and utterly damaging to the historic landscape. Feedback received to date from local residents, demonstrates the unanimous opposition to the proposal (further details are</p>	

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		available if required). All references included within this response, can be provided if required. As Parish Councillors, we feel we have a duty to do all we can to protect our community, agricultural land resource and historical assets	
Boston Borough Council			
Boston Borough Council	No Comment	I write to confirm that the Council has no comments to make on the Scoping Opinion at this time. However, as the scheme progresses the Council would wish to be further consulted. This advice is therefore based upon the information available at this time. Please note that the advice is given without prejudice to any future decision made by the Local Planning Authority upon the receipt of further information.	N/A
Canal and River Trust			
Canal and River Trust	No comment	Having reviewed the location of the project and the relationship of the proposed solar farm and its associated infrastructure with our network, we do not believe that the proposals as shown would cross land owned or operated by the Trust or impact our interests. Our closest waterway is the River Witham approximately 7 kilometres northeast of the site boundary. Should the scheme be amended to potentially affect the River Witham (or any other of our waterways named above), we would welcome further	N/A

Statutory Consultee		Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		consultation on the proposals, so that we can advise about any potential impact for our interests.		
City of Lincoln Council				
City of Lincoln Council	No comment	Thank you for your consultation on the above and I would confirm that the City of Lincoln Council has no comments to make regarding this proposal.	N/A	
East Lindsey District Council				
East Lindsey District Council	No comment	I can confirm that this authority has no comments to make at this time.	N/A	
The Planning Inspectorate Environmental Services				
The Planning Inspectorate Environmental Services	Water Flood Risk	<p>Most of the site boundary sits within Flood Zone 1 – land identified as having a low probability of flooding on the Environment Agency’s flood map for planning and the Report shows that essential infrastructure will be located here. There are no river crossings or interaction with embankments or assets.</p> <p>We therefore support the proposal to exclude flood risk from the scope of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), subject to ensuring no increase in flood risk and agreeing design and mitigation measures with us.</p>	N/A	
The Planning Inspectorate Environmental Services	Land, soils and groundwater Quality	Based on the available information, the proposed development area is understood to be predominantly Greenfield in nature. We therefore consider the potential for significant or widespread contamination at the site to be	Desk based preliminary risk appraisal has been undertaken and is presented in Volume 3, Appendix 10.1 of this PEIR. An	

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		<p>low. Nevertheless, areas of the site boundary are underlain by Principal and Secondary aquifers – geological strata that provide significant quantities of drinking water, water for business needs and support rivers, lakes and wetlands. In addition, a Source Protection Zone (SPZ) is present in the area of the site around Scopwick. This is an inner zone (SPZ1), providing protection around a groundwater abstraction source located to the west of Scopwick. There is also a total catchment zone (SPZ3) located across the southwest section of the site.</p> <p>We therefore support the proposal for land, soils and groundwater to be scoped into the EIA. We understood that a ‘desk-based PRA Report has been prepared, which assesses the potential risks on the existing land, soil and groundwater baseline, including contamination issue’ (Scoping Report Section 6.6.6) and that this will be used to inform intrusive ground investigations. We agree with this approach, and recommend that developers:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Follow the risk management framework provided in 'Land contamination: risk management' when dealing with land affected by contamination 2. Refer to our Guiding principles for land contamination for the type of information that we require in order to assess risks to controlled waters from the site – the local authority can advise on risk to other receptors, such as human health. 3. Consider using the National Quality Mark Scheme for Land Contamination Management which involves the use of competent persons 	<p>assessment of land, soils and groundwater is presented in Chapter 10 of this PEIR.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		<p>to ensure that land contamination risks are appropriately managed</p> <p>4. Refer to the contaminated land pages on gov.uk for more information</p>	
<p>The Planning Inspectorate Environmental Services</p>	<p>Section: 6.2 Biodiversity</p>	<p>The site boundary sits in the catchment of the 'Bringing the Limestone Becks Back to Life' project. The project is a successful collaboration between East Mercia Rivers Trust, the Environment Agency, and the Wild Trout Trust and aims to improve and protect Lincolnshire's limestone becks from deterioration. Opportunities for biodiversity enhancement that support the ambition of the project should therefore be sought.</p>	<p>The 'Brining the Limestone Becks Back to Life' project has been discussed with the Environment Agency in our initial engagement. We will continue our engagement with the EA and seek to align our biodiversity enhancements where possible.</p>
<p>The Planning Inspectorate Environmental Services</p>	<p>Further pre-application consultation</p>	<p>Should the Applicant wish us to review any technical documents or want further advice to address the environmental issues, we can do this as part of our charged for service. Further engagement at the pre-application stage will speed up our formal response to their application and provide them with certainty as to what our response to the Development Consent Order application will be. It should also result in better quality and more environmentally sensitive development. As part of our charged for service, we will provide a dedicated project manager to act as a single point of contact to help resolve any problems. We currently charge £100 per hour, plus VAT. The terms and conditions of our charged for service are available at https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/planning-and-marine-licence-advice/standard-terms-for-our-charges</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

Statutory Consultee		Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
Forestry Commission				
Forestry Commission	Forestry	<p>As the Governments forestry experts, we endeavour to provide as much relevant information to enable the project to reduce any impact on irreplaceable habitat such as Ancient Semi Natural woodland, as well as other woodland. We are satisfied there is no Ancient Woodland within the development area. However, there are numerous small fragmented woodlands within the development area. We note the scoping report suggests woodland creation will be undertaken to connect woodlands and enhance wildlife corridors and that there are no plans to remove any existing trees or woodlands.</p> <p>We would recommend that planting should be targeted to enhance existing woodland and ecological networks by buffering the existing woodland to create larger blocks of ideally at least 5ha. Species and provenance of new trees and woodland need to be considered to establish a more resilient treescape which can cope with the full implications of a changing climate. When planting new trees and woodland, ensure that biosecurity is robust to avoid the introduction of pests and diseases. Details should be provided of how the existing trees and woodlands will be protected during the construction phase, protection measures can include taking care not to cut tree roots or causing soil compaction around trees (e.g., through vehicle movements or stacking heavy equipment) or contamination from poisons. Access to the woodlands should also be considered for future management, as woodland management will improve and maintain biodiversity.</p>	<p>Noted. An Outline Landscape Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) and Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) will be produced and secured within the DCO. These will detail requirements to ensure the trees and hedgerows will be protected, biosecurity measures and outline the future management of the landscape and biodiversity enhancements.</p>	

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
Health and Safety Executive (HSE)			
HSE	HSE's land use planning advice	<p>According to HSE's records, the proposed DCO application boundary for this Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project falls into a small part of the outer zone of a Major Accident Hazard Pipeline at a single location. This is based on the site boundary in Appendix A of "EN010149-000006-EN010149 - Scoping Report.pdf" downloaded from http://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/document/EN010149-000006.</p> <p>The major accident hazard pipeline is operated by National Grid Gas Plc and has the ref number 2704. The Applicant should make contact with the above operator, to inform an assessment of whether or not the proposed development is vulnerable to a possible major accident. There are three particular reasons for this:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The pipeline operator may have a legal interest in developments in the vicinity of the pipeline. This may restrict developments within a certain proximity of the pipeline. 2. The standards to which the pipeline is designed and operated may restrict major traffic routes within a certain proximity of the pipeline. Consequently, there may be a need for the operator to modify the pipeline or its operation, if the development proceeds. 3. To establish the necessary measures required to alter/upgrade the pipeline to appropriate standards. <p>HSE's Land Use Planning advice is dependent on the location of areas where people may be present. Based on the information in the Scoping Report "EN010149-000006-</p>	Noted – The Application is having ongoing engagement with National Grid.

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		EN010149 - Scoping Report.pdf", it is unlikely that HSE would advise against the development	
HSE	Hazardous Substance Consent	Based on http://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/document/EN010149-000006 , it is not clear whether the applicant has considered the hazard classification of any chemicals that are proposed to be present at the development. Hazard classification is relevant to the potential for accidents. For example, hazardous substances planning consent is required to store or use any of the Categories of Substances or Named Hazardous Substances set out in Schedule 1 of The Planning (Hazardous Substances) Regulations 2015 as amended, if those hazardous substances will be present on, over or under the land at or above the controlled quantities. There is an addition rule in the Schedule for below-threshold substances. If hazardous substances planning consent is required, please consult HSE on the application.	Desk based preliminary risk appraisal has been undertaken and is presented in Volume 3, Appendix 10.1 of this PEIR. An assessment of land, soils and groundwater is presented in Chapter 10 of this PEIR.
HSE	Consideration of Risk Assessments	Regulation 5(4) of the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 requires the assessment of significant effects to include, where relevant, the expected significant effects arising from the proposed development's vulnerability to major accidents. HSE's role in NSIPs is summarised in Advice Note 11 'working with public bodies in the infrastructure planning process' Annex G on the Planning Inspectorate's website [Advice notes National Infrastructure Planning	Major accidents has been scoped out from further assessment as agreed by the Planning Inspectorate.

Statutory Consultee		Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		(planninginspectorate.gov.uk)] - Annex G – The Health and Safety Executive. This document includes consideration of risk assessments under the heading “Risk assessments”.		
HSE	Explosives sites	HSE has no comment to make as there are no licensed explosives sites in the vicinity.		N/A
HSE	Electrical Safety	No comment from a planning perspective.		N/A
Historic England Advice				
Historic England Advice		Numerous cropmark features plotted in the National Mapping Programme suggestive of quite busy late prehistoric – Romano British landscape		Noted. Archaeological Desk Based Assessment (DBA), Aerial Investigation Report and Geophysical survey have been undertaken and are provided in Volume 3, Appendix 8.1, 8.2 and 8.3.
Historic England Advice		Undesignated NHRE asset ref 349061 to NE of Kingfisher Court - Probable Prehistoric or Roman settlement consisting of enclosures and a trackway seen as cropmarks.		
Historic England Advice		Undesignated NHRE asset ref:1061192 - Mareham Lane Roman road running from Bourne to Lincoln via Sleaford, partly covered by modern road and part surviving as cropmarks and in parish boundaries – and associated features.		

Statutory Consultee		Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
Historic England Advice		Undesignated NHRE asset ref: 1061215 - Probable Roman Road (and associated remains) between Sleaford and Lincoln on the line of the A15 + GII listed Milepost 1061824		Noted. Archaeological Desk Based Assessment (DBA), Aerial Investigation Report and Geophysical survey have been undertaken and are provided in Volume 3, Appendix 8.1, 8.2 and 8.3.
Historic England Advice		Undesignated remains associated with former RAF Digby aka RAF Scopwick		
Historic England Advice		Undesignated crop marks NHRE asset ref 1057715 – south of Ash Holt Probable Prehistoric or Roman rectangular and square enclosures seen as cropmarks		
Historic England Advice		Undesignated find spot NHRE ref 349439 – Four Cinerary Urns and late Roman Coin found near site of Brickyard Farm		
Historic England Advice		We welcome reference to geophysical survey and trial trenching		
Historic England Advice	We refer you to the detailed advice of our local government archaeological curator colleagues who can	Solar schemes present risk to buried archaeological remains through panel fixing, cabling, substations, fencing, biodiversity features etc, these impacts can be effectively managed through a sound process of archaeological assessment with a particular focus upon the identification areas of highest or uncertainty through desk-based assessment or HER, Portable Antiquities Scheme and cartographic data, aerial photography, lidar and geophysical survey and deposit modelling. Whilst large		The DBA and Stage 1 Setting Assessment has included consideration of Portable Antiquities Scheme, and cartographic data; the Aerial Investigation and Mapping report has reviewed aerial photography and LiDAR and a geophysical survey has been carried out. The PEIR has taken account of the results of all of these phases of non-intrusive survey and the

Statutory Consultee		Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
	access their Historic Environment Record.	scale solar schemes have relatively high degrees of elasticity (when compared to say housing or quarry schemes) this potential to deploy open areas of grass (exclusion zones) or differential support schemes (concrete shoes rather than piles) or cable avoidance routes / sensitive location of substations / habitat ponds etc, all these are only effective where one has a robust understanding of archaeological risk. The sooner and better these understandings can be achieved the better risks will be managed. Whilst micro piling a ploughed flat iron-age field system might appear a low impact the same could not be said of an early medieval burial ground or Roman Villa, hence iterative process of investigation is necessary to characterise features revealed through non-intrusive survey and to test apparent blank areas. In the case of 20th century military remains you should contact the Ministry of Defence for advice and it is likely that specialist survey techniques and methodology and UXO survey may be needed.		masterplan has responded to the known assets. A phase of intrusive evaluation (trial trenching) is proposed for the areas of potential greatest impact from the scheme to inform the ES and we are in discussion with the MOD regarding the scope of work around the WWII crash sites.
Lincolnshire County Council				
Lincolnshire County Council	Mounting Structure	Two options are currently being considered for the mounting structure e.g. single axis tracker or tracker platform. This suggests that a fixed mounting system is not being proposed and the Inspectorate is invited to clarify this. In the event that a fixed mounting structure is proposed then the ES and all relevant assessments will need to also consider the impacts of this option. If not, the		As detailed in the Proposed Development description presented in Chapter 2 of PEIR, fixed mounting structure is the only option that is proposed. Tracking panels have since been discounted following further design development and environmental surveys.

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		ES will in any case need to assess both options and any potential impacts arising from each (e.g. noise, glint and glare, landscape and visual impacts, etc) until or unless a decision is taken on which option would be used in advance of completing the ES.	
Lincolnshire County Council	Balance of Solar System	Different configuration options currently being considered for the inverters, transformers and switchgears. The ES will need to assess all options being considered at this stage (e.g. string or centralised inverters; independent outdoor or contained indoor equipment) and any potential impacts arising from each of these (e.g. noise, landscape and visual impact, etc) until or unless a decision is taken on which option would be used in advance of completing the ES.	Noted. The optionality that has been assessed within the PEIR is detailed within Chapter 4 of this PEIR. Further detail will be presented in the ES.
Lincolnshire County Council	Battery Energy Storage System - BESS	Two options being considered at this stage which include consolidated or distributed BESS. The ES will need to assess all options being considered at this stage (e.g. string or centralised inverters; independent outdoor or contained indoor equipment) and any potential impacts arising from each of these (e.g. noise, landscape and visual impact, etc) until or unless a decision is taken on which option would be used in advance of completing the ES.	As detailed in the Proposed Development description presented in Chapter 2 of PEIR, the distributed BESS option has been discounted. The potential locations for the consolidated BESS are presented in Volume 2, Figure 2.3.
Lincolnshire County Council	National Grid Connection (NGC) and new 400kV Transmission Towers (TT)	Several potential locations identified and so all options will need to be assessed. The NGC and TT will be a permanent features and not decommissioned and removed at the end of the project period (40 years) like the 'temporary' PV solar park. Therefore the EIA and assessments will need to make a clear distinction between those impacts which it might view as temporary (e.g. the	It should be noted that the National Grid Navenby substation and National Grid connecting towers no longer form part of the Proposed Development.

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		PV park) and those which would be permanent (e.g. the NGC and TT)	
Lincolnshire County Council	Lighting	States that the NGC compound, Project Substation compound, BESS compounds, and Collector Compounds would include lighting, in accordance with relevant standards, but will not be permanently lit. Whether scoped in or out of the ES, external lighting should be assessed in a lighting assessment to include consideration of glare, glow, lux levels and consideration of Environmental Zone (ILE standards) source intensity levels relative to the countryside location of the site.	Noted. Further detail including a lighting assessment will be presented in the ES.
Lincolnshire County Council	Borrow Pits	The location of potential borrow pits will need to be identified and must be included within the proposed Order Limits of the development and an assessment of impacts, including cumulative effects, arising from the working and restoration of identified borrow pits included as part of the ES.	No borrow pits are proposed as part of the project.
Lincolnshire County Council	Reasonable Alternatives	The Council agrees that a consideration of alternatives should be presented. Reasonable alternatives include different layouts, scales, technologies adopted, design parameters as well as different sites. The ES should explain in detail what criteria have been used to identify the chosen option and explain what criteria have been applied as well as reasons why other alternatives have been dismissed.	Noted. A summary of reasonable alternatives has been included within Chapter 3 of this PEIR. Further detail will be presented in the ES, the Statement of Need and the Planning Statement.
Lincolnshire County Council	Reasonable Alternatives	In regard to alternative sites, this is particularly key as the proposal includes the creation of a new NGC in order to connect into the 400kV overhead powerline network. A new	Noted. A summary of alternatives has been included within Chapter 3 of this PEIR. Further detail will be presented in

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		<p>NGC could potentially be constructed to give access to any other 400kV powerline network and so the ES will need to explain and justify why this site has been chosen over potential alternative sites/locations. Alternative sites/locations could therefore include anywhere along the same 400kV powerline route/corridor and so include sites elsewhere within the District as well as within the County and even nationally given this is a 'national infrastructure project' and therefore locational need factors are not relevant and any other 400kV powerline network could potentially act as a connection point for a new NGC</p>	<p>the ES, the Statement of Need and the Planning Statement.</p>
<p>Lincolnshire County Council</p>	<p>Reasonable Alternatives</p>	<p>The assessment of alternative sites should also consider the scope for connection into existing National Grid connection points currently in existence (like those proposed by other registered NSIP solar projects currently being promoted within the County) and explain why connection or upgrade of these to facilitate connection has been dismissed.</p>	<p>Noted. A summary of alternatives has been included within Chapter 3 of this PEIR. Further detail will be presented in the ES, the Statement of Need and the Planning Statement.</p>
<p>Lincolnshire County Council</p>	<p>Consultees</p>	<p>It is accepted the list of consultees is not a definitive list however it is recommended that identified consultees include Navenby Parish Council, RAF Waddington, RAF Cranwell and Internal Drainage Boards.</p>	<p>Noted. These have added onto our list of consultees.</p>
<p>Lincolnshire County Council</p>	<p>Offset distances</p>	<p>It is unclear how the proposed minimum offset distances of 10m from hedgerows and 15m to locally designated wildlife sites have been identified and derived. The basis and justification for these distances needs to be explained.</p>	<p>The offset distances for the hedgerows are based on British Standard BS:5837:2012 Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction - Code of Practice. The offset from woodlands is based on Natural England, Ancient woodland, ancient trees</p>

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
			<p>and veteran trees: advice for making planning decisions (https://www.gov.uk/guidance/ancient-woodland-ancient-trees-and-veteran-trees-advice-for-making-planning-decisions#ancient-woodland); and British Standard BS:5837:2012 Trees in Relation to Design, Demolition and Construction - Code of Practice. The distance from local wildlife sites is based on professional judgement.</p> <p>The offset distances will be refined as the EIA and DCO progresses.</p>
<p>Lincolnshire County Council</p>	<p>BMV Land</p>	<p>Under 'Land and soils' it is stated that the proposal will seek to retain fields that comprise majority Grade 1 and 2 within arable production where possible. This should however be extended to include Grade 3a land as this is still classed as 'best and most versatile'.</p>	<p>The design of the Proposed Development has been guided by the below principles to help reduce the use of higher grade agricultural land, where practicable. All fields comprising solely of Grade 1 or 2 land within the site will remain in arable production.</p> <p>Prioritise the use of BMV land for arable production where practicable.</p> <p>Prioritise the use on non-BMV land for the creation of legacy / permanent habitats where practicable.</p>
<p>Lincolnshire County Council</p>	<p>Glint and Glare</p>	<p>Disagree with the proposal to scope out this as a specific chapter of the ES and to instead be considered as part of a separate assessment. Whilst the Council accepts that each case must be considered on its merits, glint and glare</p>	<p>A preliminary assessment of Glint and Glare has been presented in Chapter 14 of the PEIR.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		<p>impacts were scoped into the ES for the Heckington Fen Solar Farm (NSIP Ref: EN010123) although the Planning Inspectorate (PINS) agreed that aviation impacts could be excluded. In this case there are three RAF bases in and around the proposed development and so we recommend that PINS seek the advice of those bases in relation to potential glint and glare impacts, not least given that there is the potential for tracking panels to be used. Furthermore, there is the potential for cumulative and in-combination effects with other topics/chapters considered by ES (e.g. landscape and visual impact, impacts on residential amenity assessment) and so this should form part of the ES so that any cumulative and in-combination effects can be assessed together and not form part of a separate assessment that sits outside the ES.</p>	
Lincolnshire County Council	Human health	Agree this can be scoped out as a specific chapter in the ES and that considerations will form part of other topics/chapters	N/A
Lincolnshire County Council	Material assets and waste chapter	Agree that this can be scoped out as a specific chapter of the ES on the condition consideration of potential borrow pits is included within the chapter/section under Section 6.6 (Land, soils and groundwater). The location of potential borrow pits will need to be identified and must be included within the proposed Order Limits and an assessment of impacts, including cumulative effects, arising from the working and restoration of identified borrow pits included as part of the ES	No borrow pits are proposed as part of the project.

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
Lincolnshire County Council	Population	Paragraph 5.8.1 states that the requirement to consider population in UK EIA practice was introduced via the 2017 update to the EIA Regulations, with impacts to population taken to refer to socio-economic impacts. There is no proposed ES chapter heading dealing solely with socio-economic impacts and instead the applicant suggests that a 'Socio-Economic Benefits Statement' will be submitted in support of the DCO Application.	Socio-Economic Statement will be submitted in support of the DCO.
Lincolnshire County Council	Water	Disagree with the proposal to scope out this as a specific chapter of the ES and to instead be considered as part separate assessments (e.g. Flood Risk Assessment and Construction Environmental Management Plan). There is too much uncertainty at this stage given the site area is significant, possible site layout and potential location of the BESS and NGC as well as drainage requirements, etc. Therefore we consider this should be included as specific chapter in the ES.	Water has been scoped in for further assessment and a preliminary assessment of potential effects is detailed within Chapter 13 of the PEIR.
Lincolnshire County Council	Electric, magnetic and electromagnetic fields	Note powerlines/cables up to 132kV are not expected to exceed ICNIRP exposure guidelines but there is no mention or reference to the NGC and new Transmission Towers (TT) and associated 400kV cables. RAF Digby is the HQ of the Joint Cyber and Electromagnetic Activities Group and is located immediately west of proposed Springwell Central. Given the potential impacts associated with the NGC, TT and 400kV an assessment is likely to be required however it is recommended that PINS takes into account the views of RAF Digby and relevant defence consultees before agreeing whether this topic should be scoped out of the ES.	Noted.

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
Lincolnshire County Council	Air Quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council agrees this matter should be ‘scoped in’ and appropriate assessments included as part of the ES. • If borrow pits are proposed then the location of these will need to be confirmed along with any potential impacts associated with the working and restoration of those sites (e.g. dust and traffic emissions) on receptors close to those specific sites. • No specific comments regarding the proposed methodology of scope of the assessment at this stage. • Recommend that comments and advice provided by North Kesteven District Council be taken into account. 	No borrow pits are proposed as part of the project.
Lincolnshire County Council	Biodiversity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council agrees this matter should be ‘scoped in’ and appropriate assessments included as part of the ES. • Unclear how embedded mitigation measures identified in Table 4.1 have been identified/derived. For example, it is proposed that a minimum offset distance of 10m from hedgerows and 15m to locally designated wildlife sites – how have these been identified? • No specific comments regarding the proposed methodology of scope of the assessment at this stage. • Recommend that comments and advice provided by NKDC, Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust and Natural England be taken into account. 	Noted. Appropriate assessments and clarification of design/embedded mitigation measures will be included in the ES.
Lincolnshire County Council	Climate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council agrees this matter should be ‘scoped in’ and appropriate assessments included as part of the ES. • This chapter/section should: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - take into account GHG emissions associated with the full life-cycle of the development and potential sources of GHG emissions. This includes emissions associated with the 	Noted. Further detail is provided in Chapter 7 – Climate of the PEIR.

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		<p>production of the PV panels and other supporting equipment as well as that associated with the transportation, construction and operation of the development, including replacements that may be necessary during the lifetime of the development; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - identify the potential savings in GHG emissions associated with the operation of the development as a result of the consequent reduction in use of more carbon-emitting electricity generation methods; and - assess any increase in carbon emissions as a result of the need to transport/import food and crops from elsewhere which would have otherwise been grown on the arable farmland that would be lost or removed from production as a consequence of the development. Such an assessment would enable the full carbon gains or benefits of this proposal to be properly understood. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council requests that the Inspectorate therefore requires the applicant to include such an assessment within the ES. 	
Lincolnshire County Council	Cultural Heritage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council agrees this matter should be ‘scoped in’ and appropriate assessments included as part of the ES. We would refer PINS and the applicant to the more general comments provided by the Council’s Historic Environment Team which are attached to this response – Appendix 1. The following points are however highlighted and we would request that PINS take these into account when issuing its decision and/or the applicant take these into account when preparing the PEIR/ES. 	N/A

Statutory Consultee		Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
Lincolnshire County Council	Cultural Heritage	Whilst the applicant has discussed this proposal with the County Historic Environment Team they are also advised to liaise with the Heritage Trust of Lincolnshire who act on behalf of NKDC especially in relation to the scope of and timing of any intrusive evaluation following completion of the geophysical survey.		Liaison with Lincolnshire County Council Heritage Team, Heritage Trust of Lincolnshire and North Kesteven District Council regarding scope and timing of intrusive evaluation is ongoing.
Lincolnshire County Council	Cultural Heritage	We expect the desk based evaluation to be complete and the field evaluation to be well underway by the time the PEIR is produced. It's vital that a competent full desk based assessment (DBA) be completed at the earliest opportunity as desk based work provides the basis for initial understanding. This is informed by, and built upon, by a full air photo/LiDAR assessment and geophysical survey which in turn assists in the development of the trial trenching programme. The full suite of archaeological evaluation is required and must be completed in time to inform the mitigation strategy which will lay out how the developmental impact on archaeology will be dealt with. This needs to be submitted as part of the EIA (and not left as a DCO Requirement as suggested in paragraph 6.4.6 – see comments below).		The PEIR has taken account of the DBA and Stage 1 Setting Assessment, Aerial Investigation and Mapping assessment and geophysical survey. The scope and timing of intrusive evaluation is still being discussed.
Lincolnshire County Council	Cultural Heritage	Paragraph 6.4.2 references LCC's "General guidance on large schemes including NSIPs, EIAs...etc" and it is proposed that a study area of 2km from the site boundary be used for assessing non-designated assets and 5km, informed by the ZTV, for assessing designated assets. Given the uncertainty regarding extent and footprint of the site area, possible site layout and positioning of various elements at this stage, the proposal has the potential for		The DBA and Stage 1 Setting Assessment has used a study area of 2km from the Site for non-designated assets and 5km from the Site for designated assets in line with Lincolnshire County Council guidance. Assets identified in the stage 1 setting assessment as being sensitive to changes in their setting have been filtered

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		<p>both direct physical impacts on heritage assets as a result of construction and also on the setting of heritage assets due to the extent of possible visual change. It is therefore recommended that the study areas for both designated and non-designated assets be the same at 5km.</p>	<p>for detailed assessment based on a worst case ZTV for the proposed development.</p>
<p>Lincolnshire County Council</p>	<p>Cultural Heritage</p>	<p>Paragraph 6.4.3 – data sources need to also include reference to Scopwick and Kirkby Green Neighbourhood Plan which contains schedules and descriptions of heritage assets within the Plan area</p>	<p>The Neighbourhood Plan has informed the DBA</p>
<p>Lincolnshire County Council</p>	<p>Cultural Heritage</p>	<p>Paragraph 6.4.6 – indicates that additional mitigation to offset adverse impacts will take the form of a programme of archaeological investigation and recording secured by a DCO Requirement. As indicated above, the Council cannot agree to this approach and recommends that PINS makes clear that the full suite of archaeological evaluation presubmission/determination. We are aware that on-site geophysical survey work is anticipated to be completed by the end of April 2023 and until the results of those surveys are known the Council cannot agree to a programme of archaeological investigation being deferred to a post decision DCO Requirement. It is highly likely that trial trenching will be required not only across known or suspected archaeology but also across the ‘blank’ areas to obtain baseline evidence where previous evaluation techniques have not identified archaeological remains</p>	<p>The scope and timing of further evaluation following the geophysical survey is still being discussed with Lincolnshire and North Kesteven District Council.</p>
<p>Lincolnshire County Council</p>	<p>Cultural Heritage</p>	<p>Paragraph 6.4.7 – the significance of each asset must be assessed prior to scoping which assets would be affected. Modelling should particularly include any identified assets</p>	<p>The DBA and Stage 1 Setting Assessment has used a study area of 2km from the Site for non-designated assets and 5km</p>

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		which have the potential to be visible or have their setting affected by the taller elements of the development	from the Site for designated assets in line with Lincolnshire County Council guidance. Assets identified in the stage 1 setting assessment as being sensitive to changes in their setting have been filtered for detailed assessment based on a worst case ZTV for the proposed development.
Lincolnshire County Council	Cultural Heritage	Paragraph 6.4.8 – receptors to be ‘scoped in’ need to also include reference to Conservation Areas at Scopwick, Blankney and Bloxholm.	These conservation areas have been considered in the DBA and Stage 1 Setting Assessment.
Lincolnshire County Council	Cultural Heritage	Paragraph 6.4.9 – proposes to scope out setting impacts on listed dwellings within settlements over 1km from the site. There is no assessment contained in the Scoping Report to support this and to justify why and how the 1km reference has been derived. The reference just to ‘dwellings’ rather than ‘buildings’ is also unclear and so needs to be clarified as to does the decision to single out K6 kiosks for consideration.	The DBA and Stage 1 Setting Assessment has used a study area of 2km from the Site for non-designated assets and 5km from the Site for designated assets in line with Lincolnshire County Council guidance. Assets identified in the stage 1 setting assessment as being sensitive to changes in their setting have been filtered for detailed assessment based on a worst case ZTV for the proposed development.
Lincolnshire County Council	Cultural Heritage	Paragraph 6.4.11 – the assessment of heritage assets and impacts within the landscape needs to begin from an understanding of the significance of each heritage asset in order to assess the potential impact of the development upon them and put forward any potential benefit or mitigation of proposed negative impact. It is not just	The DBA and Stage 1 Setting Assessment has used a study area of 2km from the Site for non-designated assets and 5km from the Site for designated assets in line with Lincolnshire County Council guidance. Assets identified in the stage 1

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		<p>potential visual impact with views to, from and across any other heritage asset which may be affected and how it can be viewed from any point which is publicly accessible, it's also how the heritage asset is experienced kinetically and within its landscape. Assessment of all this must start with an understanding of the significance of each heritage asset and any interrelationships it may have with other heritage assets as well as the landscape in which it sits, for example remnant field boundaries of the field system that surrounded and supported a Medieval village.</p>	<p>setting assessment as being sensitive to changes in their setting have been filtered for detailed assessment based on a worst case ZTV for the proposed development.</p>
<p>Lincolnshire County Council</p>	<p>Cultural Heritage</p>	<p>Assessments of significance should be undertaken for all designated and undesignated assets which may be affected to ensure any assets subject to proposed descoping has an evidence base.</p>	<p>The DBA and Stage 1 Setting Assessment has used a study area of 2km from the Site for non-designated assets and 5km from the Site for designated assets in line with Lincolnshire County Council guidance. Assets identified in the stage 1 setting assessment as being sensitive to changes in their setting have been filtered for detailed assessment based on a worst case ZTV for the proposed development. Those assets included for detailed assessment will include an assessment of significance within the ES.</p>
<p>Lincolnshire County Council</p>	<p>Landscape and Visual</p>	<p>The Council agrees this matter should be 'scoped in' and appropriate assessments included as part of the ES.</p>	<p>Landscape and Visual matters are addressed in Chapter 9.</p>

Statutory Consultee		Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
Lincolnshire County Council	Landscape and Visual	We would refer PINS and the applicant to the jointly-procured detailed feedback provided by AAH on behalf of Lincolnshire County Council and NKDC contained in Appendix 2 of this response – ‘Technical Memorandum 1: AAH TM01’ and request that PINS incorporate this advice into their final opinion. The following points are however highlighted and we would request that PINS take these into account when issuing its decision and/or the applicant take these into account when preparing the PEIR/ES.		Noted. See responses to individual comments below.
Lincolnshire County Council	Landscape and Visual	<p>We would also expect the production of the Landscape and Visual chapter of the ES which would be in the form of a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA), and any supporting information (such as plans or figures) which reflect current best practice and guidance from, as a minimum, the following sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ‘Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment’, (GLVIA3), April 2013 by the Landscape Institute (LI) and Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (IEMA); - ‘An Approach to Landscape Character Assessment’, Natural England (2014); - ‘Technical Guidance Note (TGN) 06/19 Visual Representation of Development Proposals’, 17th September 2019 by the Landscape Institute (LI); - ‘Technical Guidance Note (TGN) 1/20 Reviewing Landscape and Visual Impact Assessments (LVIAs) and Landscape and Visual Appraisals (LVAs)’, 10th January 2020 by the Landscape Institute (LI) ; - ‘Technical Guidance Note (TGN) 04/20 Infrastructure’, April 2020 by the Landscape Institute (LI); and 		All relevant guidance documents are referenced as appropriate in Chapter 9. TGN 1/20 provides advice to determining authorities and stakeholders on reviewing LVIAs and as such is not a guidance document which concerns the production of LVIA work. This document is therefore not referenced in Chapter 9.

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		<p>- ‘Technical Guidance Note (TGN) 2/21 Assessing landscape value outside national designations’, May 2021 by the Landscape Institute (LI).</p>	
<p>Lincolnshire County Council</p>	<p>Landscape and Visual</p>	<p>At this initial stage, the content and level of information provided within Section 6.5 is generally considered satisfactory, however, we would expect to discuss this content and approach as part of the iterative process. Due to the scale and extent of the site and proposed development, we would be able to discuss and agree the Scoping questions within Section 6.5.14 as part of this ongoing process, as at this stage it is not possible to provide full answers to these questions.</p>	<p>Since Scoping, the applicant has engaged in further consultation with Lincolnshire County Council and its appointed landscape adviser – AAH Consultants. Details of further discussions regarding landscape and visual matters are set out in Chapter 9.</p>
<p>Lincolnshire County Council</p>	<p>Landscape and Visual</p>	<p>Viewpoints & Photomontages – the final locations of viewpoints are to be reviewed and agreed with LCC and other relevant stakeholders. The final viewpoint selection should also consider views of taller and more conspicuous elements, such as battery storage or sub-stations once the layout is more developed, as well as consider potential key, or sensitive, viewpoints. We would welcome an initial discussion and subsequent workshop (on site if appropriate) with the developer’s team in regards to proposed viewpoints. Photomontages/Accurate Visual Representations (AVRs) should be produced and the number, location and level/type of the these should be agreed with LCC and other relevant stakeholders. At this stage, it is deemed appropriate that these should be produced to illustrate the proposals at different phases: Existing Situation (baseline), Operational (year 1) and Residual with planting established (10 to 15 years).</p>	<p>Through ongoing consultation with Lincolnshire County Council and AAH Consultants, a selection of viewpoints have been agreed (subject to any subsequent amendments in the Proposed Development). Details of the further consultation and viewpoint selection are set out in Chapter 9. Further consultation will be undertaken before submission of the ES to agree what form of visualisation is appropriate for different viewpoints.</p>

Statutory Consultee		Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
Lincolnshire County Council	Landscape and Visual	The methodology should clearly lay out the process of assessing temporary and permanent elements of the scheme, and the LVIA should clearly identify those elements that would not be decommissioned at the end of the life of the development. This is of particular importance in relation to the NGC which it is assumed will be a permanent feature.		The LVIA methodology is set out in Appendix 9.1. Once full details of the Proposed Development are known at ES stage, the LVIA will clearly state which elements would not be decommissioned at the end of the operational period.
Lincolnshire County Council	Landscape and Visual	Study Area – at this early stage, the proposed study area extents should be discussed and further reviewed as the full extent of potential visibility of the development is not yet fully known, and the ZTV mapping contained within Appendix F of the Scoping Report does identify potential visibility beyond these extents. The ZTV mapping would need to be updated once the proposals have developed (as stated within paragraph 13.5) and the study area should not be fixed until the full extents of visibility are known from both desktop and site work. It therefore seems appropriate to assume a (minimum – TBA) 5km study area across the scheme rather than a reduction to 3km for the solar array or collector compounds/distributed BESS.		The study area has been discussed with Lincolnshire County Council/North Kesteven District Council through further consultation and responding on their behalf on 15th August 2023 AAH Consultants confirmed that ‘The proposed 3km study area is appropriate from the solar PV development and 5km from the Springwell Substation. However, the LVIA should clearly state the justification for these study areas, and thoroughly assess and confirm no significant views are available from beyond the study area. The ZTVs demonstrate that in the worst case scenario there would be negligible visibility of the Proposed Development beyond the study area proposed above. Any landscape or visual effects beyond this distance would not be significant. For the purposes of the PEIR the above study area has been adopted but will be

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
			reviewed again once the final layout is fixed before completion of the ES.
Lincolnshire County Council	Landscape and Visual	Sections 6.5.8. and 6.5.9 identify a range of potential landscape receptors to be scoped in or out of the LVIA, however at this early stage of the project we request these be reviewed and consulted upon further once proposals have been developed and we are not in a position to confirm their inclusion or omission. We therefore request that PINS makes it clear in its response that these matters have yet to be agreed.	The scope of the LVIA and the receptors/matters to be scoped in and out of the assessment are reviewed in Chapter 9 of the PEIR.
Lincolnshire County Council	Landscape and Visual	Cumulative Landscape and Visual effects should be assessed in regards to other major developments, and in particular commercial scale solar developments, as appropriate in regards to proximity and scale (also see comments under Section 7).	Potential cumulative effects are addressed in Chapter 15 of the PEIR. A more detailed assessment will be provided in the ES once further detail about the Proposed Development is available.
Lincolnshire County Council	Landscape and Visual	At this stage it is not relevant to comment on any potential mitigation or layout of the development. Best practice guidance, relevant published landscape character assessment's and Local and County Council Policy and Guidance should be referred to and implemented as appropriate.	Noted. Best practice guidance, baseline documents and relevant policy is set out in Chapter 9.
Lincolnshire County Council	Land, Soils and Groundwater	The Council agrees this matter should be 'scoped in' and appropriate assessments included as part of the ES.	Land, Soil and Groundwater matters are addressed in Chapter 10 of the PEIR.
Lincolnshire County Council	Land, Soils and Groundwater	The ES and ALC assessment should clearly identify how much of the site comprises of agricultural land and identify its ALC grade and current use. The ES should identify what	Land, Soil and Groundwater matters are addressed in Chapter 10 of the PEIR.

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		(if any) measures would be taken to retain the agricultural land in productive use (i.e. sheep grazing, hay/silage production) and how this would be secured. The ES should also give consideration to the economic effects of the loss or change to the use of the agricultural land as well as a consideration of the potential carbon footprint created through the displacement or removal of this land from productive use. This needs to be properly calculated to ensure that the full carbon gains or benefits of this proposal are accurate.	A Socio-economic statement will be produced and submitted in support of the DCO which will give consideration to the economic effects of the change of land use.
Lincolnshire County Council	Section 6.6 – Land, Soils and Groundwater	Paragraph 6.6.8 suggests scoping in the operational impacts of the proposed development in terms of the loss of agricultural and BMV as a consequence of the removal of this land from productive use. The Council agrees with the inclusion of this however the assessment should also include and detail mitigation measures to remove, reduce or minimise such impacts. For example, the possibility of retaining some areas of land in productive use which also act as buffers and stand-offs; enabling some continuance of agricultural activity through sheep grazing or alternative forms of cropping among panelled areas, etc. As part of the ES the applicant should identify a mechanism by which any changes in agricultural activity and associated socio-economic effect can be secured through the DCO process and provide evidence of this (e.g. use of planning conditions, legal agreements, covenants, etc)	Noted. Consultation is ongoing with the landowners.
Lincolnshire County Council	Section 6.6 – Land, Soils	The ‘alternatives’ exercise needs to consider alternative site layouts and potentially a reduction in MW generating capacity in order to demonstrate avoidance or minimisation	Noted. A summary of alternatives has been included within Chapter 3 of this PEIR. Further detail will be presented in

Statutory Consultee		Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
	and Groundwater	of agricultural land impacts (as recommended by the Draft NPS EN-3 March 2023).		the ES, the Statement of Need and the Planning Statement
Lincolnshire County Council	Section 6.6 – Land, Soils and Groundwater	Reference is given to the proximity of Mineral Consultation and Mineral Safeguarding Areas within the current Minerals & Waste Local Plan. It is stated that as the majority of the land take would be temporary, future extraction would be possible after decommissioning. This would not apply in respect of the proposed NGC and so this needs to be taken into account.		A Mineral Safeguarding Assessment will be part of the Planning Statement submitted with the DCO application.
Lincolnshire County Council	Section 6.6 – Land, Soils and Groundwater	A Minerals Assessment will be required as part of the application. The findings of this assessment could inform and influence the design and layout of the development and potentially remove areas of land that lie close to existing quarries or which could potentially be worked in the future.		A Mineral Safeguarding Assessment will be part of the Planning Statement submitted with the DCO application.
Lincolnshire County Council	Section 6.6 – Land, Soils and Groundwater	Unless considered elsewhere within the ES, this chapter will need to also consider potential borrow pits that may be used as part of the development. The ES should confirm if borrow pits are proposed and identify the location of these which must be included within the proposed Order Limits. The ES will also need to contain an assessment of impacts, including cumulative effects, arising from the working and restoration of identified borrow pits and these included as part of the ES.		No borrow pits are proposed as part of the project.
Lincolnshire County Council	Section 6.7 – Noise and Vibration	The Council agrees this matter should be ‘scoped in’ and appropriate assessments included as part of the ES.		Noise and Vibration matters are addressed in Chapter 11 of the PEIR.

Statutory Consultee		Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
Lincolnshire County Council	Section 6.7 – Noise and Vibration	No specific comments regarding the proposed methodology of scope of the assessment at this stage.		Noted.
Lincolnshire County Council	Section 6.7 – Noise and Vibration	Recommend that comments and advice provided by NKDC.		Noted.
Lincolnshire County Council	Section 6.8 – Traffic and Transport	The Council agrees this matter should be ‘scoped in’ and appropriate assessments included as part of the ES.		Traffic and Transport matters are addressed in Chapter 12 of the PEIR.
Lincolnshire County Council	Section 6.8 – Traffic and Transport	The Council is generally agreeable to the methodology and approach detailed within the Scoping Report but recommends that discussions with the Highway Authority continues in order to ensure that the scope of the assessments is agreed. A Transport Assessment for the construction period will be required and safety and capacity impacts will need to be assessed to ensure that the impact on the highway network is acceptable. The primary point of operational access is assumed to be directly from or via the A15 Sleaford Road and onto the B1191. Access points and locations will therefore also need to be identified and discussed with Highways.		Traffic and Transport matters are addressed in Chapter 12 of the PEIR. Full transport assessment will be undertaken and provided within the ES. Consultation is ongoing with Lincolnshire County Council Highways.
Lincolnshire County Council	Section 6.8 – Traffic and Transport	This chapter of the ES should also consider potential cumulative construction effects (and where relevant operational effects) associated with other large-scale and NSIP scale projects including Triton Knoll, Viking Link, Heckington Fen Solar park (including works to Bicker Fen Substation), Beacon Fen Energy Park, Temple Oaks Renewable Energy Park and the Lincolnshire Reservoir		Preliminary cumulative effects are detailed within Chapter 15 of the PEIR. Further engagement with Lincolnshire County Council. Will be undertaken to agree the list of cumulative developments to be assessed within the ES.

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		<p>depending on the timeframes of those projects. The assessment should also considered TCPA projects including the Sleaford West and potentially the Sleaford South SUEs (A17/A15 corridor), along with the Lincoln South East Quadrant (SEQ) SUE which sits alongside parts of the A15 and B1188.</p>	
<p>Lincolnshire County Council</p>	<p>Section 6.8 – Traffic and Transport</p>	<p>A Travel Plan would be required for a project of this scale to ensure that the significant numbers of construction workers are encouraged to use alternative modes to the private car.</p>	<p>An Outline Travel Plan which will form part of the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan will be submitted in support of the DCO. This will set out strategies to encourage the use of sustainable transport for the construction workforce.</p>
<p>Lincolnshire County Council</p>	<p>Section 6.8 – Traffic and Transport</p>	<p>There is an extensive network of public rights of way (PRoW) within the site which link with the surrounding settlements. Opportunities to create new and expanded routes that would improve access and links between settlements should be considered with potential additional public footpaths and bridleways created as part of the development. Any such routes should not utilise routes used for construction or maintenance activities and be a minimum width of 4m for public footpaths and 5m for public bridleways. Any fencing alongside a public path should be open mesh construction and not close board timber fencing or metal palisade to avoid the creation of narrow claustrophobic. Any new routes to be created should look to be formally adopted as part of the Definitive Rights of Way network rather than permissive routes which could potentially be removed at any point during the life of the</p>	<p>Proposals for new permissive footpaths following feedback from the first stage of consultation are detailed within Chapter 2 of the PEIR and displayed within Volume2, Figure 2-6.</p> <p>Engagement is ongoing with the Public Rights of Way officer.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		<p>project. If permissive routes are proposed then details of what mechanisms would be adopted to ensure these remain in place for the duration and life of the development is needed.</p>	
<p>Lincolnshire County Council</p>	<p>Section 7 – Cumulative Effects</p>	<p>The Council agrees this matter should be ‘scoped in’ and appropriate assessments included as part of the ES.</p>	<p>Cumulative Effects matters address in Chapter 15.</p>
<p>Lincolnshire County Council</p>	<p>Section 7 – Cumulative Effects</p>	<p>The Council disagrees that NSIP projects must lie within the Zol of the development which is based on the study area for each environmental factor considered in the EIA. The County is currently subject of several other NSIP projects and these all need to be taken into account in terms of potential cumulative effects in particular in respect of LVIA and impacts on ‘best and most versatile’ agricultural land. Of particular relevance are the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - West Burton Solar Project - Cottam Solar Project - Gate Burton Energy Park - Heckington Fen Solar Park - Mallard Pass Solar Park - Temple Oaks Renewable Energy Park – Tillbridge Solar Project - Beacon Fen Energy Park - Lincolnshire Reservoir <p>We are aware that there may well be further NSIP projects coming forward in the not to distant future and therefore we reserve the right to highlight other projects as and when these become known and can advise how these might be treated with reference to Table 2 of Advice Note Seventeen</p>	<p>Chapter 15 of the PEIR sets out the Cumulative effects, methodology for carrying out the assessing and Zone of Influence for each Environmental Factor. This is a preliminary assessment is based on publicly available information at the time.</p> <p>Further consultation with North Kesteven District Council and Lincolnshire County Council to agree the final short list for inclusion in the ES will be undertaken.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		‘Cumulative effects assessment relevant to nationally significant infrastructure projects’.	
Lincolnshire County Council	Local Community Comments	Finally, in addition to the above comments, the Council has also been sent and received a copy of comments and views on the proposed Scoping Report prepared by a local Parish Council. Attached to this response is a copy of that response/comments which we have been asked be brought to the attention of the Inspectorate. The Council recognises that local residents and communities have the benefit of local knowledge and so is supportive of their involvement and comments at this stage and invites the Inspectorate to therefore take these comments into account and, where considered necessary, require appropriate assessments or information to be provided as part of the ES by stating this explicitly within its formal response	Noted. The Applicant has reponed to Local Parish feedback within the matrix, under individual names.
LCC Historic Environment			
LCC Historic Environment	DBA	It’s vital that a competent full desk based assessment (DBA) be completed at the earliest opportunity as desk based work provides the basis for initial understanding. This is informed by and built upon by a full air photo/LiDAR assessment and geophysical survey which in turn assists in the development of the trial trenching programme. The full suite of archaeological evaluation is required. The evaluation work must be completed in time to inform the mitigation strategy which will lay out how the developmental impact on archaeology will be dealt with, therefore this will need to be submitted as part of the EIA.	The PEIR has been informed by a DBA and Stage 1 Setting Assessment, Aerial Investigation and Mapping and geophysical survey. The scope and timing of further evaluation is still being discussed with Lincolnshire County Council and North Kesteven District Council.

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
LCC Historic Environment	Trial Trenching	Section 6.4.1 of the scoping report states that “Further consultation with Lincolnshire County Council will be carried out to confirm the scope of and timing of any intrusive evaluation following completion of the geophysical survey.” Trial trenching is required not only across known or suspected archaeology but also across the ‘blank’ areas to obtain baseline evidence where previous evaluation techniques have not identified archaeological remains. Trenching results are essential to get a full understanding of the archaeology which will be impacted across the full impact zone and will inform an archaeological mitigation strategy which is reasonable, appropriate and fit for purpose.	The scope and timing of further evaluation is still being discussed with Lincolnshire County Council and North Kesteven District Council.
LCC Historic Environment	Trial Trenching	Trial trenching is part of the standard range of archaeological evaluation and full trenching results are essential for effective risk management and to inform programme scheduling and budget management. Failing to do so could lead to unnecessary destruction of heritage assets, potential programme delays and excessive cost increases that could otherwise be avoided. A programme of trial trenching is required to inform a robust mitigation strategy which will need to be agreed by the time the Environmental Statement is produced and submitted with the DCO application	The scope and timing of further evaluation is still being discussed with Lincolnshire County Council and North Kesteven District Council.
LCC Historic Environment	Study Area	Regarding the Study Area (section 6.4.2) and the EIA Baseline Information (sections 6.4.3 and 6.4.4), these are required for the main site boundary and any proposed	It is anticipated that the Proposed Development will connect to a future National Grid Navenby substation.. If this

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		connection route options. Until they are descoped all connector route options need to be properly assessed as part of the development and as part of the Environmental Statement (ES).	changes then further assessment of the potential grid connection would be carried out at that time.
LCC Historic Environment	Trial Trenching	Section 6.4.4 ends with the following statement: “The need for, scope, and timing of intrusive evaluation will be negotiated and agreed with the statutory consultees following completion of the desk-based assessments and geophysical survey.” As stated above, a sufficient trenching programme across the impact zone is essential in understanding the character, depth and extent of surviving archaeology which would be impacted by the development.	The scope and timing of further evaluation is still being discussed with Lincolnshire County Council and North Kesteven District Council.
LCC Historic Environment	Mitigation	Section 6.4.6 is entitled ‘Additional (secondary and tertiary) mitigation’, what is the primary mitigation? The proposed mitigation options of Section 6.4.6 includes preservation in situ, excavation and ‘watching brief’. Archaeological topsoil strip, map and record is also an essential part of the suite of archaeological mitigation techniques, and all of these will need to be informed by sufficient evaluation including trenching to determine where archaeologically sensitive areas are and their full extent to inform a competent reasonable mitigation strategy.	Primary mitigation comprises embedded mitigation through the design and layout of the proposed development. The scope and timing of further evaluation to inform a mitigation strategy is still being discussed with Lincolnshire County Council and North Kesteven District Council.
LCC Historic Environment	Likely significant effects	Regarding section 6.4.7 Description of likely significant effects, please be advised that the significance of each asset must be assessed prior to scoping which assets	The DBA and Stage 1 Setting Assessment has identified the significance of all non-designated assets within 2km and all

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		<p>would be affected. Modelling should particularly include any identified assets which have the potential to be visible or have their setting affected by the taller elements of the development.</p>	<p>designated assets within 5km of the Site. Those sensitive to changes in their setting have then been filtered based on a worst case ZTV.</p>
<p>LCC Historic Environment</p>	<p>Methodology</p>	<p>Regarding section 6.4.11 Proposed assessment methodology, the assessment of heritage assets and impacts within the landscape needs to begin from an understanding of the significance of each heritage asset in order to assess the potential impact of the development upon them and put forward any potential benefit or mitigation of proposed negative impact.</p> <p>It is not just potential visual impact with views to, from and across any other heritage asset which may be affected and how it can be viewed from any point which is publicly accessible, it's also how the heritage asset is experienced kinetically and within its landscape. Assessment of all this must start with an understanding of the significance of each heritage asset and any interrelationships it may have with other heritage assets as well as the landscape in which it sits, for example remnant field boundaries of the field system that surrounded and supported a Medieval village. Assessments of significance should be undertaken for all designated and undesignated assets which may be affected to ensure any assets subject to proposed despoiling has an evidence base</p>	<p>The DBA and Stage 1 Setting Assessment has identified the significance of all non-designated assets within 2km and all designated assets within 5km of the Site. Those sensitive to changes in their setting have then been filtered based on a worst case ZTV. Assessments of significance will be included for those assets included in the ES.</p>
<p>LCC Historic Environment</p>	<p>In conclusion</p>	<p>The EIA will require the full suite of comprehensive desk-based research, non-intrusive surveys, and intrusive field</p>	<p>The PEIR has been informed by the DBA and Stage 1 Setting Assessment, Aerial</p>

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		<p>evaluation for the full extent of proposed impact. The results should be used to minimise the impact on the historic environment through informing the project design and an appropriate programme of archaeological mitigation. The provision of sufficient baseline information to identify and assess the impact on known and potential heritage assets is required by Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (Regulation 5 (2d)), National Planning Statement Policy EN1 (Section 5.8), and the National Planning Policy Framework. Sufficient information on the archaeological potential must include evidential information on the depth, extent and significance of the archaeological deposits which will be impacted by the development. The results will inform a fit for purpose mitigation strategy which will identify what measures are to be taken to minimise or adequately record the impact of the proposal on archaeological remains which must be submitted with the EIA.</p> <p>This is in accordance with The Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 which states “The EIA must identify, describe and assess in an appropriate manner...the direct and indirect significant impacts of the proposed development on...material assets, cultural heritage and the landscape.” (Regulation 5 (2d))</p>	<p>Investigation and Mapping and geophysical survey. The scope and timing of further evaluation is still being discussed with Lincolnshire County Council and North Kesteven District Council.</p>
<p>AAH Consultants (Landscape and Visual consultant acting on behalf of North Kesteven District Council and Lincolnshire County Council)</p>			
<p>North Kesteven</p>	<p>Landscape and visual</p>	<p>Overall, we would expect that the assessment of potential Landscape and Visual matters and evolving proposals</p>	<p>Following scoping a series of meetings have taken place with AAH Consultants.</p>

Statutory Consultee		Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
District Council and Lincolnshire County Council		<p>relating to the Springwell Solar Farm, as a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP), follow an iterative process of engagement and consultation to ensure the following are not fixed at this stage and are discussed, developed and agreed at subsequent technical meetings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) Methodology; • Development, and subsequent ZTV, parameters; • Study Area extents (distance); • Viewpoint quantity and locations; • Photomontage/Accurate Visual Representations (AVRs): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Quantity and location; - Phase depiction; - AVR Type and Level. • Mitigation Measures/Landscape Scheme/Site Layout; • Cumulative effects, including surrounding developments to be considered; and • The extent as to which a Residential Visual Amenity Assessment (RVAA) should be considered (based on the Landscape Institute TGN 2/19) if there are residential properties with receptors likely to experience significant effects to their visual amenity 		<p>This list of matters has been discussed and the outcome of meetings to date is summarised in Chapter 9. It is envisaged that further consultation will take place before submission of the ES. In particular, it is anticipated that the number, location and type of visualisations will be agreed and mitigation measures discussed.</p>
North Kesteven District Council and Lincolnshire	Landscape and visual	We would also expect the production of the Landscape and Visual chapter of the Environmental Statement (ES), which would be in the form of a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA), and any supporting information (such as plans or figures) reflect current best practice and guidance from, as a minimum, the following sources:		All relevant guidance documents are referenced as appropriate in Chapter 9. TGN 1/20 provides advice to determining authorities and stakeholders on reviewing LVIAs and as such is not a guidance document which concerns the production

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
County Council		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ‘Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment’, (GLVIA3), April 2013 by the Landscape Institute (LI) and Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (IEMA); • ‘An Approach to Landscape Character Assessment’, Natural England (2014); • ‘Technical Guidance Note (TGN) 06/19 Visual Representation of Development Proposals’, 17th September 2019 by the Landscape Institute (LI); • ‘Technical Guidance Note (TGN) 1/20 Reviewing Landscape and Visual Impact Assessments (LVIAs) and Landscape and Visual Appraisals (LVAs)’, 10th January 2020 by the Landscape Institute (LI) ; • ‘Technical Guidance Note (TGN) 04/20 Infrastructure’, April 2020 by the Landscape Institute (LI); and Landscape Technical Memo 1 April 2023 Lincolnshire County Council, Springwell Solar Farm • ‘Technical Guidance Note (TGN) 2/21 Assessing landscape value outside national designations’, May 2021 by the Landscape Institute (LI). 	<p>of LVIA work. This document is therefore not referenced in Chapter 9.</p>
North Kesteven District Council and Lincolnshire County Council	Landscape and Visual- 6.5	<p>While the focus of this review is on Landscape and Visual matters, other information provided within the report, and associated Appendices, has also been considered, providing background and context to the site. At this initial stage of the NSIP process, the content and level of information provided by the developer within Section 6.5 Landscape and visual are generally considered satisfactory, however, as stated previously, we would</p>	<p>Since Scoping, the applicant has engaged in further consultation with AAH Consultants. Details of further discussions regarding landscape and visual matters are set out in Chapter 9. See responses to individual comments below.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		<p>expect to discuss this content and approach as part of the iterative process. Due to the scale and extent of the site and proposed development, we would be able to discuss and agree the Scoping questions within Section 6.5.14 as part of this ongoing process, as at this stage it is not possible to provide full answers to these questions. The following should be considered in the evolving assessment and layout:</p>	
<p>North Kesteven District Council and Lincolnshire County Council</p>	<p>Viewpoints</p>	<p>The final locations of viewpoints are to be reviewed and agreed with LCC and other relevant stakeholders. The final viewpoint selection should also consider views of taller and more conspicuous elements, such as battery storage or sub-stations once the layout is more developed, as well as consider potential key, or sensitive, viewpoints. We would welcome an initial discussion and subsequent workshop (on site if appropriate) with the developer's team in regards to proposed viewpoints.</p>	<p>Further consultation on the viewpoints has been undertaken with AAH Consultants resulting in a letter dated 15th August 2023 confirming that the viewpoint selection was 'proportional to the project and extent of potential visual receptors.'</p>
<p>North Kesteven District Council and Lincolnshire County Council</p>	<p>Photomontages</p>	<p>To gain an understanding of the visibility of the development and how the panels and infrastructure would appear in the surrounding landscape, Photomontages/Accurate Visual Representations (AVRs) should be produced. The number and location of the agreed viewpoints to be developed as Photomontages/AVRs should be agreed with LCC and other relevant stakeholders and produced in accordance with TGN 06/19 Visual Representation of Development Proposals. At this stage, it is deemed appropriate that</p>	<p>As per the comment above, representative assessment viewpoints have been agreed with AAH Consultants and visualisations (eg photomontages) will be presented for a selection of these in the ES. The number, location and type of visualisation for each viewpoint will be agreed through ongoing consultation with AAH Consultants before submission of the ES. Visualisations will be prepared in accordance with the stated</p>

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		<p>these should be produced to illustrate the proposals at different phases: Existing Situation (baseline), Operational (year 1) and Residual with planting established (10 to 15 years). The Photomontage/AVR Level and Type is to be discussed and agreed.</p>	<p>guidance and illustrate effects in Year 1 and Year 10.</p>
<p>North Kesteven District Council and Lincolnshire County Council</p>	<p>Methodology</p>	<p>As stated previously, the LVIA should be carried out in accordance with the GLVIA3 and undertaken by suitably qualified personnel. The methodology provided at Section 6.5.11 and Appendix D is typical of those used for ES Chapters and standalone LVIA where potential significant effects can be considered and reflects the guidance in GLVIA3. We would request that the most up to date technical guidance be used and the methodology is further interrogated at the next phases of the project.</p> <p>The Landscape and Visual methodology within Appendix D identifies that Significant effects are identified as those that are “Major or Major/Moderate”, and that in the case of predicting Moderate effects professional judgement will be applied. This is fine and follows GLVIA3, however for full transparency, we would expect that a full explanation be provided in the assessment as to whether a Moderate effect on a receptor is assessed as being Significant or not, and not simply relying on stating that an effect is not significant “based on professional judgement”.</p> <p>The methodology should also clearly lay out the process of assessing temporary and permanent elements of the scheme, and the LVIA should clearly identify those elements that would not be decommissioned at the end of</p>	<p>The LVIA will be undertaken by Chartered Landscape Architects and in accordance with the most up to date published best practice guidance as set out in Chapter 9. In the PEIR, simple statements have been provided as to whether effects are likely to be significant or not but, in the ES, a full justification will be provided for each judgement including for any conclusions of ‘Moderate’ significance.</p> <p>A detailed methodology for the LVIA is set out in Appendix 9.1 and the ES will clearly identify those elements of the Proposed Development which would not be decommissioned at the end of the operational period.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		the life of the development, such as the National Grid substation, and assessed accordingly.	
North Kesteven District Council and Lincolnshire County Council	Scope of the Study Area:	<p>It is acknowledged in Section 6.5.2 that, based on desktop (ZTV mapping) and field study, an initial Study Area covering 3km has been allowed for the proposed development, and an extended Study Area covering 5km for the National Grid substation and National Grid connecting tower. At this early stage, we recommend these extents are discussed and further reviewed as the full extent of potential visibility of the development is not yet fully known, and the ZTV mapping within Appendix F does identify potential visibility beyond these extents. The ZTV mapping would be updated once the proposals have developed (as stated within paragraph 13.5) and the study area should not be fixed until the full extents of visibility are known from both desktop and site work. Once the study area has been defined, the LVIA should also provide a justification for the full extent/distance, which would be further refined as part of the iterative process.</p>	<p>The study area has been discussed through further consultation and on 15th August 2023 AAH Consultants confirmed that ‘The proposed 3km study area is appropriate from the solar PV development and 5km from the Springwell Substation . However, the LVIA should clearly state the justification for these study areas, and thoroughly assess and confirm no significant views are available from beyond the study area.</p> <p>It should be noted that the National Grid Substation and connecting towers no longer form part of the Proposed Development. The ZTVs demonstrate that in the worst-case scenario there would be negligible visibility of the Proposed Development beyond the study area proposed above. Any landscape or visual effects beyond this distance would not be significant. For the purposes of the PEIR the above study area has been adopted but will be reviewed again once the final layout is fixed before completion of the ES.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
North Kesteven District Council and Lincolnshire County Council	Landscape	<p>Published landscape character areas have been identified, however to align with GLVIA3 the LVIA should include an assessment of landscape effects at a range of scales and likely need to include a finer grain landscape assessment that includes the Site and immediate area that also considers individual landscape elements or features that make up the character area. Sections 6.5.8. and 6.5.9. identify a range of potential landscape receptors to be scoped in or out of the LVIA, however at this early stage of the project we request these be reviewed and consulted upon further once proposals have been developed and we are not in a position to confirm their inclusion or omission.</p>	<p>Further analysis of landscape character is provided in Chapter 9 including Appendices 9.2 and 9.3. The scope of the LVIA and the receptors/matters to be scoped in and out of the assessment are reviewed in Chapter 9 of the PEIR.</p>
North Kesteven District Council and Lincolnshire County Council	Visual	<p>Several visual receptors are identified within Sections 6.5.5. and 6.5.8. We would expect that the visual assessment would include for identification of visual receptors, and not just an assessment of any agreed viewpoints, which should clearly cross reference viewpoints to associated receptors. Sections 6.5.8. and 6.5.9. identify a range of potential visual receptors to be scoped in or out of the LVIA, however at this early stage of the project we request these be reviewed and consulted upon further once proposals have been developed and we are not in a position to confirm their inclusion or omission. The visual assessment should take account of the 'worst case scenario' in terms of winter views, and effects associated with landscape mitigation at the Operational Phase (year 1), Residual Phase with planting having established (10 to 15 years), and at the Decommissioning</p>	<p>It is confirmed that the visual assessment will focus on assessing effects on visual receptors rather than viewpoints. Representative viewpoints will be provided to illustrate the nature and scale of effect at various locations but are a tool to assist in the assessment of effects. The scope of the LVIA and the receptors/matters to be scoped in and out of the assessment are reviewed in Chapter 9 of the PEIR. The assessment takes account of seasonal variations in visibility and operational phase effects will be assessed in Year 1 and Year 10. Construction and Decommissioning effects will be</p>

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		Phase. The LVIA should ensure all elements associated with the development are considered and assessed, such as battery storage, sub-stations, CCTV poles and boundary fencing, which may be more visible than panels due to height, mass and extent	considered as well. The LVIA will take account of all new infrastructure.
North Kesteven District Council and Lincolnshire County Council	Cumulative impacts	Cumulative Landscape and Visual effects should be assessed in regards to other major developments, and in particular commercial scale solar developments, as appropriate in regards to proximity and scale.	The approach to cumulative effects is set out in Chapter 15. Cumulative landscape and visual effects will be assessed in detail in the ES.
North Kesteven District Council and Lincolnshire County Council	Mitigation and Layout	<p>As this is an iterative process, at this stage it is not relevant to comment on any potential mitigation or layout of the development. However, best practice guidance, relevant published landscape character assessment's and Local and County Council Policy and Guidance shall be referred to and implemented as appropriate.</p> <p>We would also expect the landscape and planting scheme is coordinated with other relevant disciplines, such as ecology, heritage or civils (e.g. SuDS features), to improve the value of the landscape and reflect appropriate local and regional aims and objectives. Any Landscape Scheme and associated Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan should accompany the ES which should cover the establishment period, which is assumed would be up to 15 years to cover the period up to the residual assessment.</p>	<p>Noted. Best practice guidance, baseline documents and relevant policy is set out in Chapter 9.</p> <p>Mitigation Proposals will be developed in detail before submission of the ES and will take account of other relevant disciplines. A landscape scheme and LEMP will be submitted with the ES. The LEMP will cover the establishment period as well as the long-term management of the site and will cover existing as well as new vegetation.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		The management plan should provide for both new planting and existing retained vegetation and how it will be managed and protected through all phases of the development	
John Woodward - Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council			
Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council	Scoping	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is there an impact pathway from the Proposed Development to the aspect/matter? 2. Is the aspect/matter sensitive to the impact concerned? 3. Is the impact likely to be on a scale that may result in significant effects to the aspect/matter? 4. Could the impact contribute cumulatively with other impacts to result in significant effects to the aspect/ matter? 5. Is there a method of avoidance or mitigation that would reduce the impact on the aspect/matter to a level where significant effects would not occur? 6. Is there sufficient confidence in the avoidance or mitigation method in terms of deliverability and efficacy to support the request? 7. Is there empirical evidence available to support the request? 8. Do relevant statutory consultees agree with the request? 9. Have you had regard to (a) relevant National Policy Statement(s) (NPS) and specifically any requirement stated in the NPS(s) in respect of the assessment of this aspect/matter? <p>The subsequent comments and observations will demonstrate that factors proposed to be scoped out of the</p>	Noted.

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		EIA are not justified as they fail to follow the above Guidelines.	
Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council	Footpaths	Temporary diversions potentially lasting two years will substantially impact the community's freedom of the community to walk the local countryside with adverse consequences to their health and well being	We will seek to reduce the number of temporary diversions of Public Rights of Way where practicable during the construction phase.
Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council	Footpaths	It is not clear whether all the current footpaths and permitted paths are covered in the text since the facility to walk within the development site extends to more than just the PROWs found there. This entire facility is enjoyed and valued not only by the parish but also by the surrounding wider community in the District. A reduction to any of these will impact all communities' freedom of the community to walk the local countryside with adverse consequences to their health and well being. Comment. The proposal to scope out this factor is challenged.	Noted. The Public Rights of Ways and permissive paths are displayed in Volume2, Figure 2-6 of the PEIR.
Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council	Human health	Observation. The above observation fundamentally challenge the Report's assertion that "human health is not subject to dedicated assessment and therefore excluded from the scope of the EIA.", since in each proposed example quite the opposite appears to be true. Comment. The proposal to scope out this factor is challenged.	Noted. Issues related to human health including dust, vibration etc. will be referenced within the ES and assessed within the Air Quality and Noise and Vibration chapters.

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council	5.8.6	<p>Observation. Within the development's Site boundary work associated with the development is being planned to take place on land allocated for housing in the made Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Comment. The proposal to scope out this factor is challenged</p>	Noted. This has been taken into consideration in the design.
Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council	Socio-economic	<p>Observation. The changes to the local environment arising from the proposed development will very inevitably impact the value of public and private residential property and housing in the area contributing cumulatively to other social/economic impacts . This is a factor that should not be excluded from the EIA assessment</p> <p>Comment. The proposal to scope out this factor is challenged.</p>	A socio-economic statement will be produced and submitted in support of the DCO.
Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council	Socio-economic	<p>Observation. The community benefits from its current environment as a rural agricultural area which the proposed development as a mega-sized industrial plant will fundamentally impact. Therefore this should not be scoped out of the EIA assessment</p> <p>Comment. The proposal to scope out this factor is challenged</p>	A socio-economic statement will be produced and submitted in support of the DCO.
Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council	Socio-economic	<p>Observation. The development will impact on the numbers employed on land held by the landlord and as well have a significant effect on employment by the many peripheral trades and businesses associated with agriculture in that</p>	A socio-economic statement will be produced and submitted in support of the DCO.

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		<p>area during the operational phase and beyond it. While at present there are no other businesses, land allocated for business use, or planning applications for such within the Site, there nevertheless is the possibility that such, say as small cooperative agricultural holdings or business enterprises being generated any time in future as an alternative to the proposed development. Therefore these should not be scoped out of the EIA assessment Comment. The proposal to scope out this factor is challenged</p>	
<p>Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council</p>	<p>Public Rights of Way</p>	<p>Observation. As with 5.63 and 64 it is not clear whether all the current footpaths and permitted paths are covered in the text. This facility is enjoyed and valued not only by the parish but also by the surrounding wider community in the District. A reduction to any of these will impact all communities' freedom of the community to walk the local countryside with adverse consequences to their health and well being. Comment. The proposal to scope out this factor is challenged</p>	<p>We will seek to reduce the number of temporary diversions of Public Rights of Way where practicable during the construction phase.</p>
<p>Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council</p>	<p>Population</p>	<p>Observation. The suggested increase in benefits can at best only be in the short term. Meanwhile as stated above the value added to the local economy resulting from the development will be negative as will occupancy rates in hospitality venues. This inevitably has significant effect on the population. Comment. The proposal to scope out this factor is challenged</p>	<p>A socio-economic statement will be produced and submitted in support of the DCO.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council	Population	Observation. As the effects on population have been demonstrated as significant factors to the EIA as affecting the local and regional area it is justified that it should also be included in the EIA Report'FINAL VERSION OBS ON SPRINGWELL SOLAR FARM SCOPING REPORT Comment. The proposal to scope out this factor is challenged	A socio-economic statement will be produced and submitted in support of the DCO.
Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council	Conclusion	The preceding observations demonstrate that the proposal to scope out from the EIA environmental factors of significance without suitable justification will invalidate its very purpose and is therefore to be challenged. These factors should be made to be part of this EIA process.	N/A
Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council (received from NO2SPRINGWELLSOLAR)			
NO2SPRINGWELLSOLAR	Rochdale Envelope	<p>2.2.3 In order to maintain flexibility in the design, it is the Applicant's intention to use the 'Rochdale Envelope' approach within parameter ranges. The Planning Inspectorate's Advice Note Nine 'Rochdale Envelope' [Ref 2-1] provides specific guidance to applicants on the degree of flexibility that could be considered appropriate under the PA2008 regime.</p> <p>The Rochdale Envelope approach was developed to assist with the development of much large national infrastructure projects such as HS2 where at the start it is difficult to know what matters will be relevant as the project develops. This</p>	The level of flexibility assessed for the purposes of the PEIR are detailed within Chapter 2 and 4 of the PEIR. This will be refined and detailed within the ES.

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		flexible approach is not appropriate for a development of this limited and static nature where the matters to be considered can be determined at the start. Its use in this context would be an abuse of the process allowing the Applicants to change their plans at will without proper scrutiny.	
NO2SPRINGW ELLSOLAR	Landscape, Habitat Management and Biodiversity Enhancement	2.4.53The Proposed Development will include landscaping, habitat management, biodiversity enhancement, and amenity improvements, which will be explored as the design progresses. This will be sensitivity designed to retain and enhance ecological and recreational connectivity. 2.4.54. Where possible, existing trees, hedgerows, public rights of way and Local Wildlife Sites would be retained. Comment Received: The words 'explored' and 'recreational connectivity' are not specific enough again the information in the ES needs to be more specific.	Noted.
NO2SPRINGW ELLSOLAR	Lighting	2.4.61The National Grid Substation compound, Project Substation compound, BESS compounds, and Collector Compounds would include lighting, in accordance with relevant standards, but will not be permanently lit. Comment Received: Just lit after dark? Needs to be specific.	The lighting will be manually operated for the Springwell Substation compound, BESS compounds, and Collector Compounds, therefore, it would not be permanently lit.
NO2SPRINGW ELLSOLAR	Use of Borrow Pits	2.5.9 The use of borrow pits during construction of the Proposed Development will be considered as the design	No borrow pits are proposed as part of the project.

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		<p>develops. The potential benefit of including borrow pits as part of the Proposed Development include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allows extracted aggregate to be transported to construction locations (largely via site access tracks) within the Site. • Generates significantly lower levels of Heavy Goods Vehicle (HGV) movements on the local highway network than importation of aggregate from commercial quarries. • Reduces cost risks arising from double handling, importation from commercial quarries and landfill disposal. <p>2.5.10 The benefit of using borrow pits will be carefully considered against any potential environmental impacts. Further detail on the approach to identifying suitable borrow pit locations and justification for their inclusions as part of the Proposed Development will be provided as part of the PEIR and ES.</p> <p>Comment Received: This is a cost cutting exercise allowing the Developers to quarry their own aggregate out of the heath sub-soils to use to build temporary roads and hardstandings; further details and approval from the Environment Agency should be gained. The land where borrow pits are excavated will never be returned to proper agricultural use and this procedure should be prohibited as unnecessary and open to abuse. Unnecessary as there is a limestone quarry adjacent to the proposed site. Open to abuse as there is no monitoring of the 'rubbish' that may end up being dumped in a pit rather than properly (and more expensively) disposed of</p>	

Statutory Consultee		Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
NO2SPRINGW ELLSOLAR	Construction Reinstatement	<p>2.5.16 A programme of construction reinstatement and habitat creation will commence during the construction phase.</p> <p>The above statement is a contradiction in terms, the construction machinery and the work being carried out will be disruptive and will have an adverse effect on wildlife, surely 'during' should be 'after' and further specific detail is required.</p>		An Outline Landscape and Ecological Management (OLEMP) will be produced and submitted in support of the DCO. This will detail the management requirements during construction and operation of the Proposed Development.
NO2SPRINGW ELLSOLAR	Soils Management	<p>2.6.9. An Outline Soils Management Plan (oSMP) will be prepared and submitted with the DCO Application. The oSMP will follow the principles of best practice to maintain the physical properties of the soil, with the aim of restoring the land to its pre-construction condition at the end of the lifetime of the solar farm.</p> <p>With regard to agricultural land remediation. The document states the land will return to agricultural use at the end of the 40 year period, will the ES confirm that if the development is approved all of the concrete bases, foundations, piles and all other sub-structure elements are grubbed up, crushed and recycled on site into aggregate and then removed for future construction use, also where necessary replacing any topsoils with a similar heathland soil where required? If this land is not properly restored it will not be able to be farmed in a conventional manner, unable to be cultivated or harvested due to the potential damage to farm machinery. Wild grasses and weeds will grow and it will look something like the old Butlins Filey holiday camp site does today. I like to see wildflowers</p>		<p>During the decommissioning phase, it is assumed that all concrete, hardstanding areas, foundations for the infrastructure and any internal tracks will be removed to a depth of up to 1m. It is assumed that all the below ground cables will be left in situ. Further detail is included within the PEIR Chapter 2.</p> <p>The landscape management plan will be developed with the Estate to ensure that the landscape design and long-term habitats align with the Estate long term strategy</p>

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		growing but not 4,200 acres of them, when this best and most versatile land should be growing food crops	
NO2SPRINGWELLSOLAR	Above ground infrastructure decommissioning and DEMP	The ES should properly address this? At the moment solar panels at the end of their usable life are finding their way into landfill in Africa. As far as we know there is no recycling facility in the UK. The West's relationship going forward with China is uncertain. Springwell should fully address these matters at this pre-planning stage. The Lincoln Heath is a very fragile part of our county. The heathland soils are light in nature with an element of limestone particles within the growing medium, very free draining to the limestone brash subsoils which continue down to the water bearing strata which is the Central Lincolnshire aquifer which provides drinking water to many hundreds of thousands homes.	Climate Assessment which assesses the reasonable worst case is provided in Chapter 7 of the PEIR.
NO2SPRINGWELLSOLAR	Flood risk and management	The villages of Scopwick and Kirkby Green have been adversely effected by flooding particularly during periods of high rainfall with an increasing incidence in recent years. The problems created by old and poorly maintained surface water drainage and sewerage systems may be exacerbated by the hard landscaping and the solar panels themselves. This should be investigated at an early stage in assessing the suitability of the land for solar panels	The potential impacts to water and groundwater are detailed within Chapter 10 and 13 of the PEIR.
NO2SPRINGWELLSOLAR	Pollution	The natural aquifer which is a unique feature of the Lincolnshire Heath and feeds the many springs and streams which occur along the site of the proposed solar	The potential impacts to water and groundwater are detailed within Chapter 10 and 13 of the PEIR.

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		<p>development should be assessed and protected. The risks of pollution need to be assessed and monitored. In particular those associated with known risks of harmful chemicals from solar panels and battery installations.</p>	
<p>NO2SPRINGWELLSOLAR</p>	<p>Protected Species</p>	<p>The area is home to many protected species well adapted to the current landscape of open farmland and small woodlands. A full protected species survey should be carried out before construction begins and the habitats protected from development. The area is home to the wild brown hare whose numbers have declined rapidly in recent years due to habitat loss. They are protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 and listed as a priority species under the UK post 2010 Biodiversity Framework. The area is also an important habitat for birds of prey including the red kite, buzzard and barn owl. The number of barn owls is declining and this native bird was placed on the Red List of Birds of Conservation Concern (2021). Similarly the area has important populations of ground nesting birds namely skylarks and lapwings, both species named on the Red List as numbers have been subject to recent dramatic decline. Other animals reported in the area and protected by law include bats, hazel dormice, slow-worms and badgers. The area is also home to several populations of deer, whose populations range over fields threatened with being fenced off and covered with solar panels. At a time when the UK has been assessed as one of the most ecologically impoverished countries in the</p>	<p>The design principles are to avoid habitats of high ecological value and enhance/ or create habitats where possible to mitigate habitat loss and provide benefit to priority and notable species.</p> <p>The surveys carried out to date are considered sufficient to provide baseline information on the importance of habitats and species on site to enable an informed assessment of impact. Further targeted surveys may need to be carried out once design details are confirmed to inform impact and inform the design and mitigation in order to avoid significant adverse impact.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		world, it is proposed to take large areas of open countryside and valuable wildlife habitat for industrial use.	
NO2SPRINGWELLSOLAR	Health	Of those living and working in the area should be considered particularly the effects on mental health. The pandemic highlighted the importance of being out in nature for our mental health. The considerable disruption of construction over many months together with the industrialisation of the landscape with high metal fencing, closely packed solar panels, lighting, cctv and 3.5m high solar stations housing transformers on this vast scale will necessarily have a negative impact on mental health in an area which is used for both residential and recreational purposes.	Noted. The CCTV system will be positioned away from any footpaths and sensitive receptors.
Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council (Mr Marc Williams)			
Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council	Commissioning RSK to prepare the EIA	RSK are not an independent body. They have a biased towards these projects as their ultimate parent company invest in these projects. We should be pushing for a truly independent body. This should be clearly highlighted as a major concern by the PC. RSK are own by a major US private Equity firm called Ares who are directly involved in the Green Energy Market.	Noted.
	Scope of the EIA	This seems to be a common strategy by solar factory developers. Similar strategy was deployed by Mallard Pass developers. We should strongly object. The following should not be taken out of scope - 5.2 (Glint & Glare), 5.3	Noted.

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		(Heat & Radiation), 5.4 (Major accidents and disaster), 5.5 (Utilities), 5.6 (Human health), 5.7 (Material assets and waste), 5.8 (population) and 5.9 (Water)	
LA 112	LA 112 is not relevant they need to reconsider - LA112 is for transport projects this isn't a transport project (Design Manual for Roads & Bridges) There are major impacts to all the groups above as highlighted by the 95% who voted against this project in the last Parish meeting.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5.8.5- 5.8.7 Private Property & Houses - They see no impact on our properties • 5.8.8-5.8.9 Community Land & Assets - They want this out of scope, they miss the point we live in this area for the outstanding natural beauty. • 5.8.10-5.8.14 Agricultural & Development Land - I believe this contradicts much of what was published in the Neighbourhood plan. - How can they position this as out of scope when they are taking 4200 acres of Best Most Valuable farmland out of production. • 5.8.15-5.8.18 Walkers Cyclists & Horse Riders - They see no impact and indicate this should be out of scope. For all of these groups the significant change to the landscape will have a material impact. - We are meant to be promoting health and wellbeing and the countryside is a key element of this. 	<p>The potential visual effects on are addressed in Chapter 9 Landscape and Visual of the PEIR.</p> <p>Socio-economic statement will be produced and submitted in support of the DCO.</p> <p>The impact to Best and Most Versatile agricultural land is assessed within Chapter 10 of the PEIR.</p>
Decommissioning		They say that in 40 years the site will be decommissioned and returned to prior condition. However if we consider 2.4.6, 2.4.19, 2.4.20, 2.4.21, 2.4.24, 2.4.27, 2.4.37, 2.4.38,	During the decommissioning phase, it is assumed that all concrete, hardstanding areas, foundations for the infrastructure

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		<p>2.4.43, 2.4.48 this is clearly not going to happen. These areas are going to be covered in concrete to create hard standing platforms. This along with piling to create footings for the panels this land will never be used again for farming. What cast iron assurances will there be that ever piece of concrete will be removed from the land? Soil management 2.6.9 totally contradicts what's stated in 2.7.2 which states only stuff above ground will be dealt with</p>	<p>and any internal tracks will be removed to a depth of up to 1m. It is assumed that all the below ground cables will be left in situ. Further detail is included within the PEIR Chapter 2.</p>
	Concrete	<p>Where does the significant amount of concrete required to convert this farmland into an industrial site meet any green credentials?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concrete pillars for the panels • Concrete under Independent Outdoor Equipment • Concrete under inverters & Transporter Stations • Concrete in Collection Compounds • Concrete in Substations Compounds • Concrete in Battery Storage Areas • Concrete in National Grid Substation Areas • Concrete in Transmission Tower 	<p>Climate Assessment which assesses the reasonable worst case is provided in Chapter 7 of the PEIR.</p>
	Human rights & privacy	<p>There is going to be fencing at a minimum height of 2.5 metres up to 3m high, with CCTV up to 5 metres high also lighting. The CCTV is a gross intrusion into our human rights with security tracking our right to roam freely in the countryside. We should object strongly on the ground of privacy and human rights.</p>	<p>The CCTV system will be positioned away from any footpaths and sensitive receptors.</p>

Statutory Consultee		Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
	Rochdale Envelope	This seems like an opportunity for the develop to materially change critical elements after a potential consent is granted. We should strongly object. With the resources available to EDF they should be in a position to fully scope and list everything before consent is granted.		The Rochdale Envelope is a common approach employed where the nature of the Proposed Development means that some details of the whole project have not been confirmed when the application is submitted, and flexibility is sought to address uncertainty. It is important to maintain a degree of flexibility to ensure that the Project can use the most up-to-date technology and maximise any efficiencies such technology would enable.
	Extensive network of Public Rights of Way	These have been in place for many years and were originally scoped by MR Eric Parker, these included 4 promoted walks. These walks will be fundamentally changed and spoilt. At a time when we are focussed so much on people's mental wellbeing this will have a significant detrimental impact.		The potential visual effects on users of PROWs are addressed in Chapter 9: Landscape and Visual.
Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council	Cultural Heritage	There are a significant number of Listed Heritage sites across the planned site. These sites will all have their outlooks spoilt by the development		All listed buildings within 5km of the Site have been considered within the DBA and Stage 1 Setting Assessment. The masterplan has taken account of the listed buildings to minimize effects on them. Those sensitive to changes in their setting have been filtered for further assessment based on a worst case ZTV.

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
	Drainage	There is already increased risk of flooding in the Scopwick area. The document 5.9.23 references Cook & McQueen (2013) when discussing runoff and potential impacts on flooding. This was a modelled classroom study on a tiny scale. It did demonstrate a small increase. They cannot seriously be using a classroom-based study to take Water out of scope. The potential change to drainage on a site this large could be significant.	Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) will be undertaken as part of the EIA, which will inform the ongoing design of the Sustainable Drainage Systems. The FRA will be submitted in support of the DCO.
	Red Kites are protected by Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981	The protection of Red Kite is the longest continuous Conservation project in the World. There are several nesting in and around Scopwick house.	Noted.
	Use of borrow pits	Can the planning inspectorate guarantee that these sites won't be filled with construction contaminates and then back filled. Ref 5.7 materials, assets & waste	No borrow pits are proposed as part of the project.
	Reasonable alternatives	why has no alternative site or source of power generation been considered.	A summary of reasonable alternatives has been included within Chapter 3 of this PEIR. Further detail will be presented in the ES, the Statement of Need and the Planning Statement.
	Opportunity to enhance the environment	<p>WHERE POSSIBLE – there is zero commitment – the only part of the EIA that isn't concrete.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Panels shipped from China • Concrete on the Land 	The design principles are to avoid habitats of high ecological value and enhance/ or create habitats where possible to mitigate

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alteration of Drainage • Removal of Best most valuable farmland out of production resulting in increase in import and the associated carbon footprint 	habitat loss and provide benefit to priority and notable species.
	Utilities	How can they look to make utilities out of SCOPE There is a significant risk with the Exolum Pipeline that crosses the Blankney estate. This pipeline is a critical piece of infrastructure and needs to be accessed at anytime.	We are aware of the Exolum Pipeline and are engaging with the relevant consultees to ensure that there is sufficient offset distances from any development.
	Socio Economic impact.	Whilst during the construction phase there may be a few extra hotel/B&B rooms rented out the longer-term cost will be much higher as potential tourist will avoid the areas and the impact on property could be devastating	Socio-economic impacts will be detailed within a Socio-economic Statement which will be submitted in support of the DCO.
Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council	Cumulative Effect	There was an Environment and Scrutiny Committee meeting at the County Council where it was apparent that at least 5 NSIPs are going through at the moment and there is a real risk that the grid cannot take it (which will mean not just solar panels but ore pylons and overhead cables).	<p>Chapter 15 of the PEIR sets out the Cumulative effects, methodology for carrying out the assessing and Zone of Influence for each Environmental Factor. This is a preliminary assessment is based on publicly available information at the time.</p> <p>Further consultation with North Kesteven District Council and Lincolnshire County Council to agree the final short list for inclusion in the ES will be undertaken</p>

Statutory Consultee		Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
	Alternatives	Regarding section 3.1.3 (Alternatives), I would like to propose that not just alternative sites but also alternative energy sources eg offshore wind farms are included. The chairman responded that this should be included in our response but it is highly likely that the Planning Inspectorate will say they are only considering that specific application.		Noted. A summary of alternatives has been included within Chapter 3 of this PEIR. Further detail will be presented in the ES, the Statement of Need and the Planning Statement.
	Lithium Battery Storage	An attendee stated he has done research on lithium battery storage which will be predominantly on A15 area. There is a relevant Oxford University paper which he will pass on for inclusion on the website. There is a high level of danger with these units and the fire service have no guidance on dealing with lithium battery fires.		Engagement with Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue is ongoing. The guidance published by the National Fire Chiefs Council in November 2022 will be considered.
Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue				
Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue	Fire risk	The developer should produce a risk reduction strategy (regulation 38 of the Building Regulations) as the responsible person for the scheme as stated in the regulatory Reform (Fire Safety) Order 2005. We would also expect that safety measure and risk mitigation is developed in collaboration with LFR. The strategy should cover the construction, operational and decommissioning phases of the project. During the construction phase the number of daily vehicle movements in the local area will significantly increase. The Service will want to view the transport strategy to minimise this impact and prevent increase in the number of potential road traffic incidents. Any development should not negatively impact on the Service's ability to respond to an incident in the local area.		Noted. Engagement with Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue is ongoing.

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue	Battery and energy storage	<p>LFR recognises the use of batteries (including lithium-ion) as Energy Storage Systems (ESS) is a new and emerging practice in the global renewable energy sector. As with all new and emerging practices within the UK industry the service would like to work with the developers to better understand any risks that may be posed and develop strategies and procedures to mitigate these risks.</p>	<p>Noted. Engagement with Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue in relation to the BESS is ongoing.</p>
Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue	Fire risk	<p>The developer must ensure the risk of fire is minimised by: Procuring components and using construction techniques which comply with all relevant legislation.</p> <p>The inclusion of Automatic Fire Detection systems in the development design.</p> <p>Including automatic fire suppression systems in the development design. Various types of suppression systems are available, but the Service's preferred system would be a water misting system as fires involving Lithium-ion batteries have the potential for thermal runaway. Other systems would be less effective in preventing re-ignition.</p> <p>Including redundancy in the design to provide multiple layers of protection.</p> <p>Designing the development to contain and restrict the spread of fire through the use of fire-resistant materials, and adequate separation between elements of the Battery Energy Storage System (BESS).</p> <p>Developing an emergency response plan with the LFR to minimise the impact of an incident during construction, operation and decommissioning of the facility.</p> <p>Ensuring the BESS is located away from residential areas.</p> <p>Prevailing wind directions should be factored into the</p>	<p>Noted. Engagement with Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue in relation to the BESS is ongoing.</p> <p>The potential impacts to water and groundwater are assessed within Chapter 10 and 13 of the PEIR.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		<p>location of the BESS to minimise the impact of a fire involving lithium-ion batteries due to the toxic fumes produced.</p> <p>The emergency response plan should include details of the hazards associated with lithium-ion batteries, isolation of electrical sources to enable fire-fighting activities, measures to extinguish or cool batteries involved in fire, management of toxic or flammable gases, minimise the environmental impact of an incident, containment of fire water run-off, handling and responsibility for disposal of damaged batteries, establishment of regular onsite training exercises.</p> <p>The emergency response plan should be maintained and regularly reviewed by the occupier and any material changes notified to LFR.</p> <p>Environmental impact should include the prevention of ground contamination, water course pollution, and the release of toxic gases.</p>	
BESS		<p>The BESS facilities should be designed to provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Adequate separation between containers. - Provide adequate thermal barriers between switch gear and batteries, - Install adequate ventilation or an air conditioning system to control the temperature. Ventilation is important since batteries will continue to generate flammable gas as long as they are hot. Also, carbon monoxide will be generated until the batteries are completely cooled through to their core. 	Noted. Engagement with Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue in relation to the BESS is ongoing.

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Install a very early warning fire detection system, such as aspirating smoke detection/air sampling. - Install suitable gas monitoring / detection that will support early detection of leaks/issues, within the BESS containers. Consider Volatile Organic Compound (VOC), sensors as they respond to droplets of organic solvent. - Consider the installation of internal suppression protection within BESS containers. Suitable systems/strategies should be installed / developed to ensure the fire does not propagate beyond a single cabinet. - Ensure that sufficient water is available for manual fire-fighting. An external fire hydrant should be located in close proximity of the BESS containers. – The water supply should be able to provide a minimum of 1,900 l/min for at least 120 minutes (2 hours). Further hydrants should be strategically located across the development. These should be tested and serviced at regular intervals by the operator. If the site is remote from a pressure feed water supply, then an Emergency Water Supply (EWS) meeting the above standard should be incorporated into the design of the site e.g. an open water source and/or tank(s). If above ground EWS tanks are installed, these should include facilities for the FRS to discharge (140/100mm RT outlet) and refill the tank. - The site design should include a safe access route for fire appliances to manoeuvre within the site (including turning circles). An alternative access point and approach route should be provided and maintained to enable appliances to approach from an up-wind direction. 	

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - As the majority of BESS are remotely monitored, consideration should include the fixing of an Information Box (IB) at the FRS access point. The purpose of the IB is to provide information for first responders e.g. Emergency Response Plan, to include water supplies for firefighting, drainage plans highlighting any Pollution Control Devices (PCDs) / Penstocks etc for the FRS. - Consideration of external visual indicator that allows effected area to be easily identified. <p>LFR are aware that large scale BESS is a fairly new technology, and as such risks may or may not be captured in current guidance in pursuance of the Building Regulations (as amended) and the Regulatory Reform (Fire Safety) Order 2005. This will highlight challenges the FRS have when responding to Building Regulations consultations. For this reason, we strongly recommend applying the National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) 855 Standard for the Installation of Stationary Energy Storage Systems</p>	
National Gas Transmission			
National Gas Transmission	Electrical interference	National Gas Transmission operates 3 high pressure gas pipelines in the vicinity of the proposed solar farm. The site boundary doesn't appear to encroach on the pipelines or easements, but there is a potential risk of electrical interference from the proposed solar farm and battery energy storage systems. The developer will need to provide an earthing report and electrical risk assessment to	Noted. Engagement with National Grid Transmission is ongoing.

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		<p>show that the potential transfer voltages to the pipelines are within safe levels, and pre and post energisation surveys may be required. I would be happy to arrange a meeting with the developer to discuss the project</p>	
<p>National Gas Transmission</p>		<p>National Gas Transmission exercises its right to place a Holding Objection to the above proposal which will cross our High-Pressure Gas Pipeline.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We would draw your attention to the Planning (Hazardous Substances) Regulations 1992, the Land Use Planning rules and PADHI (Planning Advise for Developments near Hazardous Installations) guidance published by the HSE, which may affect this development. • To visit the Land Use Planning site, please use the link below: https://www.hse.gov.uk/landuseplanning/methodology.htm • No buildings should encroach within the Easement strip of the pipeline • No demolition shall be allowed within 150 metres of a pipeline without an assessment of the vibration levels at the pipeline. Expert advice may need to be sought which can be arranged through National Gas Transmission. • National Gas Transmission has a Deed of Easement for each pipeline which prevents change to existing ground levels, storage of materials. It also prevents the erection of permanent / temporary buildings, or structures. If necessary National grid will take action to legally enforce the terms of the easement. Internal to Wipro 	<p>Noted.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • You should be aware of the Health and Safety Executives guidance document HS(G) 47 "Avoiding Danger from Underground Services", and National Gas Transmission's specification for Safe Working in the Vicinity of National Gas Transmission High Pressure gas pipelines and associated installations - requirements for third parties T/SP/SSW22. You should already have received a link to download a copy of T/SP/SSW/22, from our Plant protection Team, which is also available to download from our website. • To view the SSW22 Document, please use the link below: https://www.nationalgrid.com/uk/gas-transmission/document/113921/download • A National Gas Transmission representative will be monitoring the works to comply with SSW22. • To download a copy of the HSE Guidance HS(G)47, please use the following link: • http://www.hse.gov.uk/pubns/books/hsg47.htm • National Gas Transmission will also need to ensure that our pipelines access is maintained during and after construction. • Our pipelines are normally buried to a depth cover of 1.1 metres however; actual depth and position must be confirmed on site by trial hole investigation under the supervision of a National Gas Transmission representative. Ground cover above our pipelines should not be reduced or increased. • If any excavations are planned within 3 metres of National Gas Transmission High Pressure Pipeline or, within 10 	

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		<p>metres of an AGI (Above Ground Installation), or if any embankment or dredging works are proposed then the actual position and depth of the pipeline must be established on site in the presence of a National Gas Transmission representative. A safe working method must be agreed prior to any work taking place in order to minimise the risk of damage and ensure the final depth of cover does not affect the integrity of the pipeline.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excavation works may take place unsupervised no closer than 3 metres from the pipeline once the actual depth and position has been confirmed on site under the supervision of a National Gas Transmission representative. Similarly, excavation with hand held power tools is not permitted within 1.5 metres from our apparatus and the work is undertaken with NGT supervision and guidance. 	
National Gas Transmission	Pipeline Crossings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where existing roads cannot be used, construction traffic should ONLY cross the pipeline at locations agreed with a National Gas Transmission engineer. • All crossing points will be fenced on both sides with a post and wire fence and with the fence returned along the easement for a distance of 6 metres. • The pipeline shall be protected, at the crossing points, by temporary rafts constructed at ground level. No protective measures including the installation of concrete slab protection shall be installed over or near to the National Gas Transmission pipeline without the prior permission of National Gas Transmission. National Gas Transmission will need to agree the material, the dimensions and method of 	Noted.

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		<p>installation of the proposed protective measure. The method of installation shall be confirmed through the submission of a formal written method statement from the contractor to National Gas Transmission.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please be aware that written permission from National Gas Transmission is required before any works commence within the National Gas Transmission easement strip. • A National Gas Transmission representative shall monitor any works within close proximity to the pipeline to comply with National Gas Transmission specification T/SP/SSW22. Internal to Wipro • A Deed of Indemnity is required for any crossing of the easement including cables 	
National Gas Transmission	Cables Crossing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cables may cross the pipeline at perpendicular angle to the pipeline i.e. 90 degrees. • A National Gas Transmission representative shall supervise any cable crossing of a pipeline. • An impact protection slab should be laid between the cable and pipeline if the cable crossing is above the pipeline. • Where a new service is to cross over the pipeline a clearance distance of 0.6 metres between the crown of the pipeline and underside of the service should be maintained. If this cannot be achieved the service must cross below the pipeline with a clearance distance of 0.6 metres. <p>All work should be carried out in accordance with British Standards policy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BS EN 13509:2003 - Cathodic protection measurement techniques 	Noted.

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BS EN 12954:2001 - Cathodic protection of buried or immersed metallic structures – General principles and application for pipelines • BS 7361 Part 1 - Cathodic Protection Code of Practice for land and marine applications. 	
National Gas Transmission	National Gas Transmission – High Risk Response Letter	An assessment has been carried out with respect to National Gas Transmission plc's apparatus and the proposed work location. Based on the location entered into the system for assessment the area has been found to be within the High Risk zone from National Gas Transmission plc's apparatus and you MUST NOT PROCEED without further assessment from Asset Protection.	Noted.
National Gas Transmission	National High Pressure Gas Pipelines	<p>BEFORE carrying out any work you must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ensure that no works are undertaken in the vicinity of our gas pipelines and that no heavy plant, machinery or vehicles cross the route of the pipeline until detailed consultation has taken place. - Carefully read these requirements including the attached guidance documents and maps showing the location of apparatus. - Contact the landowner and ensure any proposed works in private land do not infringe National Gas Transmission's legal rights (i.e. easements or wayleaves). If the works are in the road or footpath the relevant local authority should be contacted. - Ensure that all persons, including direct labour and contractors, working for you on or near National Gas Transmission's apparatus follow the requirements of the 	Noted.

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		<p>HSE Guidance Notes HSG47 - 'Avoiding Danger from Underground Services' This guidance can be downloaded free of charge at http://www.hse.gov.uk</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In line with the above guidance, verify and establish the actual position of mains, pipes, cables, services and other apparatus on site before any activities are undertaken. 	
<p>National Gas Transmission</p>	<p>National High Pressure Gas Pipelines</p>	<p>DURING any work you must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ensure that the National Gas Transmission requirements are followed for work in the vicinity of High pressure pipelines including the supervision of the digging of trial holes. - Comply with all guidance relating to general activities and any specific guidance for each asset type as specified in the Guidance Section below. - Ensure that access to National Gas Transmission apparatus is maintained at all times. - Prevent the placing of heavy construction plant, equipment, materials or the passage of heavy vehicles over National Gas Transmission apparatus unless specifically agreed with National Gas Transmission in advance. - Exercise extreme caution if slab (mass) concrete is encountered during excavation works as this may be protecting or supporting National Gas Transmission apparatus. - Maintain appropriate clearances between gas apparatus and the position of other buried plant. 	<p>Noted.</p>

Statutory Consultee		Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
National Gas Transmission	Letter pages 153-157	<p>NGT has three feeder mains located within the vicinity of the Order limits near Scopwick and Kirkby Green however these are currently located to the East outside of the Order limits. The closest pipeline is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Feeder Main 24 – Hatton to Silk Willoughby 		Noted.
National Grid				
National Grid	Electricity Infrastructure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ NGET's Overhead Line/s is protected by a Deed of Easement/Wayleave Agreement which provides full right of access to retain, maintain, repair and inspect our asset ▪ Statutory electrical safety clearances must be maintained at all times. Any proposed buildings must not be closer than 5.3m to the lowest conductor. NGET recommends that no permanent structures are built directly beneath overhead lines. These distances are set out in EN 43 – 8 Technical Specification for "overhead line clearances Issue 3 (2004)". ▪ If any changes in ground levels are proposed either beneath or in close proximity to our existing overhead lines then this would serve to reduce the safety clearances for such overhead lines. Safe clearances for existing overhead lines must be maintained in all circumstances. ▪ The relevant guidance in relation to working safely near to existing overhead lines is contained within the Health and Safety Executive's (www.hse.gov.uk) Guidance Note GS 6 "Avoidance of Danger from Overhead Electric Lines" and all relevant site staff should make sure that they are both aware of and understand this guidance. 		Noted. This will be taken account of in the ongoing design and management plans.

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Plant, machinery, equipment, buildings or scaffolding should not encroach within 5.3 metres of any of our high voltage conductors when those conductors are under their worse conditions of maximum “sag” and “swing” and overhead line profile (maximum “sag” and “swing”) drawings should be obtained using the contact details above. ▪ If a landscaping scheme is proposed as part of the proposal, we request that only slow and low growing species of trees and shrubs are planted beneath and adjacent to the existing overhead line to reduce the risk of growth to a height which compromises statutory safety clearances. ▪ Drilling or excavation works should not be undertaken if they have the potential to disturb or adversely affect the foundations or “pillars of support” of any existing tower. These foundations always extend beyond the base area of the existing tower and foundation (“pillar of support”) drawings can be obtained using the contact details above. ▪ NGET high voltage underground cables are protected by a Deed of Grant; Easement; Wayleave Agreement or the provisions of the New Roads and Street Works Act. These provisions provide NGET full right of access to retain, maintain, repair and inspect our assets. Hence we require that no permanent / temporary structures are to be built over our cables or within the easement strip. Any such proposals should be discussed and agreed with NGET prior to any works taking place. 	

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ground levels above our cables must not be altered in any way. Any alterations to the depth of our cables will subsequently alter the rating of the circuit and can compromise the reliability, efficiency and safety of our electricity network and requires consultation with National Grid prior to any such changes in both level and construction being implemented. 	
National Highways			
National Highways	Site Access and Boundary	It is noted that the site will not be accessed directly from the SRN and is located far enough from the SRN that there should be no physical impacts to our network. Consequently, we would have no comments regarding site access or boundary matters.	N/A
	Operation - Traffic Impacts	It is anticipated that during normal operations vehicle trips to the site for maintenance purposes will be minimal. In view of this, we are unlikely to have any concerns relating to traffic impacts on our network once the site is operational, particularly considering the distance from our network.	N/A
	Construction - Traffic Impacts	According to the scoping document, construction is indicatively scheduled to commence in 2026 and last for approximately 48 months across two phases. This will be followed by a commissioning period of approximately six months. It is stated that a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) and Environmental Statement	Consultation with National Highways is ongoing to determine the potential impact of construction traffic on the SRN

Statutory Consultee		Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		<p>(ES) will be produced to provide further details on the proposed construction activities.</p> <p>The Environmental Statement will include a Traffic & Transport chapter informed by a transport assessment. National Highways is appropriately listed as a key consultee in this regard. The scoping report however suggests a study area to include the B1189, B1188, B1191, and A15. Routes managed by National Highways are not mentioned. Whilst it may not be necessary to include the Strategic Road Network in the detailed study area, National Highways will require information on the number of HGVs that will be travelling on the SRN to transport materials and equipment to the site. We also require an understanding of the time of day they will likely be arriving and leaving. Information regarding the access and exit routes and arrival/departure times of workers during the construction period should also be provided to enable sufficient understanding and management of construction traffic and to minimise impacts on the SRN.</p> <p>The above information is necessary to understand the potential impact of construction traffic on the SRN and whether it will be necessary to include any parts of the SRN in the study area for the transport assessment.</p>		
NATS Safeguarding				
NATS	Technical safeguarding	The proposed development has been examined from a technical safeguarding aspect and does not conflict with our safeguarding criteria. Accordingly, NATS (En Route)		Noted.

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		<p>Public Limited Company (NERL) has no safeguarding objection to the proposal.</p> <p>However, please be aware that this response applies specifically to the above consultation and only reflects the position of NATS (that is responsible for the management of en route air traffic) based on the information supplied at the time of this application. This letter does not provide any indication of the position of any other party, whether they be an airport, airspace user or otherwise. It remains your responsibility to ensure that all the appropriate consultees are properly consulted.</p> <p>If any changes are proposed to the information supplied to NATS in regard to this application which become the basis of a revised, amended or further application for approval, then as a statutory consultee NERL requires that it be further consulted on any such changes prior to any planning permission or any consent being granted.</p>	
Natural England			
Natural England	Impact of the proposed development on designated sites:	The proposal is unlikely to adversely impact any European or internationally designated nature conservation sites or nationally designated sites and has not triggered a current Natural England Impact Risk Zone.	N/A
Natural England	In-Combination/ Cumulative impacts	The Environmental Statement should include in-combination/cumulative assessment of the whole development proposal. Section 7 of the EIA Scoping Report discusses the need for cumulative assessment, and	Noted. Further engagement will be held with Natural England to agree the developments to assess as part of the

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		<p>the methodology to be used in this assessment. Natural England would like to note the significant number of Solar projects currently proposed in Lincolnshire and the East Midlands. These projects include Cottam Solar Project, West Burton Solar Project, Tillbridge Solar Project, Heckington Fen Solar Project, Gate Burton Solar Project, Mallard Pass Solar Project. As such, it is important that all possible cumulative impacts from these projects on the environment are considered within the ES.</p>	<p>cumulative assessment for the ES. Preliminary assessment of intra-project effects and inter- project effects are included within Chapter 6 and Chapter 15,</p>
<p>Natural England</p>	<p>Loss of Agricultural Land (BMV)</p>	<p>Section 6.6.5 indicates that national level data shows the site contains a high proportion of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) agricultural land. It is also noted that an ALC survey is currently underway across the site, which is welcomed. This should normally be at a detailed level, e.g. one auger boring per hectare, (or more detailed for a small site) supported by pits dug in each main soil type to confirm the physical characteristics of the full depth of the soil resource, i.e. 1.2 metres. The survey should cover the entire site, including any proposed cable routes. In order to both retain the long-term potential of this land and to safeguard all soil resources as part of the overall sustainability of the whole development, it is important that the soil is able to retain as many of its many important functions and services (ecosystem services) as possible. The following issues should be considered and included as part of the Environmental Statement (ES):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The degree to which soils would be disturbed, damaged or lost as part of the development. This should include a 	<p>Agricultural land survey has been undertaken of the Site at one auger per hectare. Further detail is provided in Chapter 10 of the PEIR.</p> <p>Agricultural land classification survey will be undertaken of the cable route location once this has been refined to inform the ES.</p> <p>Agricultural land and soil will be managed through the construction and operational phase by the implementation of a soil management plan. An outline soil management plan will be submitted in support of the DCO.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		<p>breakdown of temporary and permanent impacts to soils (including amounts and proportions of BMV land) from all parts of the development, including, but not necessarily limited to: Solar PV panel areas, substations and other associated infrastructure, cable routes and biodiversity enhancement areas.</p> <p>- The ES should set out details of how any adverse impacts on BMV agricultural land can be minimised through site design. The results of the ALC survey should be used to influence the site design; areas of BMV land should be avoided wherever possible. - The ES should also set out details of how any adverse impacts on soils can be avoided or minimised and demonstrate how soils will be sustainably used and managed, including consideration of areas for green infrastructure or biodiversity net gain. The aim will be to minimise soil handling and maximise the sustainable use and management of the available soil to achieve successful after-uses and minimise offsite impacts. A Soil Management Plan should be used to prevent unacceptable impacts to the soil resource on the site</p>	
<p>Natural England</p>	<p>Regionally and Locally Important Sites</p>	<p>The ES should consider any impacts upon local wildlife and geological sites, including local nature reserves. The ES should set out proposals for mitigation of any impacts and if appropriate, compensation measures and opportunities for enhancement and improved connectivity with wider ecological networks. Consultation should therefore take place with the Ecology Officers for Lincolnshire County Council. Non-statutory consultees such as the Wildlife</p>	<p>Noted. Consultation meetings have been undertaken with North Kesteven District Council, Lincolnshire County Council and Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust and will be ongoing to inform the design and ES.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		Trusts should also be approached; we note the stated intention to consult Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust.	
Natural England	Protected Species	The ES should assess the impact of all phases of the proposal on protected species. We note preliminary surveys have taken place and that the ES will provide details of any proposed mitigation measures required. Consideration should be given to the wider context of the site, for example in terms of habitat linkages and protected species populations in the wider area. Natural England's standing advice ¹ provides guidance on how protected species should be dealt with in the planning system. The Standing Advice should not be treated as giving any indication or providing any assurance in respect of European Protected Species (EPS) that the proposed development is unlikely to affect the EPS present on the site; nor should it be interpreted as meaning that Natural England has reached any views as to whether a licence may be granted.	<p>The design principles are to avoid habitats of high ecological value and enhance/ or create habitats and linkages/wildlife corridors to mitigate habitat loss and provide benefit to priority and notable species.</p> <p>The surveys have/and will follow best practice guidelines. Further targeted surveys may need to be carried out once design details are confirmed to inform impact and inform the design and mitigation in order to avoid adverse impact. Natural England's Discretionary Advice Service will be sought if any advice on survey methods and/or if any EPS licences are likely required.</p>
Natural England	Biodiversity Net Gain	The ES should include a Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment and Habitat Management Plan. We note the intention to include a LEMP, which should encompass the information required to explain how the site will continue to be managed for the lifetime of the development. In Addition, the Habitat Management Plan (or LEMP) should also provide details on: - Retention and enhancement of existing habitat features such as hedgerows, woodland and ponds;	Noted: A Outline LEMP and BNG assessment will be produced and submitted in support of the DCO.

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ensuring created habitats establish and any remedial actions should they fail to establish initially; - proposed habitat connectivity to surrounding habitats which would contribute to the wider Nature Recovery Network. <p>The EIA Scoping Report notes that a substantial net gain in biodiversity will be achieved, however, no specific reference to Biodiversity Net Gain, or use of the DEFRA Metric, has been made. We recommend that a biodiversity Net Gain assessment is carried out, using the Defra Biodiversity Metric 4.0, to quantify the gains created for biodiversity. ¹ https://www.gov.uk/protected-species-and-sites-how-to-review-planning-proposals Although government intends to mandate measurable biodiversity net gain for all new development at present there is no mandatory requirement to do this for NSIPs until 2025. We therefore advise that taking the net gain approach would make this development exemplary and would be illustrative of the intent to work to benefit the environment through development. Natural England would be pleased to advise on any plan of action regarding BNG. Please be advised that the Defra metric should not be used to assess impacts and calculate compensation for habitat damage or loss in designated sites or irreplaceable habitats. Any impacts on such habitats and sites should be assessed in accordance with planning policy and via the environmental assessment.</p>	
Natural England	Impact on Protected and	The proposal is not located within or in the distinctive setting of the Lincolnshire Wolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Nonetheless, the ES should include an	Chapter 9 considers local landscape character with reference to National Character Areas and local landscape

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
	Local Landscapes	<p>assessment of local landscape character through the consideration of the relevant National Character Areas and any local landscape character assessments. We would expect the following forms of guidance to be used.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ‘Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment’ (3rd Edition) (GLVIA3), Landscape Institute and Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment, 2013; • ‘An Approach to Landscape Character Assessment’, Natural England, 2014: and • ‘Visual Representation of Development Proposals Technical Guidance Note’ 06/19, Landscape Institute, 2019. 	<p>character assessments. Relevant best practice guidance documents including those highlighted here are referenced as appropriate in Chapter 9 of the PEIR.</p>
Natural England	Connecting People with Nature	<p>Measures to help people to better access the countryside for quiet enjoyment and opportunities to connect with nature should be considered. Such measures could include reinstating existing footpaths or the creation of new footpaths, cycleways, and bridleways. Links to other green networks and, where appropriate, urban fringe areas should also be explored to help promote the creation of wider green infrastructure. Access to nature within the development site should also be considered, including the role that natural links have in connecting habitats and providing potential pathways for movements of species. Relevant aspects of local authority green infrastructure strategies should be incorporated where appropriate. We note there is an extensive network of public rights of way within the site which link with the surrounding settlements. We would expect access to these to be retained and</p>	<p>Existing Public Rights of Way within the Site will be retained.</p> <p>Based on feedback from non-statutory consultation, the Proposed Development is exploring several Rights of Way improvements and permissive paths within the Site to connect existing routes and settlements. Further information is detailed within Chapter 2 of the PEIR.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		temporary diversions placed as necessary. There may also be opportunities for new permissive paths and linkages to existing paths, as well as for improving the interpretation of the countryside, the solar project and the biodiversity enhancements that it may bring, via the use of measures such as interpretation boards.	
Natural England	Further Information	Annex A Provides Natural England's general advice on the scope of all Environmental Impact Assessments (EIA). Should the proposal be amended in a way which significantly affects its impact on the natural environment then, in accordance with Section 4 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006, Natural England should be consulted again. We would be happy to comment further should the need arise but if in the meantime you have any queries, please do not hesitate to contact us. For any queries relating to the specific advice in this letter please contact Robbie Clarey at @naturalengland.org.uk or on . Please send any new consultations or further information on this consultation to consultations@naturalengland.org.uk.	Noted. Engagement is ongoing with Natural England.
Newark & Sherwood District Council			
Newark & Sherwood District Council	No comment	I can advise that Newark & Sherwood District Council have no comments to make on the Environmental Impact Assessment Scoping Report (by RSK Environmental Limited Dated March 2023).	N/A

Statutory Consultee		Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
NHS Lincolnshire Integrated Care Board				
NHS Lincolnshire Integrated Care Board	No comment	NHS Lincolnshire Integrated Care Board does not have any comments to make.		N/A
Norfolk County Council				
Norfolk County Council	No comment	Give then location of the development I can confirm that the County Council does not have any comments to make on this project		N/A
North East Lincolnshire Council				
North East Lincolnshire Council	No comment	I can confirm there are no comments to make.		N/A
North Kesteven District Council				
North Kesteven District Council	Consultation	Paragraph 5.8 of the advice note recommends that applicants undertake their own non statutory consultation with the consultation bodies, or others, prior to submission of a Scoping Request to allow for refinement of options ahead of the formal request. It notes that applicants may choose to consult on preferred sites or solutions.		Non-statutory consultation was undertaken in January – March 2023 prior to the submission of the EIA Scoping Report.
North Kesteven	Scoping	Paragraph 5.9 then cautions that applicants should consider carefully the best time to request a scoping opinion, and that “in order to gain the most benefit,		Noted. Further detail on the reasonable alternatives and design options are presented in the PEIR.

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
District Council		<p>applicants should consider requesting the opinion once there is sufficient certainty about the design of the Proposed Development and the main design elements likely to have a significant environmental effect”</p> <p>Continuing, it advises that applicants “should avoid submitting requests with multiple and varied design and layout options” however that if this cannot be avoided and options remain under consideration (for example a number of route corridors associated with a proposed linear development) “applicants should be aware that this may affect the ability of the Planning Inspectorate and consultation bodies to provide detailed comments”. Finally, paragraph 5.9 notes that “should a high level of uncertainty remain around key design elements of the Proposed Development this is likely to limit the Planning Inspectorate’s ability to agree to scope out aspects/matters to enable the refinement of the ES”</p>	
North Kesteven District Council	Design Parameters	<p>Paragraph 2.2.7 notes that further detail on draft design approach that is being used to inform the EIA is presented in Section 2.4 and that design parameters will be further developed for statutory consultation and presented in the PEIR, with final parameters and limits of deviation presented in the ES, draft order and works plans. Whilst we accept that design parameters and layout will evolve as the scheme progresses, as above the Council’s view is that there is insufficient detail across the collective Scoping Report including its Appendices to provide any meaningful feedback even in relation to preliminary design considerations.</p>	Noted. Preliminary design parameters are detailed within this PEIR.

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
North Kesteven District Council	National Grid Substation	<p>Paragraph 2.3.2 confirms that elements of the proposals will be permanent; notably the National Grid Substation. The NGS is confirmed as a component of the scheme at paragraph 2.4.1. The applicant will need to ensure that the respective sections of the ES dealing specifically with the NGS acknowledge and address this matter when applying significance criteria and the overall assessment of effects. In many cases the emerging overall assessment, where presented in the Scoping Report, highlights the temporary/reversible nature of the development when drawing those initial conclusions however clearly this will not be the case for the NGS.</p> <p>Mindful that the NGS is likely to be permanent operational development that is not decommissioned at/ahead of the 40-year lifetime of the solar park, the Council considers it likely that this will increase the prospect and probability that the solar park would seek repowering or partial repowering beyond 40 years. Whilst we appreciate that such a scheme is not before PINS and they are required to consider the Scoping Report as submitted we would request that this potential scenario is accounted for.</p>	<p>The National Grid Substation no longer forms part of the Proposed Development. The Solar PV development including the Springwell Substation and BESS are considered to be temporary with an operational life of 40 years.</p>
North Kesteven District Council	Solar PV Mounting Structure	<p>Paragraph 2.4.7 states that the mounting structure carrying the solar PV modules will be designed to face southwards on a single-axis tracker or on a tracking platform. Both options should be considered specifically in the context of LVIA, glint and glare and noise. Paragraphs 2.4.17, 23, 25,</p>	<p>As detailed in the Proposed Development description presented in Chapter 2 of PEIR, fixed mounting structure is the only option that is proposed. Tracking panels have since been discounted following</p>

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		34, 37, & 43 – as above there are significant unknowns in terms of the location, layout and composition of the BOSS, BESS and NGS. It is clear that different configuration options are currently being considered for the inverters, transformers and switchgears. 4 The ES will need to assess all options being considered at this stage (e.g. string or centralised inverters; independent outdoor or contained indoor equipment) and any potential impacts arising from each of these (e.g. noise, landscape and visual impact, etc) until or unless a decision is taken on which option would be used in advance of completing the ES.	further design development and environmental surveys.
North Kesteven District Council	Lighting	Paragraph 2.4.61 states that the NGS compound, Project Substation compound, BESS compounds, and Collector Compounds would include lighting, in accordance with relevant standards, but will not be permanently lit. Whether scoped in or out of the ES, external lighting should be assessed in a lighting assessment to include consideration of glare, glow, lux levels and consideration of Environmental Zone (ILE standards) source intensity levels relative to the countryside location of the site.	Further information on lighting will be included within the ES.
North Kesteven District Council	Borrow Pits	Paragraph 2.5.9 states that borrow pits might be used to source construction material. The relevant chapters of the ES must consider associated impacts, e.g. in relation to minerals impacts/potential sterilisation, groundwater/hydrology, noise/vibration, residential amenity, ecology and restoration of the pits. If proposed, the borrow	No borrow pits are proposed as part of the Proposed Development.

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		pits must be included within the proposed Order Limits of the development.	
North Kesteven District Council	National Grid Substation	With reference to paragraph 2.7.4, as above the NGS is expected to be a permanent feature that needs to be factored into the overall assessment of impacts.	The National Grid Substation no longer forms part of the Proposed Development.
North Kesteven District Council	Alternatives	This section is focussed solely on alternative layouts and the 'no development' scenario; for example at paragraph 3.2.3 which states that 'the size, scale, and preferred location for key features (permanent and temporary) of the Proposed Development will require careful consideration as the design process evolves'. There is no specific reference to alternative sites, nor the degree to which the various environmental or other constraints will be factored into the search parameters in order to identify and potentially rule out (with evidence) what those alternatives are. It is accepted that the grid connection option is a key locational factor for solar farms however unlike the other known registered and pending NSIP solar schemes in Lincolnshire which have grid connection offers at existing substations via National Grid, in this case the export of energy requires a new NGS as part of the DCO. The Scoping Report states that up to two new 400kV transmission towers are needed to facilitate the electrical connection of the National Grid Substation to the existing 400kV transmission line and that the towers would be located within 50m of the existing 400kV overhead transmission line which crosses Springwell West. On this basis, in the absence of any other	Noted. A summary of alternatives has been included within Chapter 3 of this PEIR. Further detail will be presented in the ES, the Statement of Need and the Planning Statement as part of the DCO submission.

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		<p>discussion or supporting information in the Scoping Report the 'reasonable alternatives' site search area is theoretically anywhere in a linear corridor along the identified 400kV circuit; which therefore encompasses expansive areas of land not only within the District but also outside the District and potentially beyond the Lincolnshire county boundary (in theory, nationally given this is an NSIP project and therefore locational need factors are not relevant and any other 400kV powerline network could potentially act as a connection point for a new national grid connection). 5 The search area proposed by the Council in relation to Heckington Fen Solar Park was county-level (in the context of NSIP-scaled solar farms registered with PINS in the West Lindsey/Bassetlaw and South Kesteven/Rutland districts) and in consideration of the grid connection options associated with those schemes. We requested that evidence should be provided from the National Grid confirming whether and why alternative connections into existing substations (for example Bicker Fen, Cottam, Ryhall, Spalding) could not be secured. In the Council's view the approach to considering alternative sites should initially start with the applicant evidencing why grid connections into these substations cannot be made. This should not be on the basis of simply ruling those out on the basis of an excessive grid connection distance; but to provide written evidence from National Grid of an inability to offer a connection point on capacity or other infrastructure grounds and the earliest timescale, where applicable, that an offer might be made. If this can</p>	

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		<p>evidenced, the second element of that exercise is to then consider alternatives on the 400Kv circuit (which passes through Springwell West) and which (as above) is in theory of considerable length. The assessment should have regard to environmental constraints including BMV land impacts and should not focus solely on land that is 'not BMV', but rather also areas that comprise lesser proportions of BMV. In terms of the 'site specific' consideration of alternatives (without prejudice to our comments in relation to alternative sites) we consider that the exercise also needs to consider alternative site layouts within Springwell east, central and west including potentially a reduction in MW generating capacity aligned with location of the respective Agricultural Land Classification Grades in order to demonstrate avoidance or minimisation of agricultural land impacts. As currently proposed we do not consider that the applicants proposed assessment of alternatives (in part by reference to Appendix B) is sufficient.</p>	
North Kesteven District Council	Consultation	Paragraph 4.2.6 states that as part of the EIA process, the applicant will consult with a range of statutory and non-statutory consultees. Whilst noting that the subsequent list is not exhaustive, it does not include the MOD/DE/DIO, Internal Drainage Board, and RAF Cranwell and Waddington	Noted.
North Kesteven	Design iterations	Paragraph 4.3.1 notes that as the detailed design of the Proposed Development is still emerging, as are the environmental surveys and assessments required to	Further detail on the study area for each environmental factor is included within the PEIR.

Statutory Consultee		Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
District Council		<p>support the planning and EIA process, the Scoping Report is provided based on the information available at the time of writing. It then advises that any changes to the scope of the EIA will be reported in the ES to reflect design and layout iterations and changes to reflect ongoing engagement. Paragraph 4.4.1 then notes that the study areas for respective chapters have been defined individually for each environmental factor, taking into account the geographic scope of the potential impacts relevant to that factor and the information required to assess those impacts. The Council does not support this approach and we would refer you back to PINS Advice Note 7 as referred to above.</p> <p>Table 4.1 sets out a series of mitigation measures for example offset/buffer distances from ecological receptors and noise separation distances to residential property. However, it is unclear how these have been defined and as such justification should be presented in the ES. In addition, the 'Land and Soils' section of that table states that 'The design of the Proposed Development will seek to retain fields comprising majority Grade 1 or Grade 2 agricultural land within arable production where possible'. However, there is no reference to sub-grade 3a (which also comprises BMV agricultural land) or commitment to either retain or reduce impacts thereto (see also below)</p>		<p>Good design has been a fundamental consideration from the outset. The project principles have been identified to ensure good design outcomes are embedded within the Proposed Development from the very start. These will be tested and refined as part of the EIA and DCO process.</p> <p>The design of the Proposed Development has been guided by the below principles to help reduce the use of higher grade agricultural land, where practicable. All fields comprising solely of Grade 1 or 2 land within the site will remain in arable production. Prioritise the use of BMV land for arable production where practicable. Prioritise the use on non-BMV land for the creation of legacy / permanent habitats where practicable.</p>
North Kesteven	Local Plan and Neighbourhood Plan	Paragraph 4.10.2 states that 'Enhancement measures will be assessed in accordance with steps set out in the National Planning Policy Framework'. This should be		The Proposed Development will be assessed in accordance with the relevant policies and will be part of the individual

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
District Council		expanded to the range of national and local policy and guidance statements including the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan (2023) (including associated evidence base reports) and the Scopwick and Kirkby Green Neighbourhood Plan.	ES chapters and assessed within the Planning Statement as part of the DCO application.
North Kesteven District Council	Glint and Glare	Paragraph 5.2.3 suggests that glint and glare can be excluded from the scope of the EIA, however, that a detailed stand-alone glint and glare assessment will be undertaken and submitted in support of the DCO Application, considering ground-based (residential dwellings, road, and rail) and airborne (airfields, Air Traffic Control Towers, and approaching aircrafts) receptors. Whilst each case must be considered on its merits, glint and glare impacts were scoped into the ES for the Heckington Fen Solar Farm however the Planning Inspectorate agreed that aviation impacts could be excluded. Mindful of the use of airspace above and around Springwell by the three RAF bases referred to, we recommend that PINS seek the advice of those bases in relation to potential glint and glare impacts, not least given that paragraph 2.4.7 references the potential use tracking panels. The March 2023 consultation draft 'National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy Infrastructure (EN-3)' states at paragraph 3.10.12 that 'Utility-scale solar farms are large sites that may have a significant zone of visual influence' and that 'the two main impact issues that determine distances to sensitive receptors are therefore likely to be visual amenity and glint and glare.' At this	A preliminary assessment of Glint and Glare has been presented in Chapter 14 of the PEIR.

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		<p>stage, in the absence of any detailed or indicative site layout options we would request that glint and glare is scoped into the ES. There are large concentrations of residential property as identified in the 'Appendix C – Environmental Features Plan' in particular around the northern edge of Scopwick, Kirkby Green, the southern and eastern edges of RAF Digby and at more scattered isolated dwelling and farmstead locations throughout the study area and where the suggested DCO/red line boundary immediate abuts those locations or is at least in very close proximity. 7 Whether or not PINS agree with this approach we would highlight paragraph 3.10.94 of the 2023 consultation draft EN-3 which states that 'Applicants should map receptors to qualitatively identify potential glint and glare issues and determine if a glint and glare assessment is necessary as part of the application'. Paragraph 3.10.95 then notes that 'When a quantitative glint and glare assessment is necessary, applicants are expected to consider the geometric possibility of glint and glare affecting nearby receptors and provide an assessment of potential impact and impairment based on the angle and duration of incidence and the intensity of the reflection'.</p>	
<p>North Kesteven District Council</p>	<p>Major Accidents and Disasters</p>	<p>With reference to paragraph 5.4.4, the applicant also proposes to scope out the risk of major accidents and disasters, which they state will be considered throughout the design process of the Proposed Development and will include siting the potentially hazardous equipment, such as the BESS and grid infrastructure, at a suitable distance</p>	<p>A management plan for battery safety will be prepared and submitted with the DCO application in a document entitled Battery Safety Commitments (BSC). The BSC will detail the regulatory guidance reviewed to ensure that all safety concerns around the</p>

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		<p>from sensitive receptors. Whilst PINS agreed to scope out a standalone Chapter for major accidents and disasters in consideration of the Heckington Fen Solar Farm, this was on the basis that ‘that the nature, scale, and location of the Proposed Development is not considered to be vulnerable to or give rise to significant impacts in relation to the risk of accidents and major disasters’. However, whilst not implicit in that Scoping Opinion, the BESS and grid infrastructure including probable composition and site area were identified on the indicative site plan with reasonable certainty at that time. In the case of Springwell, the Appendix B – Zonal Masterplan confirms significant unknowns and uncertainty in terms of the probable locations for the collector compounds and distributed BESS, the NGS and project substation across all three parcels. Some of these areas abut or are very close to concentrations of residential property or isolated dwellings and the A15. The degree of uncertainty and variability of layout at this stage suggests that the risk of accidents and disasters should be scoped in and where the applicant’s suggestion that this risk can be ‘designed out’ through subsequent design and layout iterations should be relied upon. A smoke plume assessment should also form part of this chapter.</p>	<p>BESS element of the Proposed Development are addressed in so far as is reasonably practicable. The BSC will be developed and agreed with Lincolnshire Fire Service, North Kesteven District Council and Lincolnshire County Council.</p>
<p>North Kesteven District Council</p>	<p>Human Health</p>	<p>Paragraph 5.6.1 states that consideration of the potential effects to human health as a result of the proposed development will be covered through the findings of other</p>	<p>N/A</p>

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		assessments undertaken as part of the EIA process. The Council agrees with this suggestion.	
North Kesteven District Council	Material Assets	Paragraph 5.7.1 defines material assets as ‘substances used in each lifecycle stage of a development, with particular focus on the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning or ‘end of first life’ (deconstruction, demounting, demolition and disposal) phases” [Ref. 5-7]. Material assets can include ‘material’ (i.e. physical resources that are used across the lifecycle of a development) and ‘excavated arisings’ (i.e. soil, rock, or similar resource generated by excavations)’	Noted.
North Kesteven District Council	Minerals and Waste	Paragraph 5.7.6 states that it is not intended to remove significant quantities of excavated arisings from the site during construction and that where possible, soil arisings will be balanced through a cut and fill exercise to retain volumes on site. However, there is no reference to the potential use of borrow pits, and relative to the Heckington Fen Solar Park the Springwell proposals are set across a significantly larger site area, with more variable topography and also comprise the NGS. Whilst the potential for minerals sterilisation is to be addressed in the ‘Land, soils and groundwater’ chapter, and other environmental effects associated with the potential use of borrow pits (for instance noise, historic environment, vibration, ecology/biodiversity) could be assessed elsewhere in other ES Chapters, the Planning Inspectorate should satisfy themselves that there is sufficient information available with	No borrow pits are proposed as part of the project. A Mineral Safeguarding Assessment will be part of the Planning Statement submitted with the DCO application.

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		the Scoping Report including the Appendix B – Zonal Masterplan to scope out this topic area.	
North Kesteven District Council	Socio-economic	Paragraph 5.8.1 states that the requirement to consider population in UK EIA practice was introduced via the 2017 update to the EIA Regulations, with impacts to population taken to refer to socio-economic impacts. There is no proposed ES chapter heading dealing solely with socio-economic impacts (instead the applicant suggests that ‘Socio-Economic Benefits Statement’ will be submitted in support of the DCO Application), however the Council suggests that there should be.	A socio-economic statement detailing both the benefits and negatives will be submitted in support of the DCO.
North Kesteven District Council	Socio-economic	Paragraph 5.8.19 states that socio-economic benefits as a result of the Proposed Development are expected with regards to the increase in the level of temporary employment; the subsequent gross value added to the economy; the uptake in the occupancy rate for beds in local hospitality venues; and a small number of long term employment opportunities during operation. The Scoping Report identifies potentially negative effects associated with the inevitable removal of land from agricultural production and that there may be businesses/tenants/occupiers currently undertaking agricultural operations across the site boundary who may cease to do so for the duration of the operational phase of the development. However, there is no reference in the proposed scope to any socio-economic benefit enduring from continued agricultural use of part or all of the site	Agricultural operations, tourism and business will be addressed within a socio-economic statement detailing both the benefits and negatives will be submitted in support of the DCO.

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
<p>North Kesteven District Council</p>	<p>Agricultural land</p>	<p>Paragraph 6.6.8 (see also below) suggests scoping in the operational impacts of the proposed development in relation to the loss of agricultural and BMV land owing to the direct impact on its availability of such land, however there is no outline of any suggested mitigation measures. For example this could include enabling some continuance of agricultural activity through sheep grazing or alternative forms of cropping among panelled areas.</p> <p>The applicant should therefore quantify whether and how there are socio-economic benefits stemming from a change from predominantly arable agricultural use of the site predevelopment to a solar and possibly pastoral use post-development. We suggest that the applicant should also identify a mechanism by which any changes in agricultural activity (and ergo any associated socio-economic effect) can be secured through the DCO process.</p>	<p>The design has included embedded mitigation to reduce the impact of loss of high quality agricultural land. Good design has been a fundamental consideration from the outset. The following Project Principles have been identified to ensure good design outcomes are embedded within the Proposed Development from the very start. These will be tested and refined as part of the EIA and DCO process.</p> <p>All fields comprising solely of Grade 1 or 2 land within the site will remain in arable production.</p> <p>8.2 Prioritise the use of BMV agricultural land for arable production where practicable.</p> <p>8.3 Prioritise the use on non-BMV agricultural land for the creation of legacy/permanent habitats where practicable.</p> <p>sought to reduce the extent of higher grade agricultural land, where practicable and to retain this for agricultural use.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
			<p>Agricultural operations will be addressed within a socio-economic statement that will be submitted in support of the DCO.</p>
<p>North Kesteven District Council</p>	<p>Walking, cycling and horse riding</p>	<p>Furthermore, Figure 7 ‘Visual Receptors’ maps the location of the ‘Stepping Out’ and ‘Spires and Steeples’ walking routes through the study area. The lack of detail relating to site layout options means that there is a potential direct impact of these walking routes becoming surrounded by solar panels and associated infrastructure.</p> <p>Walking, cycling and horse riding is a key visitor attraction/promotion for this part of the District and therefore potential socioeconomic effects and mitigation should be discussed.</p>	<p>Following further assessment work, we have avoided placing solar panels in the fields alongside the B188 and the Spires and Steeples trail to retain the views between Scopwick and Blankey. The revised area of Solar PV development is displayed in Volume 2, Figure 2-3.</p> <p>Residential visual amenity effects will be assessed within the Landscape and Visual chapter as part of the ES. Preliminary assessment is detailed within Chapter 9 of this PEIR.</p> <p>Public Rights of Way are discussed in further detail within Chapter 9 – Landscape and Visual and Chapter 12 – Traffic and Transport of the PEIR.</p>
<p>North Kesteven District Council</p>	<p>Socio-economic</p>	<p>There is limited information in the Scoping Report in relation to direct, indirect, temporary and permanent employment jobs created through construction, operation, maintenance and decommissioning. This information should be presented along with identification of;</p> <p>➤ opportunities for using local businesses on various aspects of the construction phase;</p>	<p>Employment including direct, indirect, temporary and permanent jobs will be detailed within a socio-economic statement which will be submitted in support of the DCO.</p> <p>Residential visual amenity effects will be assessed within the Landscape and Visual chapter as part of the ES. Preliminary</p>

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> > how the applicant would go about supporting local business procurement; > financial estimates of economic benefits of the construction phase to the local economy including hotel spend etc; > opportunities to encourage apprenticeships; and > financial estimates and local opportunities associated with ongoing maintenance over the 40-year operational period <p>In terms of potential economic benefits, the Council notes that an established way of calculating the extra value generated by local spend on contractors and services would be by using LM3 multipliers which the applicant might wish to consider depending on the certainty of construction contracts etc at this stage. The multiplier can be found at https://www.lm3online.com/. Finally the Council only agrees that the sensitive receptor 'population' impacts can be scoped out as long as residential visual amenity effects are assessed in full in the LVIA chapter</p>	assessment is detailed within Chapter 9 of this PEIR.
North Kesteven District Council	Water	Paragraphs 5.9.19, 5.9.23 and 5.9.32 describe how the development and utilisation of the site has the potential to result in marginal increased localised flood risk due to increases in impermeable area associated mainly with the infrastructure elements, but that the solar panels themselves will not result in a direct increase in impermeable area of the site as they will be raised above the ground level. It is also noted that only very limited parts of the site are located in flood zones 2 or 3. The Scoping	Water has been scoped in for further assessment and a preliminary assessment in provided in Chapter 13 of the PEIR.

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		<p>Report states that in light of the above, it is proposed to exclude water from the scope of the EIA, subject to ensuring no deterioration of water quality or increase in flood risk and agreeing design and mitigation measures with the Environment Agency, Lincolnshire County Council (the Lead Local Flood Authority) and the Witham First Internal Drainage Board.</p> <p>Whilst the site is primarily underlain by limestone bedrock with some areas of sandstone, mudstone and siltstone, suggesting that infiltration methods might be appropriate, nevertheless the Council is aware that geotechnical and ground investigations have yet to be undertaken. On the basis of that uncertainty, and given the site area is significant with a number of possible site layout options not least the potential location of the BESS and NGC as well as their associated drainage requirements (impermeable surfacing), we consider that 'water' should be scoped in as a specific chapter in the ES. The Planning Inspectorate should therefore defer to the drainage consultees prior to scoping out this chapter, not least given the significant variability identified.</p>	
North Kesteven District Council	Electric, magnetic and electromagnetic fields	Section 5.10.3. quotes Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy (BEIS) guidance, which alongside the 1998 guidelines published by International Commission on Non – Ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) states that underground cables and overhead power lines at voltages up to and including 132 kV are not capable of exceeding the ICNIRP exposure guidelines. However, there is no	Noted. Consultation with the MOD and RAF Digby is ongoing.

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		<p>reference to the proposed transmission towers and 400kv NGS connection.</p> <p>RAF Digby is the HQ of the Joint Cyber and Electromagnetic Activities Group and is located immediately west of Springwell Central. Paragraph 5.10.4 states that ongoing consultation will be held with RAF Digby throughout the design of the development to avoid any interference with their operations, and that it is proposed to exclude electric, magnetic and electromagnetic fields from the scope of the EIA.</p> <p>The Scoping Report contains no discussion or analysis of potential electric, magnetic and electromagnetic field effects on the operations of RAF Digby, whether and how avoidance or mitigation of effects is to be adopted, and where the Appendix B – Zonal Masterplan identifies potentially suitable areas for the collector compounds and distributed BESS on land close to MOD property to the east of RAF Digby. As above section 5.10.3 only references ICNIRP guidelines in relation to the 132kv circuit. The Planning Inspectorate should therefore be guided by the relevant defence consultees before agreeing whether this topic should be scoped out of the ES.</p>	
North Kesteven District Council	Air Quality	We have no objection to the issues to be scoped in to the Air Quality chapter at paragraph 6.1.8. There are no references to BESS and NG substation operational impacts however we note that operational air quality was not scoped into the ES for the Heckington Fen scheme.	Human receptors have been identified within 250 of the site boundary and non-statutory designated sites have been identified within or adjacent the site. An assessment of the dust emissions arising from construction and decommissioning

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		<p>IAQM guidance advises the need for a construction dust assessment if there are human receptors within 50m of the boundary of the site, or within 50m of construction vehicle trackout routes, and if there are ecological receptors within 50m of the site boundary or the trackout routes. Whilst the site DCO boundary is noted, the layout of development is still fluid and therefore the need for a dust assessment should be reserved until the location of trackout routes and access etc are confirmed</p>	<p>activities will be conducted with reference to the IAQM 2023 construction dust guidance and reported in the ES.</p>
<p>North Kesteven District Council</p>	<p>Ecology and Biodiversity</p>	<p>Please find attached detailed comments from the Council's consultant ecologist, AECOM (Appendix 1). In summary;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ There is no reference to or commitment to deliver Biodiversity Net Gain (see below) ➤ We disagree that impacts on certain LWS's can be screened out (see below) ➤ We disagree with the conclusion that there are no Ancient Woodlands impacted. The Ancient Woodland Inventory is not definitive and generally omits woodlands smaller than 2ha, therefore, the applicant should ensure that all woodlands in the zone of influence are considered. The summary survey scope (Section 6.2.4) does not identify the methods to be applied or the survey timings. As a consequence, there is insufficient information to confirm that the survey work completed to date is appropriate and sufficient. <p>Reptile surveys will be needed if the habitats of relevance cannot be avoided as indicated and the great crested newt survey scope does not confirm that the off-site ponds located within 500m of the proposed development have</p>	<p>Response provided in full in the below section.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		<p>been surveyed for this species There is no reference to Wildlife and Countryside Act Schedule 1 bird species or notable flora and we disagree that the need for wintering bird surveys can be scoped out</p> <p>The reference to ‘barns’ at 6.2.2 (preliminary bat roost assessments) should be extended to ‘buildings’ given that these might also be used for roosting.</p> <p>Paragraph 6.2.9 states that impacts on LWS’s at Blankney Brick Pit LWS, Temple Road Verges, Welbourn to Braucewell 2 LWS, Slate House Farm to Dunsby Pit Plantation 1 LWS, Green Man Road to Cuckoo Lane 2 LWS and Bloxholm Wood LWS/Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust reserve are to be scoped out as they ‘are avoided by the current Proposed Development design’. However, as above no layout options have been presented and as such it is not confirmed that impacts have been avoided.</p> <p>Furthermore the paragraph states that the scheme will incorporate a minimum offset distance of 15m from Local Wildlife Sites however it is unclear how this 15m distance has been derived relative to the characteristics of each LWS. The Council therefore considers that they should be scoped into the assessment.</p> <p>Whilst paragraph 6.2.10 states that opportunities for ecological enhancement within the site are diverse, it also states that no specific enhancement measures have yet been agreed and that a detailed biodiversity design will be produced and implemented outlining how a substantial net gain in biodiversity will be achieved. Paragraph 3.10.119 of the 2023 draft EN-3 confirms that solar proposals should</p>	

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		<p>aim to achieve environmental and biodiversity net gain in line with the ambition set out in the Environmental Improvement Plan and any relevant measures and targets, 'including statutory targets set under the Environment Act or elsewhere'. A minimum BNG of 10% is therefore required although it is anticipated that development of this scale will be able to deliver considerably in excess of this. The applicant is advised that Local Ecological Network, Biodiversity Opportunity and Green Infrastructure Mapping, along with the Local Nature Recovery Strategy has been prepared for Central Lincolnshire by the Greater Lincolnshire Nature Partnership. These maps and strategies identify the known existing areas of high biodiversity value and areas of local biodiversity priority where it is considered most important and feasible to target habitat creation, extension and restoration. The applicant should refer to these in the formulation of BNG proposals.</p>	
<p>North Kesteven District Council</p>	<p>Climate</p>	<p>Paragraph 6.3.2 states that GHG emissions 'will be estimated based upon project-specific data that may relate to activities outside the Site boundary (e.g., water provision and wastewater treatment outside of the Site boundary, or the embodied carbon within construction materials and solar PV modules as a result of the energy used for production). The Council requests that GHG emissions should also account for the replacement of panels and any other operational/infrastructure elements during the lifetime of operation, and the applicant should also address</p>	<p>Full life cycle assessment if GHG emissions has been undertaken. Further information is detailed within Chapter 7 of the PEIR.</p> <p>Methods to increase in-situ carbon sequestration will be considered within the ongoing design and detailed within the ES.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		<p>'alternatives' in the context of GHG offset to reflect revised layouts or overall energy generation capacity in relation to BMV land considerations (see below). This must include manufacture, shipping etc.</p> <p>The approach to the assessment should consider the full life-cycle of the proposed development and potential sources of GHG emissions. GHG emissions offset through the production of lower carbon electricity compared to grid average emissions during the operational phase should also be accounted for within the GHG emissions calculations.</p> <p>The ES should incorporate sufficient detail on emissions calculations (estimated and actual) to cover pre-construction, construction phase, life time (including operational and maintenance) and decommissioning. Ideally this should include the expected payback period for all estimated emissions and ensure ongoing emissions are calculated during the lifetime of the proposal (est. 40 years).</p> <p>The Council also requests consideration of methods to increase in-situ carbon sequestration from effectively leaving the land fallow for the expected 40 years (in the absence of any details of agricultural land impact 'mitigation' at this stage). This could include low growing plants (e.g. sweet yellow clover and vetches) as part of a BNG strategy that could assist with increasing the organic content of the soil and locking carbon.</p>	

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
North Kesteven District Council	Cultural Heritage	<p>With reference to paragraph 6.4.1 the applicant should also liaise with the Heritage Trust of Lincolnshire (on behalf of the Council) in relation to the scope of and timing of any intrusive evaluation following completion of the geophysical survey. The Scoping Report states that Lincolnshire County Council has also approved a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) for geophysical survey of the site. This was not discussed or agreed in advance with North Kesteven District Council and therefore we reserve the right to make representations on its scope.</p> <p>With reference to paragraph 6.4.2, we recommend that a 5km buffer from the site boundary should include both designated and non-designated heritage assets (NDHA).</p>	Scope and timing of further evaluation still being discussed with North Kesteven District Council and Lincolnshire County Council.
North Kesteven District Council	Local and neighbourhood plan	<p>Paragraph 6.4.3 'Data sources to inform the EIA baseline characterisation' makes no reference to the Council's local list of non-designated heritage assets and its criteria for assessment. A copy of the latest list can be provided on request. In addition there is no reference to the 'made' Scopwick and Kirkby Green Neighbourhood Plan which contains schedules and descriptions of heritage assets within the Plan area. Whilst there are no Conservation Area appraisals for Blankney and Scopwick there is a high level character summary contained at Appendix 9 of the archived 2007 NKDC Local Plan which whilst prepared some time ago still serves as a source of information.</p>	Neighbourhood Plan has informed the DBA and Stage 1 Setting assessment.
North Kesteven	Archaeology	Paragraph 6.4.6 notes that additional mitigation to off-set adverse impacts will take the form of a programme of	The scope and timing of further evaluation following the geophysical survey is still

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
District Council		archaeological investigation and recording secured by a DCO Requirement. The Council is aware that on-site geophysical survey work is anticipated to be completed by the end of April. Pending the results of those surveys the Council cannot yet agree that a programme of archaeological investigation can be deferred to a DCO Requirement, and we caution that pre-submission trial trenching will likely be required in at least some parts of the site.	being discussed with Lincolnshire County Council and North Kesteven District Council.
North Kesteven District Council	Cultural Heritage	Paragraph 6.4.8 lists the receptors/matters to be scoped into the assessment however this does not include the Conservation Areas at Scopwick, Blankney or Bloxholm. Furthermore it does not reference or confirm NDHAs to be assessed – which as above should be within 5km and should ideally include proactive identification and assessment using adopted Council guidance – see Local List of Non-Designated Heritage Assets North Kesteven District Council (n-kesteven.gov.uk)	Conservation Areas included in the DBA and Stage 1 Setting Assessment. The DBA and Stage 1 Setting Assessment has used a 2km study area for non-designated assets and 5km for designated assets in line with Lincolnshire County Council guidance.
North Kesteven District Council	Cultural Heritage	Paragraph 6.4.9 proposes to scope out setting impacts on listed dwellings within settlements over 1km from the site. We disagree with this suggestion as there is no assessment contained in the Scoping Report to support this and to justify why and how the 1km reference has been derived. The reference just to ‘dwellings’ rather than ‘buildings’ is also unclear. It is also unclear why listed K6 kiosks have been singled out for consideration.	All heritage assets within 2km and all designated heritage assets within 5km have been included in the DBA and Stage 1 Setting Assessment. Those sensitive to change within their setting have been filtered for detailed assessment based on a worst case ZTV for the Proposed Development.

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		<p>In the absence of detailed layout options and a plan of the HER entries applicable to the site area (those entries referred to/summarised in paragraph 6.4.9), the Council is also unable to agree to the schedule of HER entries proposed to be scoped out. There is no spatial mapping of these entries contained within the Scoping Report and we will need to review this information in conjunction with Lincolnshire County Council before commenting further. The assets proposed to be scoped out of assessment at paragraph 6.4.9 are not supported by an evidence base and appear to be piecemeal and based largely on setting effects (rather than an assessment of the significance of the asset and the likely impact of the proposals) or on the type of record (for example findspots). Any proposal to 'descope' designated or relevant non-designated assets must be informed by an evidence base demonstrating the lack of direct or indirect impact upon the heritage asset and its significance.</p> <p>The Settings Assessment/Heritage Impact Assessment needs to demonstrate an understanding of the significance and context of each of those assets in order to assess the impact of the development upon them and propose any mitigation.</p> <p>In terms of archaeological considerations, detailed feedback is provided by the Council's archaeological consultant, the Heritage Trust of Lincolnshire (HTL) in the attached Appendix 2. In summary HTL comment that the proposals for construction of a solar farm will necessarily have an impact on any buried archaeological remains.</p>	<p>The scope and timing of further evaluation following the geophysical survey is still being discussed with Lincolnshire County Council and North Kesteven District Council.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		<p>Piling, building foundations, cable trenching, access roads, building compounds and construction traffic are all known impacts and the cumulative effect will be significant; therefore, trial trenching is required to establish the baseline conditions and to understand the nature and extent of the impacts on the archaeological remains.</p>	
<p>North Kesteven District Council</p>	<p>Archaeology</p>	<p>Paragraph 6.4.4 suggests that trial trenching might not be required and 6.4.6 states instead that archaeological investigation and recording could be secured by a DCO Requirement. However, HTL comment that there is currently insufficient information on the presence, character, date and significance of any archaeological deposits and that the results of the full desk-based assessment including the aerial photographic and Lidar assessments together with the results of the geophysical survey will need to inform the programme of trial trench evaluation. Mitigation through archaeological excavation may be required. Without detailed information on the archaeological potential and the likely impact of the proposals, mitigation by means of a 'watching brief' during construction is not considered acceptable as a first response. The section entitled 'Opportunities for enhancing the environment' (6.4.10) has not considered the positive and / or beneficial effects of the programme of archaeological surveys and investigations to be undertaken during this process and the added value that a large development can make to archaeology and cultural heritage. The programme of archaeological works should</p>	<p>The scope and timing of further evaluation following the geophysical survey is still being discussed with Lincolnshire County Council and North Kesteven District Council.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		include proposals for community outreach, public engagement and dissemination of the results.	
North Kesteven District Council	Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment	<p>We would refer the applicant to the jointly-procured detailed feedback provided by AAH on behalf of Lincolnshire County Council and North Kesteven District Council contained in Appendix 4, 'Technical Memorandum 1: AAH TM01'. AAH generally agree with the approach advocated for the LVIA chapter but note that the final locations of viewpoints are still to be reviewed by the applicant and will need to be agreed with LCC, NKDC and other relevant stakeholders. The final viewpoint selection should also consider views of taller and more conspicuous elements, such as battery storage or sub-stations once the layout is more developed, as well as considering potential key, or sensitive, viewpoints. The relative prematurity of the submission and the large number of variables and options in terms of site layout mean that no illustrative viewpoints have been provided at scoping stage.</p> <p>AAH request that photomontages are produced to illustrate the proposals at different phases namely the existing situation (baseline), Operational (year 1) and Residual with planting established (10 to 15 years). AAH also advise that the methodology should also clearly lay out the process of assessing temporary and permanent elements of the scheme, and the LVIA should clearly identify those elements that would not be decommissioned at the end of the life of the development (such as the National Grid substation), and assessed accordingly</p>	<p>Comments provided by AAH Consultants have been addressed separately above. Further consultation on the viewpoints has been undertaken with AAH Consultants (on behalf of North Kesteven District Council/Lincolnshire County Council) resulting in a letter dated 15th August 2023 confirming that the viewpoint selection was 'proportional to the project and extent of potential visual receptors.' Photomontages will be presented for a selection of these in the ES. The number, location and type of visualisation for each viewpoint will be agreed through ongoing consultation with AAH Consultants before submission of the ES. Visualisations will be prepared in accordance with the stated guidance and illustrate effects in Year 1 and Year 10.</p> <p>A detailed methodology for the LVIA is set out in Appendix 9.1 and the ES will clearly identify those elements of the Proposed Development which would not be decommissioned at the end of the operational period.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
<p>North Kesteven District Council</p>	<p>Landscape and Visual Impact</p>	<p>Paragraph 6.5.2 states that based on analysis of the ZTVs (Figures 1-3) and field work undertaken to date, 'it is considered unlikely that there would be any view of the solar array or collector compounds/distributed BESS beyond 3 km of the Site boundary'. It is therefore suggested that a 3 km study area offset from the boundaries of the site is adequate and proportionate for the consideration of landscape and visual effects. The same paragraph notes that any visibility of the National Grid and Project Substation would be limited to a maximum distance of 5 km from the site.</p> <p>We note though that, whilst each case must be assessed on its merits relevant to the surrounding topography, a 5km study area for the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) was proposed in relation to the Heckington Fen solar farm and where in that case the maximum height of built infrastructure was markedly lower than the National Grid and Project Substation proposed at Springwell.</p> <p>AAH comment that at this early stage, the proposed study area extents should be discussed and further reviewed as the full extent of potential visibility of the development is not yet fully known, and the ZTV mapping contained within Appendix F of the Scoping Report does identify potential visibility beyond these extents. The ZTV mapping would need to be updated once the proposals have developed (as stated within paragraph 13.5) and the study area should</p>	<p>The study area has been discussed through further consultation and on 15th August 2023 AAH Consultants (on behalf of North Kesteven District Council/Lincolnshire County Council) confirmed that 'The proposed 3km study area is appropriate from the solar PV development and 5km from the National Grid and Project Substation and National Grid connecting towers. However, the LVIA should clearly state the justification for these study areas, and thoroughly assess and confirm no significant views are available from beyond the study area. Also, as it is not confirmed as to whether the National Grid Substation and National Grid connecting towers are to be included within the redline boundary, and if so both the final location and design of these elements, and the Project Substation, is yet to be confirmed, therefore while every effort has been made to accommodate this with the viewpoint selection, additional viewpoints and extension of the 5km study area may be required subject to confirmation of these aspects.'</p>

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		<p>not be fixed until the full extents of visibility are known from both desktop and site work. It therefore seems appropriate to assume a (minimum – TBA) 5km study area across the scheme rather than a reduction to 3km for the solar array or collector compounds/distributed BESS.</p> <p>The data sources and policy considerations referred to in paragraph 6.5.3 should be revised to the 2023 adopted CLLP and where Appendices B and D in particular of the Scopwick and Kirkby Green Neighbourhood Plan 2021 – 2036 should be referred to alongside the Design Code by way of considering any impacts on key views and green gaps.</p>	<p>The National Grid Substation and connecting towers no longer form part of the Proposed Development. The ZTVs demonstrate that in the worst case scenario there would be negligible visibility of the Proposed Development beyond the study area proposed above. Any landscape or visual effects beyond this distance would not be significant. For the purposes of the PEIR the above study area has been adopted but will be reviewed again once the final layout is fixed before completion of the ES. Updates to policy documents have been noted.</p>
<p>North Kesteven District Council</p>	<p>Landscape and Visual Impact</p>	<p>Paragraph 6.5.5 states that ‘There are no tourist attractions or recognised viewpoints from which the Proposed Development may be visible’, however these attractions and viewpoints are seemingly not defined or mapped. The ‘decommissioning’ references in paragraph 6.5.6 do not refer to the retention of the NGS and associated infrastructure as permanent development, and the degree to which additional (secondary and tertiary) mitigation will be formulated to reflect this.</p>	<p>Figure 9.3 in the PEIR identifies all relevant visual receptors in the study area. Once details of the National The National Grid Substation and connecting towers no longer form part of the Proposed Development. The ES will clearly identify those elements of the Proposed Development which would not be decommissioned at the end of the operational period.</p>
<p>North Kesteven District Council</p>	<p>Landscape and Visual Impact</p>	<p>Sections 6.5.8. and 6.5.9. identify a range of potential visual receptors to be scoped in or out of the LVIA, however at this early stage of the project we request these be reviewed and consulted upon further once proposals</p>	<p>The scope of the LVIA and the receptors/matters to be scoped in and out of the assessment are reviewed in Chapter 9 of the PEIR.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		<p>have been developed and we are not in a position to confirm their inclusion or omission. It is assumed that the reference at paragraph 6.5.8 to 'Residents of the barracks at RAF Digby' means all MOD residential property.</p> <p>As above, on the basis that no further information has been provided to date to justify that significant landscape and visual effects arising from the solar array/collector compounds/distributed BESS and NGS/PS would be limited to 1km and 3km respectively, we cannot yet agree that assessments of impacts on users of the PRowS/local road network and residential properties should be restricted to those distances.</p> <p>In addition it is not clear how the applicant will define a developed footprint or settlement curtilage by way of assessing impacts on residents and visitors to the villages of Scopwick, Kirkby Green, Blankney and Ashby De La Launde vs 'isolated' properties. As a minimum maps 2a and 2b contained in the Scopwick and Kirkby Green Neighbourhood Plan should be used however the Council would wish to agree the study area for all named settlements including Blankney and Ashby De La Launde.</p> <p>In terms of residential visual amenity, paragraph 6.5.11 quotes from Technical Guidance Note 02 / 19 'Residential Visual Amenity Assessment (RVAA) and states that the LVIA will present, as an appendix to the main assessment, a residential amenity assessment of visual effects on residential properties for any property where there is a possibility that the visual effects may approach the 'public interest' (harm) threshold referred to in the guidance.</p>	<p>All residents (including all MOD residential property) are considered in the LVIA where relevant.</p> <p>Refer to the response above regarding the LVIA study area.</p> <p>Hard boundaries around settlements are not defined – for the avoidance of doubt all residential receptors are considered in the LVIA where relevant.</p> <p>RVAA as defined in Technical Guidance Note 02 / 19 'Residential Visual Amenity Assessment (RVAA) is concerned with the circumstances of individual (or groups) of residential properties. However as noted above and for the avoidance of doubt all residential receptors are considered in the LVIA where relevant. For those properties included in the RVAA, the visual effects on the access/egress from the property is part of the consideration of overall visual amenity.</p> <p>The work undertaken to date on residential visual amenity is presented in Appendix 9.5 and this appendix also establishes the proposed methodology for the assessment to be presented in the ES.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		<p>The RVAA should not focus solely on individual or groups of properties however should consider the magnitude of change to residential amenity on a 'settlement scale' basis taking account not only of fixed address points but also the experiences of residents of those settlements when travelling into and around those areas. This is notwithstanding that the 2019 RVAA guidance (paragraph 4.8) states that 'Properties are normally assessed individually, but if their outlook and / or views are in all aspects the same (for example if a development is visible from the rear gardens only of a small row of houses) they could be assessed as one (group)'. This is particularly relevant to Scopwick, Kirkby Green and Ashby de la Launde where the suggested site area/Order Limits overlap with most of the roads and rights of way passing into and through those settlements meaning that (depending on buffer zones and detailed layouts) there may be limited visual relief and separation from extensive unbroken arrays of panels, experienced on a 'day to day' basis and a potentially overbearing or overwhelming residential amenity impact felt across the lifetime of the development.</p> <p>The absence of any detailed layouts prevents further feedback at this stage and we therefore wish to agree the scope of the assessment further. Paragraph 1.8 of the 2019 RVAA guidance states that 'Judgements formed in respect of Residential Visual Amenity should not be confused with the judgement regarding Residential Amenity because the latter is a planning matter'.</p>	

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		<p>The 2019 guidance focusses generally on ‘living conditions’ associated with views and impacts from fixed points/addresses. In addition paragraph 4.14 recommends describing and evaluating the predicted magnitude of visual change and related visual amenity effects for properties, rather than potentially settlement-wide ‘experiential’ residential impacts for residents who, whilst individually may not experience significant adverse affects associated with outlooks or changes of view from their property may be unable to disconnect with a sense of potential ‘enclosure’ by development in and around where they live, work or spent recreational time.</p> <p>Strict adherence to 2019 RVAA guidance to the detriment of residential amenity (as opposed to residential visual amenity) may therefore not be appropriate in this case.</p>	
North Kesteven District Council	Agricultural Land	Appendix 3 contains advice from the Council’s agricultural consultant, Landscape. Paragraph 6.6.4 of the Scoping Report confirms that whilst a walkover survey of the site and surrounding area has been undertaken as part of the baseline assessment (20 - 21 October 2022), an Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) survey has not yet been concluded as is underway to provide confirmation of ALC across all areas of the site.	The outputs of the Agricultural Land Classification survey are detailed within Chapter 10 of the PEIR.
North Kesteven District Council	Agricultural Land	Paragraph 3.10.14 of the March 2023 consultation draft ‘National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy Infrastructure (EN-3)’ states that ‘Where the proposed use of any agricultural land has been shown to be necessary,	Agricultural land survey has been undertaken of the Site at one auger per hectare in line with Natural England ‘Technical Information Note TIN049:

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		<p>poorer quality land should be preferred to higher quality land (avoiding the use of “Best and Most Versatile” agricultural land where possible)’. The confirmation that ALC surveying is still underway across the site reinforces the Council’s concerns regarding the prematurity of this scoping submission and the failure to align layout options (including the more permanent or semi-permanent infrastructure elements) to maximise the use of non-BMV land.</p> <p>The ALC survey has been commenced without reference to or agreement with the Council (in terms of its scope) and as such we reserve the right to request additional augering or analysis depending on the results presented in due course. We note that the percentages of BMV land across the site calculated to date using the National Level Data show that 32.8% of the Site is Grade 2 land (497Ha) and 67.2% of the Site is classified as Grade 3 land (1,020Ha). It is therefore probable that a further substantial hectareage is comprised of Grade 3a ‘good’ quality agricultural land pending the outcome of the ALC survey. The report notes that the Natural England ‘Technical Information Note TIN049: Agricultural Land Classification: protecting the best and most versatile land, 2nd edition (2012)’ will be used for the purposes of assessment, and mindful that ALC survey is underway without prior consultation with the Council we would highlight that TIN049 recommends a frequency of one boring per hectare for a detailed assessment. It is also important that the ALC survey is undertaken in line with the MAFF 1988 guidelines.</p>	<p>Agricultural Land Classification: protecting the best and most versatile land, 2nd edition (2012)’.</p> <p>Agricultural land classification survey will be undertaken of the cable route location to inform the ES.</p> <p>Further detail on Agricultural Land Classification results is provided in Chapter 10 – Land, Soils and Groundwater of the PEIR. Further information on the alternatives in relation to BMV land is provided in Chapter 3 of the PEIR.</p> <p>The design has included embedded mitigation to reduce the impact of loss of high quality agricultural land. Good design has been a fundamental consideration from the outset. The following Project Principles have been identified to ensure good design outcomes are embedded within the Proposed Development from the very start. These will be tested and refined as part of the EIA and DCO process.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		<p>Without prejudice, and mindful that the National Level Data mapping envisages a composition of Grade 2 and 3 land only, the Council considers that any information presented in the ALC assessment would not be representative if undertaken below the augering frequency suggested in Technical Advice note 49.</p> <p>According to available published data and local knowledge, the soils locally are mainly Marcham 343e and Aswarby 512a Soil Associations. Both of these soils are limestone based, with shallow well drained loamy soils, over limestone and deeper brown earths. Occasionally there are heavier clay soils present of the Curdrige 841a Association.</p> <p>Previous ALC surveys locally on these soils and similar have indicated a mixture of Grades 2, 3a and 3b land. It is likely that the shallower soils will be 3b, whilst deeper soils will be 3a or Grade 2, even with some areas of Grade 1.</p> <p>The ALC should identify where BMV land is and the scheme should seek to protect and minimise damage to higher grade land wherever possible in line with national planning policy.</p> <p>Without prejudice to the ALC survey the Council's view is that there is undoubtedly a large proportion of BMV land in this vicinity and only a full ALC will identify where it is and what the Grade and quality is. Laboratory analysis of representative samples should be used to determine textures.</p> <p>Either the 'Land, Soils and Groundwater' or the 'Ecology and Biodiversity' chapter of the ES should also consider the</p>	<p>All fields comprising solely of Grade 1 or 2 land within the site will remain in arable production.</p> <p>Prioritise the use of BMV land for arable production where practicable.</p> <p>Prioritise the use on non-BMV land for the creation of legacy / permanent habitats where practicable.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		<p>interplay between agricultural and ecological/BNG impacts – and therefore the degree to which effects are temporary/reversible. There is evidence that organic matter builds up in biodiversity areas at a faster rate than arable farmland and this may benefit the land, but it is not a factor in the assessment of ALC. Long term, where biodiverse land becomes ecologically important there is the possibility of land becoming assigned with environmental designations, such as SSSI status, though generally this has not so far occurred on other solar sites. If land remains uncultivated for longer than five years, then permission may be required from Natural England to bring the land back into arable cultivation.</p> <p>Any material enhancement in the botanical diversity of the sward (to the extent that the application site may then be considered to be of ecological value), will limit the capacity for the land to be returned to arable use after the solar farm has been decommissioned. The EIA (Agriculture) (England) (No.2) Regulations 2006 prohibit the physical or chemical cultivation of what are considered to be ‘semi-natural areas’. ‘Cultivation’ is not clearly defined and does not necessarily require land to have been ploughed and therefore there is a possibility that areas of environmentally ‘enhanced’ land within the site may not be permitted to return to arable farmland after the 40 year period.</p> <p>The ‘alternatives’ exercise also needs to consider alternative site layouts and potentially a reduction in MW generating capacity aligned with location of the respective ALC Grades once the report has been analysed, in order to</p>	

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		<p>demonstrate avoidance or minimisation of agricultural land impacts as recommended in paragraph 3.10.14 of the March 2023 draft EN3.</p>	
<p>North Kesteven District Council</p>	<p>Agricultural Land</p>	<p>Paragraph 6.6.6 makes no reference to the avoidance of BMV land in the scheme’s approach to additional (secondary and tertiary) mitigation. This is in conflict with the above draft EN-3 document. Paragraph 6.6.7 ‘description of likely significant effects’ simply sets out that it is ‘anticipated that there will be a reduction in the availability of BMV land’ without any commitment to minimise or avoid those effects through ongoing review of the scheme layout. The same paragraph suggests that the majority of the land use will be short-term and temporary, some will be long-term but temporary (construction and operation) and some will be permanent (for example the National Grid substation).</p> <p>Mindful that the NGS is likely to be permanent operational development that is not decommissioned at/ahead of the 40-year lifetime of the solar park, the Council considers it likely that this will increase the prospect and probability that the solar park would seek repowering or partial repowering beyond 40 years. Whilst we appreciate that such a scheme is not before PINS and they are required to consider the Scoping Report as submitted we would request that this potential scenario is accounted for not least with reference to whether any residual BMV impacts are able to be classed as temporary/reversible. There is no reference in the Scoping Report as to whether and how agricultural land</p>	<p>The design has included embedded mitigation to avoid the loss of high quality agricultural land. Good design has been a fundamental consideration from the outset. The following Project Principles have been identified to ensure good design outcomes are embedded within the Proposed Development from the very start. These will be tested and refined as part of the EIA and DCO process.</p> <p>All fields comprising solely of Grade 1 or 2 land within the site will remain in arable production.</p> <p>Prioritise the use of BMV land for arable production where practicable.</p> <p>Prioritise the use on non-BMV land for the creation of legacy / permanent habitats where practicable.</p> <p>Further detail is included in Chapter 10 of this PEIR. Further information will be included within the ES.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		<p>use continuance across the site is to be delivered alongside the operation of the solar farm. This should be addressed in the ES chapter and should include;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Acknowledging the proposed change from primarily arable farming to solar ➤ Whether any pastoral farming (for example sheep grazing) is proposed within the site, and if so where and how this is to be secured. This should include; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • identifying whether contracts are in place for pastoral farming; • whether those contracts span the operational duration of the scheme (40 years minimum); and • whether and how the applicant considers that such contractual obligations, and more broadly, a change from one type of agricultural activity (pre-development) to another (post-development) could be legally secured, monitored and enforced through the DCO regime – for example through the use of Requirements/legal agreement ➤ For all other areas within the site whether or how those areas will remain in agricultural activity with the presence of solar panels and BNG habitat/landscaping implementation <p>In order to satisfy Schedule 4 (7) of The Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 the applicant must be able to identify and arguably secure any measures relied upon to avoid, prevent, reduce or, if possible, offset any identified significant adverse effects; not least where this is partly relied upon by any proposed change in agricultural activity across the site.</p>	<p>Noted in relation to the structure of the Outline Soil Management Plan. This will be provided in support of the DCO.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		<p>As a general observation, this part of Lincolnshire/North Kesteven District is a mainly arable farming area with only limited sheep grazing operations. Whilst it is possible to graze the areas under and between the panels, it is unlikely to be very cost effective for a grazier. The difficulties of rounding up sheep and handling them, together with finding sick or wounded animals makes the grazier's workload harder and more complex. As such the economics of moving sheep to and from the site will be marginal. Grass does not tend to grow well under the panels themselves and there are often areas that are dry and barren or that only host weed species, due to heavy shading.</p> <p>Grazing management is also not easily compatible with standard biodiversity management practices at Solar Photovoltaic sites due to fundamental population biology principles. As the site is in arable production at present, currently it may have a relatively low level of biodiversity (although see the comments submitted by AECOM in Appendix 1). The grazing management plan may, therefore, lead to a modest increase in species richness at the site from current base levels, but it will not deliver the level of biodiversity that the site could potentially achieve if biodiversity gains were prioritised over agricultural production.</p> <p>By grazing land for agricultural livestock production, the level of disturbance is high. This prevents plant species with a slow establishment rate (which often are those which are ultimately strong competitors) from growing – and thus the invertebrates that feed on these species are also</p>	

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		<p>excluded from the area. Areas which promote high species diversity often use low intensity grazing as a means to promoting biodiversity.</p> <p>Grazing represents a form of disturbance to the area, thus preventing any one species becoming too dominant. It also helps manage the sward to provide an optimum habitat for invertebrates.</p> <p>Stock densities are generally monitored and adjusted to prevent either under and overgrazing and to ensure the sward contains a mix of long and short vegetation with some plants in flower. There is therefore some conflict between maintaining the land in agricultural production and improving biodiversity. Whilst not incompatible, site based issues, such as soil type(s) and local agricultural practices may therefore pose conflicts which the relevant ES chapter/s should assess.</p> <p>Landscape also advise that the ES contains a farm holdings impact statement with reference to the farm holdings affected by the proposal and which addresses viability, infrastructure and long term consequences on the individual holding. Finally, Landscape note that paragraph 2.6.9 commits to submitting an Outline Soils Management Plan (oSMP) with the DCO Application and they recommend that the oSMP is structured to include the headings contained in their Appendix 3 advice, not least to address soil structural issues and waterlogging that has occurred on solar farms elsewhere in the UK.</p>	

Statutory Consultee		Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
North Kesteven District Council	UXO	With reference to paragraph 6.6.8 we would recommend seeking the advice of the defence consultees regarding the possible need to scope in the potential for UXO around RAF Digby.		Noted. UXO assessment has been undertaken. Further detail is included in Chapter 10 of the PEIR.
North Kesteven	Mineral Safeguarding	<p>Paragraph 6.6.9 suggests that impacts on the Minerals Safeguarding Area (MSA) could be scoped out through consultation with Lincolnshire County Council (LCC) to ensure that any negative implications for the MSA is minimised. Our view is that it would be premature to scope this issue out at this stage however we would defer to Planning Inspectorate and LCC assessment.</p> <p>The development design and layout in part relies upon and needs to be informed by the findings of the Minerals Assessment and on the basis of the Appendix B zonal masterplan there is significant uncertainty as to where and whether buffer or safeguarding zones around quarries have been considered; to include Longwood and Brauncewell Quarries.</p>		A Mineral Safeguarding Assessment will be part of the Planning Statement submitted with the DCO application.
North Kesteven District Council	Noise and Vibration	With reference to paragraph 6.7.4, the Planning Inspectorate are advised that the baseline approach adopted at Heckington Fen included reference to Professional Practice Guidance on Planning and Noise (ProPG, Association of Noise Consultants, Institute of Acoustics, Chartered Institute of Environmental Health, 2017)', BS 5228 Parts 1 and 2 (British Standard Institute, 2009, amended 2014) and BS 4142 (British Standard Institute, 2014 amended 2019). The same paragraph notes that monitoring will be undertaken in the form of long-term		Noise baseline methodology was agreed with North Kesteven District Council in advance of the survey work. Further detail is included in Chapter 11 of the PEIR.

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		<p>noise measurements, typically of 1-week duration, in order to quantify the existing noise environment and sources of noise impacting the assessment receptors and would encompass continuous periods throughout daytime and night, accounting for the likely operational times of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>The Council wishes to agree both the location and timing of background noise monitoring locations to take account of issues such as the seasonality of land use (harvest), traffic peaks/school holidays (road traffic noise) and whether there are any concentrations of airspace use for example by RAF Waddington, Cranwell and Coningsby. The applicant has recognised mineral extraction activity from Brauncwell Quarry (off A15) and Longwood Quarry (off Long Wood Lane) however should check with those operators whether there are any peaks or patterns of quarrying activity which might also influence baseline noise assessment.</p>	
North Kesteven District Council	Noise and Vibration	Paragraph 6.7.7 does not refer to any noise associated with possible use of tracking panels. This option has not yet been ruled out and therefore the noise chapter of the ES needs to consider operational noise associated with motors, plant and equipment associated with the pivoting and rotation of panels. Cumulative noise impacts may then need to be assessed stemming from the creation of variable 'corridors' down which noise could pass depending on the alignment of panels at different times of the day.	Tracker panels have since been discounted from the Proposed Development and therefore have not been assessed within the PEIR.

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		<p>This should also account for the operational noise generated by substations, inverters and other noise-emitting plant and equipment relative to those corridors and the off-site sensitive receptor locations. In addition the paragraph doesn't specifically refer to noise associated with borrow pits although this is inferred through reference to earthmoving.</p> <p>The 'Decommissioning Assessment' section of paragraph 6.7.11 doesn't refer to the permanent retention of the NGSS.</p>	
<p>North Kesteven District Council</p>	<p>Traffic and Transport</p>	<p>Paragraph 6.8.4 suggests referencing relevant DfT traffic count data for the B1188, B1189, B1191 and A15 links with regard to construction traffic routeing to each respective access. Solar panels and components will potentially arrive via east coast ports and therefore the ES should also factor in construction vehicle impacts along the A17 corridor unless otherwise scoped out in consultation with the Highway Authority.</p> <p>This should include cumulative construction (and where relevant operational) effects associated with Triton Knoll, Viking Link, Heckington Fen solar (including works to Bicker Fen Substation), Beacon Fen solar, Temple Oaks solar and the Lincolnshire Reservoir depending on the timeframes of those projects. TCPA (1990) projects requiring cumulative assessment of transport effects include the Sleaford West and potentially the Sleaford South SUEs (A17/A15 corridor), along with the Lincoln</p>	<p>Traffic and Transport matters are addressed in Chapter 12 of the PEIR.</p> <p>Full transport assessment will be undertaken and provided within the ES.</p> <p>Further consultation with North Kesteven District Council and Lincolnshire County Council to agree the final short list for inclusion in the ES.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		<p>South East Quadrant (SEQ) SUE which sits alongside parts of the A15 and B1188.</p> <p>We agree that operational transport impacts can be scoped out of the ES as noted in paragraph 6.8.9.</p> <p>There is an extensive network of public rights of way (PRoW) within the site which link with the surrounding settlements. Opportunities to create new and expanded routes that would improve access and links between settlements should be considered with potential additional public footpaths and bridleways created as part of the development.</p> <p>Any such routes should not utilise routes used for construction or maintenance activities and be a minimum width of 4m for public footpaths and 5m for public bridleways. Any fencing alongside a public path should be open mesh construction and not close board timber fencing or metal palisade to avoid the creation of a narrow claustrophobic environment.</p> <p>Any new routes to be created should look to be formally adopted as part of the Definitive Rights of Way network rather than permissive routes which could potentially be removed at any point during the life of the project. If permissive routes are proposed then details should be provided of the mechanisms to be adopted to ensure these remain in place for the duration and life of the development.</p> <p>The applicant should also investigate the potential to deliver/accommodate the elements of the Scopwick/Kirkby Green to Metheringham Railway Station Community</p>	

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		<p>Projects detailed in Appendix A of the SKGNP where these are located within the DCO boundary.</p>	
<p>North Kesteven District Council</p>	<p>Cumulative Effects</p>	<p>Paragraphs 7.1.16 and 7.1.17 of the Scoping Report state that in order to be taken forward for cumulative effects consideration, NSIP or DNS development, transport infrastructure developments, approved energy infrastructure developments and other forms of development must lie within the Zone of Influence of the Proposed Development. The Zol is then defined as the study area for each environmental factor considered in the EIA for the Proposed Development and that the environmental factor-specific study areas, and appropriate justifications for these study areas, will be provided in the ES. The Scoping Report states that the search area for forming the long list of other existing development and/or approved developments will be based on the greatest Zol in terms of distance.</p> <p>This approach is not accepted by cross reference to a number of the Zols expressed elsewhere in the Scoping Report. For the avoidance of doubt the Council suggests that cumulative effects associated with BMV agricultural land impacts (i.e. in relation to ‘Land, soils and groundwater’) should as a minimum include all of the NSIP solar projects in Lincolnshire at Heckington Fen, Beacon Fen, Tillbridge Solar, Temple Oaks, Cottam, West Burton, Gate Burton and Mallard Pass along with BMV agricultural land impacts associated with the Lincolnshire Reservoir. We reserve the right to highlight other projects as and when these become known and can advise how these</p>	<p>Chapter 15 of the PEIR sets out the Cumulative effects, methodology for carrying out the assessing and Zone of Influence for each Environmental Factor. This is a preliminary assessment is based on publicly available information at the time.</p> <p>Further consultation with North Kesteven District Council and Lincolnshire County Council to agree the final short list for inclusion in the ES.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		<p>might be treated with reference to Table 2 of Advice Note Seventeen 'Cumulative effects assessment relevant to nationally significant infrastructure projects'. Depending on the LVIA ZTVs associated with the projects located within the North Kesteven District there are not anticipated to be any cumulative LVIA impacts however some cumulative transport impacts associated with construction phases might occur across the North Kesteven and South Kesteven/Rutland solar NSIP schemes depending on respective project timescales and construction traffic routing</p>	
<p>North Kesteven District Council</p>	<p>Other Issues/ Conclusion</p>	<p>The ES should be prepared with reference to the 2023 Central Lincolnshire Local Plan which was adopted on 13th April 2023, rather than the 2017 CLLP which has now been replaced. The applicant is also advised that the proposed DCO boundary includes the allocated residential development site 'Land North of Heath Road, Scopwick' subject to Policy 12a of the SKGNP which is identified for the development of around 14 dwellings. The DCO boundary should therefore exclude this site and on a precautionary basis will need to assume development within the SKGNP Plan period in terms of sensitive receptor locations and baseline assessment where relevant to the specific ES chapters.</p>	<p>Noted. Engagement is ongoing with North Kesteven District Council.</p>
<p>North Kesteven</p>	<p>Other Issues/ Conclusion</p>	<p>In addition as set out above the revised draft NPS EN-3 expressly considers Solar Photovoltaic Generation (page 82 onwards) and is subject to a period of consultation</p>	<p>Noted. This will be presented within the Planning Statement as part of the DCO Application.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
District Council		ending on 25 May 2023. Consequently depending on the point at which the DCO is applied for, and during consideration of the application, either s104 or s105 of the Act will be engaged. Even if still in draft, the March 2023 consultation versions of EN-1 and EN-3 will be a material consideration	
North Kesteven District Council	Other Issues/ Conclusion	<p>Finally we would reiterate that this Scoping Report, dated 21 March 2023, was submitted only 2 weeks following the end of the non-statutory consultation process and our position is that this significantly compresses and restricts the opportunity for the applicant to have meaningfully considered, reflected upon, and addressed representations made during this initial non-statutory consultation and to account for how those representations have informed the scale, layout and composition of the scheme.</p> <p>On that basis our view is that this submission does not comply with the guidance set out in Advice Note Seven 'Environmental Impact Assessment: Process, Preliminary Environmental Information and Environmental Statements'. We are concerned that the timescales adopted unilaterally by the applicant – culminating in this Reg. 10 and 11 Scoping Opinion request to the Planning Inspectorate - has undermined the degree to which the information contained in the Scoping Report could be relied upon as a robust representation of the potential significant environmental effects of the proposed development.</p>	Noted.

AECOM (Ecological consultant acting on behalf of North Kesteven District Council and Lincolnshire County Council)

Statutory Consultee		Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
North Kesteven District Council	Responses to the Applicant's Scoping Questions	Do you agree with the proposed list of consultees? I consider the identified list of ecology consultees to be appropriate. The consultation with Natural England will support the conclusions in relation to potential impacts on statutory sites and requirements for Habitats Regulations Assessment		Consultation with Natural England is ongoing
North Kesteven District Council	Responses to the Applicant's Scoping Questions	Do you agree with the proposed study areas? I am in general agreement with the study areas. However, I would query (given the very limited information provided) the restriction of badger surveys to the site only given the potential for impacts on habitat accessibility and commuting routes, and consequently inter-relationships between badger clans. The study areas for national and international designations should also consider the Impact Risk Zones identified by Natural England, rather than relying solely on fixed search distances.		<p>- Only three small main setts and associated outlier setts have been identified on Site (which is considered to be a relatively low level of badger activity for the size of the Site). Pre-construction badger surveys will be carried out. The impacts on badgers will be considered in the design - with badger gates installed in the fencing where required to ensure accessibility and allow commuting routes.</p> <p>- The only SSSI Impact Risk Zone which covers the western side of the Site is for High Dyke SSSI (3.6km SW of the Site). Planning applications which are considered potentially of concern for air pollution are listed as: aviation, livestock and poultry units, slurry lagoons and digestate stores and manure stores.</p>
North Kesteven	Responses to the Applicant's	Do you agree that the data sources listed to inform the EIA baseline characterisation are appropriate? I agree with the data sources identified		N/A

Statutory Consultee		Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
District Council	Scoping Questions			
North Kesteven District Council	Responses to the Applicant's Scoping Questions	Do you agree that the surveys proposed to inform the EIA baseline characterisation are appropriate? I agree these are generally appropriate, but there are omissions. There is no specific mention of flora, but the arable landscape could support a number of scarce arable plant species of conservation concern and dependent on maintenance of cultivation regimes. As identified above there is a need for further clarity on the approach for badger. Similarly, insufficient information has been provided to agree that wintering birds can be scoped out. It is also not clear what approach is being taken in relation to the Schedule 1 bird species that could occur in the zone of influence	Consultation is ongoing with North Kesteven District Council. Arable weed survey and wintering bird surveys will be undertaken to inform the ES. See above for badger. The approach to avoid impact to Schedule 1 bird species will be detailed in the ES.	
North Kesteven District Council	Responses to the Applicant's Scoping Questions	Are any receptors/assets/resources not identified that you would like to see included in the EIA? See response to the above question. The information submitted with the Scoping Report is not sufficient to allow me to agree with the scoping assessment provided in Section 6.2.9. Supplementary information will be expected at PEIR stage.	Further information is included within Chapter 6 and within Volume 3 – Supporting reports of the PEIR.	
North Kesteven District Council	Responses to the Applicant's Scoping Questions	Do you agree with the proposed additional (secondary and tertiary) mitigation measures and is this mitigation appropriate? The identified measures seem reasonable as a starting point. It is not possible to provide a formal response to this question given the very limited information	Further information is included within Chapter 6 and within Volume 3 – Supporting reports of the PEIR.	

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		<p>provided. No reports were provided for the surveys completed in 2022. I defer further advice on this until the PEIR stage, which I anticipate will provide more comprehensive and detailed information on the work completed, the constraints identified, and potential impact pathways</p>	
<p>North Kesteven District Council</p>	<p>Responses to the Applicant's Scoping Questions</p>	<p>Do you agree with the receptors/matters that are proposed to be scoped in and out of the EIA? With certain exceptions, insufficient information has been provided to transparently explain, and therefore support and agree, the scoping of relevant ecological receptors. Further information will be required at the PEIR stage.</p>	<p>Further information is included within Chapter 6 and within Volume 3 – Supporting reports of the PEIR.</p>
<p>North Kesteven District Council</p>	<p>Responses to the Applicant's Scoping Questions</p>	<p>Do you agree with the proposed factor-specific assessment approach? The impact assessment approach based on standard good practice CIEEM methods is acceptable. The applicant should confirm that the current iteration of this guidance has been utilised. This is dated 2022, not 2018 as stated. A biodiversity net gain (BNG) assessment should be provided to demonstrate no net loss of, and a minimum 10% net gain in, biodiversity in accordance with local planning policy and to ensure consistency with other recent solar farm applications in the district. The current iteration of the good practice method is Biodiversity Metric 4.0.</p>	<p>Biodiversity net gain assessment will be undertaken and submitted as part of the DCO.</p>

Statutory Consultee		Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
North Kesteven District Council	Baseline Conditions	<p>I agree that the prevailing land use (intensive arable production) limits the scope for potential ecological impacts and offers good opportunities for biodiversity enhancement. The identified Local Wildlife Sites (LWS) of relevance are consistent with the sites identified in the online Local Plan Policies Map ('Aurora'). As the reasons for designation have not been defined in the Scoping Report it is not possible at present to agree that LWS can be screened out or that the proposed mitigation (including stand-off distances) is sufficient.</p> <p>The screening for statutory designation is likely correct but consideration should be given to the Impact Risk Zones defined by Natural England</p>		<p>The details of LWS designations are presented in the PEA reports. There are no internationally designated statutory nature conservation sites within 10km and no nationally designated nature conservation sites within 2km. As stated above, the Site is within the IRZ of High Dyke SSSI however the Proposed Development is not considered likely to impact the SSSI.</p>
North Kesteven District Council	Baseline Conditions	<p>The Scoping Report states (in Section 2.3.19) that there are no ancient woodlands (an irreplaceable habitat) in the zone of influence. This is not certain, and instead the conclusion should be (given the desk based resources utilised and the limitations of these) that there are no recorded ancient woodlands in the area. The Ancient Woodland Inventory is not definitive and generally omits woodlands smaller than 2ha. Therefore, the applicant should ensure that all woodlands in the zone of influence have been suitably assessed to demonstrate the absence of potential ancient woodland. Formal consultation with Natural England would be required if potential ancient woodlands are identified. In the absence of this, potential ancient woodlands should be protected in accordance with current Standing Advice¹ .</p>		<p>Noted. Potential impacts on all woodlands in the zone of influence are suitably assessed. All woodlands on Site will be protected from development (including standard 15m works buffer zones).</p>

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
North Kesteven District Council	Baseline Conditions	I found no information on veteran and ancient trees (irreplaceable habitat) in the Scoping Report. These could occur in areas of woodland, as free standing trees or in hedgerows. The presence/ absence of veteran and ancient trees should be clarified at PEIR stage. If present, such trees should be protected in accordance with current Standing Advice2 .	There have been no veteran trees identified on Site.
North Kesteven District Council	Baseline Conditions	The Scoping Report omits information on Green Infrastructure, which encompasses land identified as Biodiversity Opportunity Areas (BOAs). The online Local Plan Policies Map identifies BOAs in all three component parts of the proposed solar farm. BOAs are covered by specific planning policy (within both the current and emerging local plans) and have relevance to BNG assessment. Appendix 4 of the emerging local plan identifies the principles for development with BOAs. This should be considered and addressed by the Applicant. Further information in relation to this should be provided at PEIR stage.	Biodiversity Opportunity Areas (BOAs) will be considered in BNG assessment.
North Kesteven District Council	Baseline Conditions	The Scoping Report identifies the presence of priority hedgerows within the site. Further information should be provided on the approach taken to identifying these. I assume that Hedgerow Regulations methods have been employed to collect structured data on hedgerows, and to identify any 'important' hedgerows. I would encourage this	A hedgerow survey has been carried out in August of hedgerows which may be impacted by the Proposed Development – which includes identification of any ecologically Important Hedgerows.

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		<p>approach and would emphasise that all Hedgerow Regulations criteria should be addressed. These include heritage, landscape and wildlife criteria.</p>	
<p>North Kesteven District Council</p>	<p>Baseline Conditions</p>	<p>The Scoping Report identifies the presence of a number of priority habitats. These are priorities at the national level, as well as in terms of (as stated in Section 6.2.5) the Lincolnshire Biodiversity Action Plan. The Scoping Report identifies a suite of notable bird species of cultivated and farmed land. These bird species are likely to be affected by changes in land use and management arising from the Proposed Development. This will be a relevant consideration to address in the impact assessment and when developing the mitigation and habitat compensation strategy. In support of this, the applicant should refer to the relevant Standing Advice³</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>North Kesteven District Council</p>	<p>Study Areas and Survey Scope</p>	<p>My understanding of the site and the approach to scoping is constrained by the lack of reports for the surveys completed in 2022, including the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) report. The latter would have been a beneficial supplement to the Scoping Report. In most cases, the summary survey scope (Section 6.2.4) does not identify the methods to be applied or the survey timings. As a consequence, there is insufficient information to allow me to confirm that the survey work completed to date is appropriate and sufficient. This will need to be reviewed and agreed at PEIR stage. The approach to habitat survey does not include mention of specific</p>	<p>Details on survey methods are presented in the PEA, bird and bat reports. Condition assessment will follow Biodiversity Metric 4.04 or latest version.</p> <p>See above regarding hedgerow survey and that no veteran trees have been identified on Site.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		<p>requirements for BNG assessment i.e. Site Condition Assessment. The current best practice method for this is set out in the guidance for Biodiversity Metric 4.04 . A MoRPH assessment is likely to be required to calculate baseline river units if watercourses (with the exception of ditches) are present in or adjacent to the red line boundary. Further information is needed on the approach to hedgerow survey. As stated above, a comprehensive Hedgerow Regulations assessment is encouraged. Similarly, further information is needed on the approach to veteran and ancient tree survey.</p>	
<p>North Kesteven District Council</p>	<p>Study Areas and Survey Scope</p>	<p>The survey approach for badger needs to deliver data suitable to assess the relevant impacts and to meet requirements of Standing Advice⁵ . This includes considerations around access to foraging and watering areas, habitat connectivity (given badgers can be faithful to specific movement routes), and implications for territorial boundaries (e.g. from the erection of an extensive network of security fencing). Given the absence of detailed survey information and an understanding of main sett locations, I am not certain that surveys should be restricted to the site boundary. This should be clarified further at PEIR stage.</p>	<p>See above regarding badgers (including badger gates to allow access across the site).</p>
<p>North Kesteven District Council</p>	<p>Study Areas and Survey Scope</p>	<p>Reptile survey will be needed if the habitats of relevance cannot be avoided as indicated.</p>	<p>The area suitable for reptiles has been avoided.</p>

Statutory Consultee		Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
North Kesteven District Council	Study Areas and Survey Scope	The great crested newt survey scope does not confirm that the off-site ponds located within 500m of the proposed development have been surveyed for this species. This should be confirmed at PEIR stage.		All suitable ponds within the site have been eDNA surveyed and GCN are considered likely absent. Due to the negative results of ponds on Site and lack of records of GCN within 2km of the Site it is considered that GCN are unlikely to be present on Site.
North Kesteven District Council	Study Areas and Survey Scope	No specific mention is given to Wildlife and Countryside Act Schedule 1 bird species. A variety of such birds could occur, and not all can necessarily be encompassed within the scope of a standard breeding bird survey (e.g. due to the timing of their breeding activity). The PEIR should provide more detail on the approach to Schedule 1 birds. Relevant species will include but may not be restricted to barn owl (which may nest in trees as well as buildings), quail, red kite, hobby and marsh harrier		Noted. There will be consideration and assessment of Schedule 1 bird species within the ES.
North Kesteven District Council	Study Areas and Survey Scope	Notable flora is not specifically addressed within the survey scope. Plants are a relevant species consideration for purposes of PEA and impact assessment (e.g. refer to Box 2 in the PEA guidelines ⁶). I consider that specific consideration should be given to scarce arable flora that could occur in arable fields and be adversely affected by changes in land use. Botanical surveys may also be		Targeted surveys for notable (non-crop) arable plants will be carried out in May/June and August/Sept 2024.

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		needed in support of evidence gathering to determine presence/absence of ancient woodland.	
North Kesteven District Council	Study Areas and Survey Scope	Given the limited information and rationale provided, I am not in a position to agree that wintering bird surveys can be scoped out. I agree that because relevant designations are located at great distance the site is not likely to represent functionally linked habitat. However, (as with breeding birds) wintering birds are not solely a consideration in relation to designations. The site could still have value for wintering birds, and impacts could arise from the substantive land use change for the proposed development (extensive losses of arable farmland and the enclosing of the landscape).	Wintering bird surveys will be undertaken between Nov 2023 and February 2024 to inform the ES.
North Kesteven District Council	Approach to Impact Assessment	As advised above with reference to the questions posed, I agree with the approach to ecological impact assessment. This should reference the CIEEM (2022) guidance, as the current iteration of the good practice approach. The assessment should identify and show regard to relevant planning policy and related guidance, including and particularly National Policy Statements (NPS) EN-1, EN-3 and Planning Inspectorate Advice Note Ten in relation to Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA). NPS EN-4 is not likely to have direct relevance (as its remit is pipelines), but its requirements in relation to ecology could be translated to cable laying for grid connections e.g. requirements in relation to reinstatement of habitats, and avoidance of important hedgerows.	Preliminary assessment is included within Chapter 6 of the PEIR.

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		<p>Given the progress made to date on ecological surveys, I consider that it will be possible to submit a relatively comprehensive and complete ecological impact assessment with the PEIR (as opposed to a more high-level assessment). I encourage this approach as it will permit detailed review and advice in advance of submission of the DCO application.</p>	
<p>North Kesteven District Council</p>	<p>Likely Significant Effects and Scoping of Receptors for Impact Assessment</p>	<p>The assessment of potential direct and indirect effects on LWS needs to be made with reference to the reasons for designation, and the findings of other impact assessment disciplines (noise, air quality, water resources). Until this has been reported, I am not in a position to agree that there are no likely significant effects on LWS. I also cannot agree that the committed 15m stand-off distance is sufficient. Therefore, I do not agree that LWS can be scoped out</p>	<p>It is considered that impacts on LWS can be avoided by buffer zones and mitigation. Two LWS (Gorse Lane and Gorse Hill Lane) adjacent to the site have been scoped in (since the Scoping Opinion) as a precautionary measure as impacts cannot be fully assessed until the buffer zones and mitigation measures regarding these two LWS are confirmed. The 15m buffer zones from all other LWS are considered sufficient distance to avoid impacting the integrity of the LWS based on the LWS receptors and Proposed Development impacts. Details of the LWS are provided in the PEA reports and full assessment will be presented in the ES.</p>
<p>North Kesteven District Council</p>	<p>Likely Significant Effects and Scoping of Receptors for</p>	<p>I agree with the Scoping Report that impacts on birds will be an important consideration (see above) in terms of impact assessment and legislative/policy compliance.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
	Impact Assessment		
North Kesteven District Council	Likely Significant Effects and Scoping of Receptors for Impact Assessment	I agree that the lowland meadow priority habitat can be scoped out provided that the habitat is retained and that the proposed development would not prevent/obstruct potential for suitable long term management. This habitat could be a suitable target for habitat enhancement/BNG.	Noted.
North Kesteven District Council	Likely Significant Effects and Scoping of Receptors for Impact Assessment	I cannot agree that hedgerows, other priority habitats or (with certain exceptions as identified below) relevant affected species can be scoped out as the relevant survey methods, results and rationale has not been provided to inform decision-making on this	Further details on justification for scoping out hedgerows and other priority habitats are provided in the PEIR.
North Kesteven District Council	Likely Significant Effects and Scoping of Receptors for Impact Assessment	Section 6.2.9 gives the impression that the commitment to provide habitat mitigation/compensation has been relied on to scope habitats out. The first step is to identify the relative nature conservation value and apply the mitigation hierarchy. Habitat compensation should be a last resort, especially where priority habitats would be affected	The mitigation hierarchy will be applied: Impact to priority habitats will be avoided where possible or mitigated. Habitat compensation will be the last resort.

Statutory Consultee		Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
North Kesteven District Council	Likely Significant Effects and Scoping of Receptors for Impact Assessment	I agree that there is likely to be a case, given commitments for habitat stand-offs, for scoping bats out. However, I defer a final decision on this until the survey results are provided at PEIR stage. This is because a specific uncertainty has been identified in Section 6.2.12. Further, the Scoping Report identifies the presence of barbastelle bat (a Red Data List species) and does not discount potential for this species to be affected		A more detailed justification for scoping bats out is provided in the PEIR. Although, due to a design update regarding access, it is not yet known if a limited number of hedgerows will need to be removed for access therefore bats have been scoped in until this can be confirmed.
North Kesteven District Council	Likely Significant Effects and Scoping of Receptors for Impact Assessment	The grounds for scoping out invertebrates, barn owl, water vole, otter and fish seems reasonable. I also agree reptiles can be scoped out provided the identified higher risk habitats are retained. Precautionary working methods would be sufficient to address the low risk of reptiles being encountered and affected in the wider site. No likely significant effects would reasonably be anticipated in relation to roe and fallow deer. However, they remain a welfare consideration. Further information is needed on how movement corridors can be maintained for deer, and how mammal gates could apply to animals as large as deer (given needs for security)		Noted. There will be a 10m buffer of the fencing from field margins. The fencing design will allow deer to disperse across the Site via the field margins. Mammal gates in the fencing will allow badgers access for foraging across the Site and gaps under the fences should allow smaller mammals such as brown hare and hedgehog access for foraging.
North Kesteven District Council	Biodiversity Opportunities	The Applicant has not committed to a BNG assessment within the Scoping Report. A BNG assessment will be required to ensure consistency with preceding solar farm projects of comparable scale. This is also a requirement of emerging local planning policy. Biodiversity Metric 4.0 should be utilised unless substantive work has already progressed using Metric 3.1 (the preceding iteration of the		As stated above, there is a commitment to deliver at least 10% Biodiversity Net Gain. The latest metric will be used.

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		metric, which remains approved for use where already adopted ⁷). Use of this metric will deliver a structured repeatable evidence base for agreement that no net loss has been achieved, and that a meaningful biodiversity gain can be secured.	
North Kesteven District Council	Biodiversity Opportunities	The identified opportunities (Section 6.2.10) seem a reasonable starting point. Therefore, I do not wish to make any additional recommendations for habitat creation or enhancement at this time. I agree with the commitment to provide an outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) with the final application	N/A
North Kesteven District Council	Biodiversity Opportunities	I recommend that the applicant reviews their list to ensure that mitigation measures are not presented as enhancement opportunities. Mammal gates fall into this category. Similarly, arable interventions would likely represent mitigation for impacts on birds from loss of arable farmland elsewhere within the site.	Noted.
North Kesteven District Council	Biodiversity Opportunities	I do not consider drystone walls to represent meaningful biodiversity enhancement, although they may have incidental benefits for a limited suite of species (but likely less so that creation of semi-natural habitats e.g. hedgerows).	Noted.
North Kesteven	Biodiversity Opportunities	Further explanation is needed for the proposed 'herbal ley' and associated management regimes before it can be	Herbal ley would be a temporary 'cover crop' or 'green manure' such as legumes

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
District Council		<p>agreed that this would deliver meaningful benefits for biodiversity. Particularly, given the impact on farmland birds from changes in land use. With reference to standard definitions, ley usually represents a temporary land-use rather than permanent habitat creation. So, use of this terminology suggests this habitat would not be comparable with wildflower meadow and may need regular replacement sowings to maintain a biodiversity value. Further, a brief internet search indicates such seed mixes are typically marketed as forage for livestock and to improve soil fertility, rather than for purposes of biodiversity enhancement.</p>	<p>(vetches, like common vetch and hairy vetch. clovers, like red clover, white clover, alsike clover, sweet clover and crimson clover) which would provide nectar for insects and nitrogen to the soil.</p>
North Kesteven District Council	Cumulative Impacts and Effects	<p>Given the characteristics of the affected landscape and its habitats, and the species likely to be associated with these, I cannot identify any likely cumulative effects. However, given the limited information received, this would need to be reviewed in more detail at PEIR stage.</p> <p>In terms of 'intra-project effects', I consider these should be addressed in the main biodiversity impact assessment chapter so that a single cohesive assessment of the impacts and effects of the Proposed Development is reported. This should consider the conclusions of other relevant chapters in more detail (e.g. any potential significant air quality impacts). For example, a combined summary of habitat losses will need to be reported (regardless of the activities contributing to this) for purposes of impact and BNG assessment, and to transparently demonstrate that no net loss and net gain has been achieved</p>	<p>Intra-projects cumulative effects are discussed in Chapter 6 of the PEIR. Inter-project cumulative effects are discussed in Chapter 15 of the PEIR.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
Historic Environment Officer			
Historic Environment Officer	Consultation, study areas	<p>The Report states that the study areas have been defined as 2km from the site boundary for non-designated heritage assets and 5km for designated historic assets in accordance with the document ('Guidance for large schemes including NSIPs and EIAs, General Scoping Opinion for the Historic Environment') provided by Lincolnshire County Council (LCC).</p> <p>The LCC guidance also sets out the data sources that should be included to inform the baseline conditions. From the list of sources included in the Report (6.4.3) some have yet to be consulted / interrogated.</p> <p>The Report notes consultation with LCC, and an intention to consult with Historic England and the local planning authority's (LPA's) conservation officer. Consultation on the cultural heritage, relating to matters on archaeology, should also include the archaeological advisor to the LPA, North Kesteven District Council</p>	Consultation with Lincolnshire County Council, North Kesteven District Council and Heritage Trust for Lincolnshire regarding the scope and timing of evaluation is ongoing.
Historic Environment Officer	Surveys to inform the EIA, baseline conditions	<p>The report notes that a full desk-based assessment including aerial photographic and Lidar data will be produced. The full suite of desk-based information needs to be assessed to inform the baseline.</p> <p>The baseline conditions as mentioned in the report focus on the HER data and number of non-designated and</p>	A full DBA and Stage 1 Setting Assessment has informed the PEIR.

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		<p>designated assets recorded and therefore represents only a partial evidence base.</p> <p>A Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) for geophysical survey has been agreed with LCC.</p>	
<p>Historic Environment Officer</p>	<p>Trial trenching</p>	<p>The report states only that the need for, scope and timing of intrusive evaluation will be negotiated and agreed with statutory consultees following completion of the desk-based and geophysical surveys.</p> <p>The proposals for construction of a solar farm will necessarily have an impact on any buried archaeological remains. Piling, building foundations, cable trenching, access roads, building compounds and construction traffic are all known impacts and the cumulative effect will be significant. Therefore, trial trenching is required to establish the baseline conditions and to understand the nature and extent of the impacts on the archaeological remains. There is currently insufficient information on the presence, character, date and significance of any archaeological deposits. The results of the full desk-based assessment including the aerial photographic and Lidar assessments together with the results of the geophysical survey will inform the programme of trial trench evaluation.</p> <p>In order to determine the presence, absence, significance, the depth and extent of any archaeological remains which could be impacted by the development, trial trenching should target areas where archaeological remains have been identified in the foregoing, non-intrusive surveys as well as areas where the surveys have not detected</p>	<p>The scope and timing of further evaluation following the geophysical survey is still being discussed with Lincolnshire County Council and North Kesteven District Council.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		<p>archaeological remains. The programme of trial trenching should be set out in a written scheme of investigation (WSI) to be agreed with the archaeological consultees prior to commencement of the field investigation.</p> <p>The results of the trial trenching and foregoing surveys will inform the archaeological mitigation strategy</p>	
<p>Historic Environment Officer</p>	<p>Mitigation</p>	<p>It is proposed that where primary mitigation (by design) is not feasible that additional mitigation (6.4.6) will take the form of a programme of archaeological investigation and recording secured by a DCO Requirement. Such a programme may include pre-commencement phases of archaeological excavation and / or archaeological “watching brief” during construction.</p> <p>There is currently insufficient information to determine the nature and scope of the mitigation (whether by design or through archaeological investigation). A trial trench evaluation is required in order to establish the baseline conditions, provide an appropriate assessment of the significance of likely effects and inform the mitigation strategy.</p> <p>Mitigation through archaeological excavation may be required. Without detailed information on the archaeological potential and the likely impact of the proposals mitigation by means of a ‘watching brief’ during construction is not considered acceptable as a first response. The results of the assessments and site specific evaluation will inform the archaeological mitigation strategy. The results should be used to minimise the impact on the</p>	<p>The scope and timing of further evaluation to inform the mitigation strategy is still being discussed with Lincolnshire County Council and North Kesteven District Council.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		historic environment through informing the project design and an appropriate programme of archaeological mitigation (secured in the DCO)	
Historic Environment Officer	Likely significant effects	The likely significant effects (6.4.7) cannot be determined in the absence of an assessment of the baseline conditions. The section acknowledges the uncertainty of potential direct and indirect effects. It is not considered appropriate to propose that certain heritage assets be scoped out at this stage.	The DBA and Stage 1 Setting Assessment, Aerial Investigation and Mapping and geophysical survey have informed the PEIR. Further information on the Proposed Development has also been taken account of when considering likely significant effects.
Historic Environment Officer	Likely significant effects	<p>The assets proposed to be scoped out of assessment (6.4.9) are not supported by an evidence base and appear to be piecemeal and based largely on setting effects (rather than an assessment of the significance of the asset and the likely impact of the proposals) or on the type of record (for example findspots). Any proposal to ‘descope’ designated or relevant non-designated assets must be informed by an evidence base demonstrating the lack of direct or indirect impact upon the heritage asset and its significance.</p> <p>The Settings Assessment/Heritage Impact Assessment needs to demonstrate an understanding of the significance and context of each of those assets in order to assess the impact of the development upon them and propose any mitigation.</p> <p>Section 6.4.9 also proposes scoping out all heritage assets at decommissioning. The nature of these assets has yet to be determined and assessed and, for example where identified assets may have been avoided / protected in situ</p>	<p>The DBA and Stage 1 Setting Assessment has considered the significance of all heritage assets within 2km of the Site and all designated assets within 5km. Those sensitive to construction effects have been considered within the Site and those sensitive to changes in their setting have been filtered based on a worst case ZTV and considered against the proposed masterplan for the Site.</p> <p>Use of a Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan will ensure that assets not impacted during construction are not affected by decommissioning effects.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		<p>during construction / operation they may be under threat from disturbance or destruction during decommissioning. Cultural heritage should be a consideration as part of any outline decommissioning plans.</p> <p>The section entitled 'Opportunities for enhancing the environment' (6.4.10) has not considered the positive and / or beneficial effects of the programme of archaeological surveys and investigations to be undertaken during this process and the added value that a large development can make to archaeology and cultural heritage. The programme of archaeological works should include proposals for community outreach, public engagement and dissemination of the results</p>	<p>The scope and timing of further evaluation is still being discussed with Lincolnshire County Council and North Kesteven District Council.</p>
<p>Historic Environment Officer</p>	<p>References</p>	<p>Reference should be made to planning and specialist cultural heritage and archaeological guidance and standards and should include the Lincolnshire County Council Archaeology Handbook (2019) which sets out requirements for work in the county, including archiving and deposition. In summary, the EIA will need to contain sufficient information on the archaeological potential and must include evidential information on the depth, extent and significance of the archaeological deposits which will be impacted by the development. The results will inform a fit for purpose mitigation strategy which will identify what measures are to be taken to minimise or adequately record the impact of the proposal on archaeological remains.</p> <p>The provision of sufficient baseline information to identify and assess the impact on known and potential heritage</p>	<p>The scope and timing of further evaluation is still being discussed with Lincolnshire County Council and North Kesteven District Council.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		assets is required by Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (Regulation 5 (2d)), National Planning Statement Policy EN1 (Section 5.8), and the National Planning Policy Framework	
Historic Environment Officer	Scoping questions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do you agree with the proposed list of consultees? No, the archaeological advisor to the local planning authority should be included. 	NKDC's archaeological advisor is also being consulted.
Historic Environment Officer	Scoping questions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do you agree with the proposed study areas? Yes, the report defines a study area of 2km for non-designated heritage assets and 5km for designated heritage. 	N/A
Historic Environment Officer	Scoping questions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do you agree that the data sources listed to inform the EIA baseline characterisation are appropriate? Yes, if a full desk-based assessment is provided in accordance with the guidance provided by LCC. 	Full DBA and Stage 1 Setting Assessment has informed the PEIR.
Historic Environment Officer	Scoping questions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do you agree that the surveys proposed to inform the EIA baseline characterisation are appropriate? No, geophysical survey has been included, however, a programme of archaeological trial trenching has not been included and is required to inform the baseline conditions, an appropriate assessment of impact and the mitigation strategy. 	The scope and timing of further evaluation is still being discussed with Lincolnshire County Council and North Kesteven District Council.

Statutory Consultee		Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
Historic Environment Officer	Scoping questions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are any receptors / assets / resources not identified that you would like to see included in the EIA? All heritage assets as identified through the EIA process should be included (the required assessments, surveys and investigations have yet to be carried out).		All heritage assets within 2km of the Site and all designated assets within 5km have been included in the DBA and Stage 1 Setting Assessment.
Historic Environment Officer	Scoping questions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you agree with the proposed additional (secondary and tertiary) mitigation measures and is this mitigation appropriate? No. Insufficient information is available to understand the mitigation measures that may be required. A programme of archaeological trial trenching is required to inform an appropriate mitigation strategy to be included in the Environmental Statement		The scope and timing of further evaluation is still being discussed with Lincolnshire County Council and North Kesteven District Council.
Historic Environment Officer	Scoping questions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you agree with the receptors / matters that are proposed to be scoped in and out of the EIA? No. As the evidence base and assessments have yet to be carried out or completed no receptors / matters should be scoped out of the EIA at this stage.		The PEIR has been informed by the DBA and Stage 1 Setting Assessment, Aerial Investigation and Mapping and geophysical survey.
North Kesteven District Council (Landscape)				
North Kesteven District Council	Agricultural Land Classification and Soils	It is important that the ALC survey is undertaken in line with the MAFF 1988 guidelines and TIN049. These documents set out the precise methodology by which the ALC survey should be undertaken, with auger bore sampling at 1		The survey has been undertaken in line with the MAFF 1988 guidelines and TIN049.

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
	Agricultural Land Classification and Soils	<p>hectare intervals and a suitable number of soil pits dug to determine the precise nature of the soil(s).</p> <p>According to available published data and local knowledge, the soils locally are mainly Marcham 343e and Aswarby 512a Soil Associations. Both of these soils are limestone based, with shallow well drained loamy soils, over limestone and deeper brown earths. Occasionally there are heavier clay soils present of the Curdridge 841a Association. Appendix 3 sets out a description of each of these three soil associations from Cranfield University. The area locally is known as The Heath. Previous ALC surveys locally on these soils and similar have indicated a mixture of Grades 2, 3a and 3b land. It is likely that the shallower soils will be 3b, whilst deeper soils will be 3a or Grade 2, even with some areas of Grade 1. The ALC should identify where BMV land is and the scheme should seek to protect and minimise damage to higher grade land wherever possible in line with national planning policy. There is undoubtedly a lot of BMV land in this vicinity and only a full ALC will identify where it is and what the Grade and quality is. Laboratory analysis of representative samples should be used to determine textures.</p>	An Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) survey has been undertaken and the
	Ecological Effects	Where land is used for biodiversity it would not be available for agriculture. However even if it is available for some form of cutting or grazing it is unlikely that the ALC grade will change significantly during the life of the project. There is evidence that organic matter builds up in biodiversity areas at a faster rate than arable farmland and this may	Noted.

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		<p>benefit the land, but it is not a factor in the assessment of ALC. Long term, where biodiverse land becomes ecologically important there is the possibility of land becoming assigned with environmental designations, such as SSSI status, though generally this has not so far occurred on other solar sites.</p>	
	<p>Ecological Effect</p>	<p>Revisions to the Environmental Impact Assessment rules regarding the cultivation of agricultural land suggest that if land remains uncultivated for longer than five years, then permission may be required from Natural England to bring the land back into arable cultivation.</p> <p>Any material enhancement in the botanical diversity of the sward (to the extent that this site is considered to be of ecological value), will limit the capacity for the land to be returned to arable use after the solar plant has been decommissioned. The EIA (Agriculture) (England) (No.2) Regulations 2006 prohibit the physical or chemical cultivation of what are considered to be 'semi-natural areas'.</p> <p>Cultivation is not clearly defined and does not necessarily require land to have been ploughed. The application of pesticides and fertiliser may be sufficient, but the biodiverse areas are much less likely to receive these treatments once established and there is the possibility that large areas of environmentally interesting land may therefore not be allowed to return to arable farmland after the 40 year period. This is a complex area as there may be planning conditions that require land to be returned to agriculture as part of any consent and it is an open</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		question whether the compliance with a 'restoration' condition 'trumps' any future environmental status or requirement.	
	Ecological Effect	<p>Grazing management at this Site is not easily compatible with standard biodiversity management practices at Solar Photovoltaic sites due to fundamental population biology principles. As the site is in arable production at present, it currently has a relatively low level of biodiversity. The grazing management plan may, therefore, lead to a modest increase in species richness at the site from current base levels, but it will not deliver the level of biodiversity that the site could potentially achieve if biodiversity gains were prioritised over agricultural production.</p> <p>By grazing land for agricultural livestock production, the level of disturbance is high. This prevents plant species with a slow establishment rate (which often are those which are ultimately strong competitors) from growing – and thus the invertebrates that feed on these species are also excluded from the area.</p> <p>Areas which promote high species diversity often use low intensity grazing as a means to promoting biodiversity. Grazing represents a form of disturbance to the area, thus preventing any one species becoming too dominant. It also helps manage the sward to provide an optimum habitat for invertebrates.</p> <p>Grazing for biodiversity enhancement usually occurs between October and April, which will allow plants to flower and set seed. The stock densities are monitored and adjusted to prevent either under and overgrazing and to</p>	Noted.

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		<p>ensure the sward contains a mix of long and short vegetation with some plants in flower.</p> <p>There is therefore some conflict between maintaining the land in agricultural production and improving biodiversity. Whilst not incompatible, site based issues, such as soil type(s) and local agricultural practices may create future problems. Often biodiversity areas particularly target the highest grades on agricultural land and any future restriction that might prevent its return to cultivation should be a consideration in the planning process and in the conditioning of any consent.</p>	
	<p>Cumulative Impacts including District ALC</p>	<p>There are a number of small(er) and largescale Solar PV schemes in Lincolnshire, with others planned or proposed. There are five known solar project NSIP schemes; specifically in relation to impacts on agricultural land. The situation is a moving picture as new proposals come forward from time to time. Most of these sites are proposed on farmland. Lincolnshire and N Kesteven in particular are agricultural areas with substantial areas for land within the Best and Most Versatile category. Much of the non BMV land will be Grades 3b and 4 with very little Grade 5.</p> <p>A county-level alternative assessment area should be applied which as a minimum should consider scope for connection into the National Grid at the locations proposed by the registered NSIP solar projects named above, and with specific consideration of agricultural land impacts.</p> <p>For a project of this scale where the project will tie up the land for up to 40 years, there will be some impact. The area is large locally and if the quantities of BMV are as expected</p>	

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		<p>or similar then the impact will be moderately significant. However if the BMV is greater and of higher grades then I would expect the impact to be more significant at a District Level. Environmental Impact Assessments give guidance on the size and quality of Land Grade that is or can be affected by development proposals. The loss of such a large area of land would normally be considered as significant at District level, even though the use is 'temporary'. Any permanent loss of land due either to construction or through biodiversity designation may affect this assessment further.</p>	
	<p>Sheep Farming and Other Farming Impact</p>	<p>This part of Lincolnshire is a mainly arable farming area with only limited sheep grazing operations. Whilst it is perfectly possible to graze the areas under and between the panels, it is unlikely to be very cost effective for a grazier. The difficulties of rounding up sheep and handling them, together with finding sick or wounded animals makes the grazier's workload harder and more complex. As such the economics of moving sheep to and from the site will be marginal. However, most examples quoted do not charge much or anything for the grazing and this may make it sufficiently attractive for a local farmer or shepherd with a 'flying flock'. Land in use for solar panels is generally ineligible for the normal agricultural subsidies, such as the Basic Payment Scheme (now being phased out) and the Environmental Land Management Scheme (ELMS). It does not prevent land from being managed in similar ways, but there will be no payments available to farmers (e.g. graziers) for</p>	<p>Noted and we will take into consideration in the iterative design.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		<p>compliance and this could make farming less financially attractive going forward.</p>	
	<p>Sheep Farming and Other Farming Impact</p>	<p>The site will probably have to be (re)seeded to grass, or species rich grassland, but this will probably occur after the panels have been sited on the land. In my experience grass does not grow well under the panels themselves. There are often areas that are dry and barren or that only host weeds species, due to heavy shading. As part of any environmental statement there should be an impact statement with reference to the farm holdings affected by the proposal. This should address viability, infrastructure and long term consequences on the individual holding.</p>	<p>Noted. A socio-economic statement will be produced and submitted in support of the DCO, which will outline the impacts to agricultural businesses, tourism etc.</p>
	<p>Soils</p>	<p>Soil structure can be significantly damaged during the construction phase of the process. There is a lot of trafficking of vehicles on the land to erect the panels and if this work is undertaken when soils are wet, there can be significant damage. Much of this damage can be remedied post construction but not all and it is possible that long term drainage issues occur on the site due to the construction. Appendix 4 shows photographs of before during and after construction of a large solar farm in Hampshire where soil structural issues were a major problem post construction. Once the panels are in place usual agricultural practices such as subsoiling become difficult During the construction phase many of the areas will affect soil and water issues. Appendix 5 sets out a basic Soil Management Plan that should be established as part of the Construction Phase, to minimise the impact on soil</p>	<p>Measures to ensure the quality of the land is maintained throughout the operational phase of the Proposed Development will be documented within and secured by the Outline Soil Management Plan and the Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan. The Outline Soil Management Plan will identify those areas within the Site which may be more susceptible to damage, for example, steep slopes and qualities of the soil, for example when it is wet or after periods of heavy rainfall or high winds and will advise on when soils are suitable for being handled or trafficked. The Outline Soil Management Plan will also detail</p>

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		<p>resources. The following headings should be included in the Soil Management Plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site preparation; • Import of construction materials, plant and equipment to Site; • Establishment of Site construction compounds and welfare facilities; • Cable installation; • Temporary construction compounds; • Trenching in sections • Upgrading existing tracks and construction of new access roads within the Site; • The upgrade or construction of crossing points (bridges /culverts) at drainage ditches within the Site; • Appropriate storage and capping of soil; • Appropriate construction drainage; • Sectionalised approach of duct installation; • Excavation and installation of jointing pits; • Cable pulling; • Testing and commissioning; and • Site reinstatement (i.e. returning any land used during construction, for temporary purposes, back to its previous condition). • Use of borrow pits 	<p>measures for soil management and follow the principles of best practice to maintain the physical properties of the soil, with the aim of maintaining the condition of the land until the end of the lifetime of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>Further detail related to soil management and mitigation is provided in Chapter 10 of the PEIR.</p>
	Soil Management Plan (Outline)	1. The soil stripping, handling, storage and replacement operations should be undertaken in a manner that is consistent with suitable specification and methodology set out in a Soil Management Plan.	Noted. This will be set out in the Outline Soil Management Plan submitted and secured as part of the DCO.

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
	Soil Management Plan (Outline)	2. All topsoil and subsoil material shall be stripped from areas affected by top soil storage bunds, subsoil storage bunds, general fill bunds, hard-standings and other constructions including temporary access roads and vehicle trafficking routes, and shall be stored separately in bunds from any imported material and shall be used for the restoration of the temporary soil storage site unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.	Noted. This will be set out in the Outline Soil Management Plan which will be discussed and agreed with the Local Planning Authority and submitted and secured as part of the DCO.
	Soil Management Plan (Outline)	3. Soils should be stripped, stored and replaced in line with the MAFF Good Practice Guide for Handling Soils Sheets 1, 2, 3 and 4 - http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20090306103114/http://www.defra.gov.uk/farm/environment/land-use/soilguid/index.htm .	Noted.
	Soil Management Plan (Outline)	4. Topsoil and subsoil storage bunds should be placed in approved locations and constructed to ensure secure storage without damage, loss or contamination.	Noted.
	Soil Management Plan (Outline)	5. Topsoil and subsoil should be stored in bunds not exceeding 3m in height above adjacent existing ground level and shall be constructed and shaped by excavator only (dump trucks should not traffic across the bunds at any time).	Noted.
	Soil Management Plan (Outline)	6. Imported general fill material should be stored in bunds not exceeding 4m in height above adjacent existing ground level.	Noted.

Statutory Consultee		Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
	Soil Management Plan (Outline)	7. Bunds should be seeded to grass at the earliest opportunity and shall not be allowed to overwinter without grass cover.		Noted.
	Soil Management Plan (Outline)	8. No topsoil or subsoil should be sold or otherwise removed from the site.		Noted .
	Soil Management Plan (Outline)	9. Within 3 months of their construction, the Developer should provide a detailed plan of soil storage bunds showing details of position, volume and soil type. The Developer shall be responsible for maintaining an up-to-date record of all soil storage and general fill bunds throughout the life of the site.		Noted.
	Soil Management Plan (Outline)	10. The stripping, movement and re-spreading of topsoil and subsoil material should only be undertaken when the topsoil and subsoil material is in a dry and friable condition and the ground is sufficiently dry to allow the passage of heavy machinery and vehicles over it without damage to the soils		Noted.
	Soil Management Plan (Outline)	11. All injurious weeds, as defined by the Weeds Act 1959, growing within the working site should be eradicated or adequately controlled by approved method		Noted.
	Soil Management Plan (Outline)	12. All vegetation growing on soil storage bunds and peripheral areas within the site should be kept in tidy condition by cutting at least once during the growing season.		Noted.

Statutory Consultee		Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
	Soil Management Plan (Outline)	13. The boundary of the development should be made stock proof for the duration of the temporary development		Noted.
	Soil Management Plan (Outline)	14. All temporary plant, machinery, buildings, fixed equipment, roads and areas of hard standing including site compounds should be removed.		Noted.
	Soil Management Plan (Outline)	15. The natural subsoil base material should be comprehensively ripped to a minimum depth of 500mm to break up surface compaction before any soil material is spread. The developer should give the Planning Authority notice of an intention to carry out this operation. All large stones and boulders, wire rope and other foreign material arising should be removed. Special attention should be given to areas of excessive compaction such as haul roads where deeper ripping may be necessary.		Noted.
	Soil Management Plan (Outline)	16. The Developer should be responsible for providing all necessary training of operatives and site supervision by suitably qualified personnel to ensure that the soil replacement operation is carried out in the approved manner.		Noted.
	Soil Management Plan (Outline)	17. Prior to the commencement of spreading soil, all stones, boulders or foreign objects likely to impede normal agricultural cultivations should be removed from that area.		Noted.
	Soil Management Plan (Outline)	18. The soil material set aside for use in any agricultural restoration should be spread uniformly in the correct sequence (subsoil followed by topsoil) over the ripped base material, and should be rooted and scarified to full depth		Noted.

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		without causing mixing between different soil layers. The reinstated agricultural soil profile should be total 450mm thickness overlying prepared and free draining natural stony base material, and should consist of 250mm topsoil and 200mm subsoil derived from the soil stripping operation. This soil profile should meet the technical requirements of the identified Agricultural Land Classification Grade on restoration.	
	Soil Management Plan (Outline)	19. All base material ripping, soil spreading and cultivation operations should be carried out in such a manner as to minimise compaction and achieve unimpeded drainage down through the soil profile.	Noted.
	Soil Management Plan (Outline)	20. Any part of the site restored for agricultural purposes which is affected by localised settlement that adversely affects the agricultural after use should be re-graded including the re-construction of the soil profile to approved specification.	Noted.
	Soil Management Plan (Outline)	21. Following restoration of the soil materials, the land will be cultivated, seeded and managed appropriately for a minimum of a year and until agreed with the Local Planning Authority that the land meets satisfactory requirements	Noted.
Nottinghamshire County Council			
Nottinghamshire CC	No comment	Thank you for consulting Nottinghamshire CC on the above, we have no comments to make at this stage of the process.	N/A
Peterborough City Council			

Statutory Consultee		Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
Peterborough City Council	No comment	The Local Planning Authority has no comments or observations.		N/A
Severn Trent Water				
Severn Trent Water	No comment	Please be advised that the site boundary is outside STW's area of responsibility		N/A
South Holland District Council				
South Holland District Council	No comment	I confirm that South Holland District Council has no comment to make		N/A
Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council				
Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council	Public Rights of Way	The words 'explored' and 'recreational connectivity' are not specific enough in the ES. The area Springwell East in particular has a very high density of PROW which need full recognition in the scoping report		<p>Noted.</p> <p>The design has incorporated a 15m offset from all existing PROW. We have acknowledged. We acknowledge that the PROWs particularly in Springwell East and well used and this has been a factor we have considered in the development of the design. Further detail is included in Chapter 3 Reasonable Alternatives of the PEIR.</p> <p>The potential visual effects on users of PROWs are addressed in Chapter 9: Landscape and Visual.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
<p>Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council</p>	<p>Lighting</p>	<p>Particular concerns regarding lighting, fencing and security cameras. The extent, duration and intensity of lighting needs to be fully illuminated.</p>	<p>The lighting will be manually operated for the Springwell Substation compound, BESS compounds, and Collector Compounds, therefore, it would not be permanently lit. Further detail is provided in Chapter 2 of the PEIR.</p>
<p>Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council</p>	<p>Environmental factors to be scoped in</p>	<p>Despite these factors being scoped in we have additional expectations in aspects of biodiversity, cultural heritage, landscape and visual and Land, soils, and groundwater. As residents of Scopwick and Kirkby Green, the Springwell East development in particular will have a major impact on the ability of our community to enjoy local countryside and we seek to minimise this potential impact on our health and wellbeing.</p> <p>It should be recognised that Scopwick and Kirkby Green are two of the most attractive villages in Lincolnshire and welcome many visitors and tourists. The potential restriction on local business development and its future sustainability needs to be fully explored and mitigated. In conclusion, this proposed development has already generated very strong opposition by a large number of parishioners at recent public meetings. The scale of this development and impact on the landscape is beyond what any parish of our size should be expected to accept.</p>	<p>The potential visual effects on users of PROWs are addressed in Chapter 9: Landscape and Visual.</p> <p>Socio-economic statement will be produced and submitted in support of the DCO which will provide further detail on the impact to local businesses and tourism.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council	Rochdale Envelope	The Rochdale Envelope approach was developed to assist with the development of much large national infrastructure projects such as HS2 where at the start it is difficult to know what matters will be relevant as the project develops. This flexible approach is not appropriate for a development of this limited and static nature where the matters to be considered can be determined at the start. Its use in this context would be an abuse of the process allowing the Applicants to change their plans at will without proper scrutiny.	The level of flexibility assessed for the purposes of the PEIR are detailed within Chapter 2 and 4 of the PEIR. This will be refined and detailed within the ES.
Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council	Landscaping, Habitat Management and Biodiversity Enhancement	<p>The Proposed Development will include landscaping, habitat management, biodiversity enhancement, and amenity improvements, which will be explored as the design progresses. This will be sensitivity designed to retain and enhance ecological and recreational connectivity. Where possible, existing trees, hedgerows, public rights of way and Local Wildlife Sites would be retained.</p> <p>The words ‘explored’ and ‘recreational connectivity’ are not specific enough again the information in the ES needs to be more specific</p>	Further detail is included within Chapter 2 within the PEIR.
Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council	Lighting	The National Grid Substation compound, Project Substation compound, BESS compounds, and Collector Compounds would include lighting, in accordance with relevant standards, but will not be permanently lit. Just lit after dark? Needs to be specific	The lighting will be manually operated for the Springwell Substation compound, BESS compounds, and Collector Compounds, therefore, it would not be permanently lit.

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
<p>Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council</p>	<p>Use of borrow pits</p>	<p>The use of borrow pits during construction of the Proposed Development will be considered as the design develops. The potential benefit of including borrow pits as part of the Proposed Development include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allows extracted aggregate to be transported to construction locations (largely via site access tracks) within the Site. • Generates significantly lower levels of Heavy Goods Vehicle (HGV) movements on the local highway network than importation of aggregate from commercial quarries. • Reduces cost risks arising from double handling, importation from commercial quarries and landfill disposal. <p>2.5.10. The benefit of using borrow pits will be carefully considered against any potential environmental impacts. Further detail on the approach to identifying suitable borrow pit locations and justification for their inclusions as part of the Proposed Development will be provided as part of the PEIR and ES.</p> <p>Comment Received This is a cost cutting exercise allowing the Developers to quarry their own aggregate out of the heath sub-soils to use to build temporary roads and hardstandings; further details and approval from the Environment Agency should be gained. The land where borrow pits are excavated will never be returned to proper agricultural use and this procedure should be prohibited as unnecessary and open to abuse. Unnecessary as there is a limestone quarry adjacent to the proposed site. Open to abuse as there is no monitoring of the 'rubbish' that may</p>	<p>No borrow pits are proposed as part of the project.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		end up being dumped in a pit rather than properly (and more expensively) disposed of.	
Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council	Construction Reinstatement	A programme of construction reinstatement and habitat creation will commence during the construction phase. The above statement is a contradiction in terms, the construction machinery and the work being carried out will be disruptive and will have an adverse effect on wildlife, surely 'during' should be 'after' and further specific detail is required	An Outline Landscape and Ecological Management (OLEMP) will be produced and submitted in support of the DCO. This will detail the management requirements during construction and operation of the Proposed Development.
Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council	Soils Management	<p>Regarding agricultural land remediation, the document states the land will return to agricultural use at the end of the 40 year period, will the ES confirm that if the development is approved all of the concrete bases, foundations, piles and all other sub-structure elements are grubbed up, crushed and recycled on site into aggregate and then removed for future construction use, also where necessary replacing any topsoils with a similar heathland soil where required?</p> <p>If this land is not properly restored it will not be able to be farmed in a conventional manner, unable to be cultivated or harvested due to the potential damage to farm machinery. Wild grasses and weeds will grow, and it will look something like the old Butlins Filey holiday camp site does today. I like to see wildflowers growing but not 4,200 acres of them, when this best and most versatile land should be growing food crops.</p>	<p>During the decommissioning phase, it is assumed that all concrete, hardstanding areas, foundations for the infrastructure and any internal tracks will be removed to a depth of up to 1m. It is assumed that all the below ground cables will be left in situ. Further detail is included within the PEIR Chapter 2.</p> <p>The landscape management plan will be developed with the Estate to ensure that the landscape design and long term habitats align with the Estate long term strategy.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council	Above ground infrastructure decommissioning	<p>At the moment solar panels at the end of their usable life are finding their way into landfill in Africa. As far as we know there is no recycling facility in the UK. The West's relationship going forward with China is uncertain. Springwell should fully address these matters at this pre-planning stage.</p> <p>The Lincoln Heath is a very fragile part of our county.</p>	Climate Assessment which assesses the reasonable worst case is provided in Chapter 7 of the PEIR.
Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council	Flood risk and management	<p>The heathland soils are light in nature with an element of limestone particles within the growing medium, very free draining to the limestone brash subsoils which continue down to the water bearing strata which is the Central Lincolnshire aquifer which provides drinking water to many hundreds of thousands of homes.</p> <p>The villages of Scopwick and Kirkby Green have been adversely affected by flooding particularly during periods of high rainfall with an increasing incidence in recent years. The problems created by old and poorly maintained surface water drainage and sewerage systems may be exacerbated by the hard landscaping and the solar panels themselves. This should be investigated at an early stage in assessing the suitability of the land for solar panels.</p>	The potential impacts to water and groundwater are detailed within Chapter 10 and 13 of the PEIR.
Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council	Pollution	<p>The natural aquifer which is a unique feature of the Lincolnshire Heath and feeds the many springs and streams which occur along the site of the proposed solar development should be assessed and protected. The risks of pollution need to be assessed and monitored. In particular those associated with known risks of harmful chemicals from solar panels and battery installations</p>	The potential impacts to water and groundwater are detailed within Chapter 10 and 13 of the PEIR.

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
<p>Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council</p>	<p>Protected Species</p>	<p>The area is home to many protected species well adapted to the current landscape of open farmland and small woodlands. A full protected species survey should be carried out before construction begins and the habitats protected from development. The area is home to the wild brown hare whose numbers have declined rapidly in recent years due to habitat loss. They are protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 and listed as a priority species under the UK post 2010 Biodiversity Framework. The area is also an important habitat for birds of prey including the red kite, buzzard, and barn owl. The number of barn owls is declining, and this native bird was placed on the Red List of Birds of Conservation Concern (2021). Similarly, the area has important populations of ground nesting birds namely skylarks and lapwings, both species named on the Red List as numbers have been subject to recent dramatic decline. Other animals reported in the area and protected by law include bats, hazel dormice, slow-worms and badgers. The area is also home to several populations of deer, whose populations range over fields threatened with being fenced off and covered with solar panels. At a time when the UK has been assessed as one of the most ecologically impoverished countries in the world, it is proposed to take large areas of open countryside and valuable wildlife habitat for industrial use.</p>	<p>The ecological surveys undertaken to date and further survey work to be undertaken to inform the ES is detailed within Chapter 6 Biodiversity.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council	Health	Health of those living and working in the area should be considered particularly the effects on mental health. The pandemic highlighted the importance of being out in nature for our mental health. The considerable disruption of construction over many months together with the industrialisation of the landscape with high metal fencing, closely packed solar panels, lighting, CCTV and 3.5m high solar stations housing transformers on this vast scale will necessarily have a negative impact on mental health in an area which is used for both residential and recreational purposes	The CCTV system will be positioned away from any footpaths and sensitive receptors.
Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council	EIA	Commissioning RSK to prepare the EIA. RSK are not an independent body. They have a biased towards these projects as their ultimate parent company invest in these projects. We should be pushing for a truly independent body. This should be clearly highlighted as a major concern by the PC. RSK are owned by a major US private Equity firm called Ares who are directly involved in the Green Energy Market	Noted.
Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council	EIA Scope	RSK looking to take certain things out of scope in the EIA? This seems to be a common strategy by solar factory developers. Similar strategy was deployed by Mallard Pass developers. We should strongly object. The following should not be taken out of scope - 5.2 (Glint & Glare), 5.3 (Heat & Radiation), 5.4 (Major accidents and disaster), 5.5 (Utilities), 5.6 (Human health), 5.7 (Material assets and waste), 5.8 (population) and 5.9 (Water).	Noted.

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council	Population	They reference a document known as LA 112. LA 112 is not relevant they need to reconsider - LA112 is for transport projects this isn't a transport project (Design Manual for Roads & Bridges) There are major impacts to all the groups above as highlighted by the 95% who voted against this project in the last Parish meeting	Socio-economic statement will be produced and submitted in support of the DCO.
Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council	Private Property & Houses	They see no impact on our properties	Socio-economic statement will be produced and submitted in support of the DCO.
Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council	Community Land & Assets	They want this out of scope, they miss the point we live in this area for the outstanding natural beauty	The potential visual effects on are addressed in Chapter 9 Landscape and Visual of the PEIR.
Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council	Agricultural & Development Land	How can they position this as out of scope when they are taking 4200 acres of Best Most Valuable farmland out of production.	The impact to Best and Most Versatile agricultural land is assessed within Chapter 10 of the PEIR.
Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council	Public Rights of Way	Walkers Cyclists & Horse Riders They see no impact and indicate this should be out of scope. For all of these groups the significant change to the landscape will have a material impact. We are meant to be promoting health and wellbeing and the countryside is a key element of this	The potential visual effects on users of PROWs are addressed in Chapter 9: Landscape and Visual.

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council	Decommissioning	These areas are going to be covered in concrete to create hard standing platforms. This along with piling to create footings for the panels this land will never be used again for farming. What cast iron assurances will there be that ever piece of concrete will be removed from the land?	During the decommissioning phase, it is assumed that all concrete, hardstanding areas, foundations for the infrastructure and any internal tracks will be removed to a depth of up to 1m. It is assumed that all the below ground cables will be left in situ. Further detail is included within the PEIR Chapter 2.
Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council	CCTV	The CCTV is a gross intrusion into our human rights with security tracking our right to roam freely in the countryside.	The CCTV system will be positioned away from any footpaths and sensitive receptors.
Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council	Public Rights of Way	These have been in place for many years and were originally scoped by MR Eric Parker, these included 4 promoted walks. These walks will be fundamentally changed and spoilt. At a time when we are focussed so much on people's mental wellbeing this will have a significant detrimental impact	The potential visual effects on users of PROWs are addressed in Chapter 9: Landscape and Visual.
Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council	Cultural Heritage	There are a significant number of Listed Heritage sites across the planned site. These sites will all have their outlooks spoilt by the development	All heritage assets within 2km and all designated heritage assets within 5km have been included in the DBA and Stage 1 Setting Assessment. Those sensitive to changes in their setting have informed the masterplan of the Proposed Development and have been filtered for further assessment based on a worst case ZTV.

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council	Drainage	There is already increased risk of flooding in the Scopwick area. The document 5.9.23 references Cook & McQueen (2013) when discussing runoff and potential impacts on flooding. This was a modelled classroom study on a tiny scale. It did demonstrate a small increase. They cannot seriously be using a classroom-based study to take Water out of scope. The potential change to drainage on a site this large could be significant.	Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) will be undertaken as part of the EIA, which will inform the ongoing design of the Sustainable Drainage Systems. The FRA will be submitted in support of the DCO.
Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council	Use of borrow pits	Can the planning inspectorate guarantee that these sites won't be filled with construction contaminates and then back filled. Ref 5.7 materials, assets & waste	No borrow pits are proposed as part of the project.
Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council	Reasonable alternatives	Why has no alternative site or source of power generation been considered.	A summary of alternatives has been included within Chapter 3 of this PEIR. Further detail will be presented in the ES, the Statement of Need and the Planning Statement.
Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council	Climate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Panels shipped from China • Concrete on the Land • Alteration of Drainage • Removal of Best most valuable farmland out of production resulting in increase in import and the associated carbon footprint 	Climate Assessment which assesses the reasonable worst case is provided in Chapter 7 of the PEIR.

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council	Utilities	How can they look to make utilities out of SCOPE There is a significant risk with the Exolum Pipeline that crosses the Blankney estate. This pipeline is a critical piece of infrastructure and needs to be accessed at any time	We are aware of the Exolum Pipeline and are engaging with the relevant consultees to ensure that there is sufficient offset distances from any development.
Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council	Socio-Economic	Whilst during the construction phase there may be a few extra hotel/B&B rooms rented out the longer-term cost will be much higher as potential tourist will avoid the areas and the impact on property could be devastating.	Socio-economic impacts will be detailed within a Socio-economic Statement which will be submitted in support of the DCO.
Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council	Public Rights of Way	Temporary diversions potentially lasting two years will substantially impact the community's freedom of the community to walk the local countryside with adverse consequences to their health and well-being.	Any temporary diversions will be minimised where possible during the construction phase.
Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council	Public Rights of Way	It is not clear whether all the current footpaths and permitted paths are covered in the text. This facility is enjoyed and valued not only by the parish but also by the surrounding wider community in the district. A reduction to any of these will impact all communities' freedom of the community to walk the local countryside with adverse consequences to their health and well-being.	The potential visual effects on users of PROWs are addressed in Chapter 9: Landscape and Visual. The Proposed Development includes proposals to enhance the existing PROW network, as detailed in Figure 2-6 Access Parameter Plan.
Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council	Human health	5.6.5. As any potential human health impacts will be captured by the aforementioned assessments and there are not expected to be any significant human health impacts outside of these assessments, it is proposed that	Human Health has been scoped out from further assessment, however, air quality, climate and water will be assessed as part of the EIA.

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		<p>human health is not subject to dedicated assessment and therefore excluded from the scope of the EIA.</p> <p>Observation. The above observations fundamentally challenge the Report's assertion that "human health is not subject to dedicated assessment and therefore excluded from the scope of the EIA."</p>	
<p>Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council</p>	<p>Population</p>	<p>5.8.7. As no significant effects are expected in relation to private property and housing, it is proposed that these matters be scoped out of further assessment.</p> <p>Observation. The changes to the local environment arising from the proposed development will very inevitably impact the value of public and private residential property and housing in the area. This is a factor that should not be excluded from the EIA assessment</p>	<p>Residential visual amenity will be addressed as part of the LVIA in the ES but property value will not be addressed in the ES.</p>
<p>Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council</p>	<p>Population</p>	<p>5.8.9. As no significant effects are expected in relation to community land and assets, it is proposed that these matters be scoped out of further assessment.</p> <p>Observation. The community benefits from its current environment as a rural agricultural area which the proposed development as a mega-sized industrial plant will fundamentally impact. Therefore, this should not be scoped out of the EIA assessment</p>	<p>The visual effects on public amenity are addressed in Chapter 9 and where relevant views from community land and assets is addressed as appropriate.</p>
<p>Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council</p>	<p>Agricultural land holdings, development</p>	<p>5.8.11. There are no other businesses present within the (development) Site boundary. There is no land allocated for employment use, nor are there any planning applications</p>	<p>This will be reviewed prior to undertaking and the ES and will be detailed within a</p>

Statutory Consultee		Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
	land and businesses	<p>yet to be determined that will generate employment opportunities at the Site. Therefore, this should not be scoped out of the EIA assessment.</p> <p>While at present there are no other businesses, land allocated for business use, or planning applications for such within the Site, there nevertheless is the possibility that such, say as small cooperative agricultural holdings or business enterprises being generated any time in future as an alternative to the proposed development. Therefore, these should not be scoped out of the EIA assessment</p>		Socio-Economic Statement which will be submitted in support of the DCO.
Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council	Agricultural land holdings, development land and businesses	<p>5.8.18. As the PRWC will minimise any potential impacts to walkers, cyclists and horse riders during the construction phase and no significant permanent effects are expected in relation to walkers, cyclists and horse riders during the operational phase of the Proposed Development, it is proposed that these matters be scoped out of further assessment.</p> <p>Observation. As with 5.63 and 64 it is not clear whether all the current footpaths and permitted paths are covered in the text. This facility is enjoyed and valued not only by the parish but also by the surrounding wider community in the district. A reduction to any of these will negatively impact health and well-being</p>		The potential visual effects on users of PROWs are addressed in Chapter 9: Landscape and Visual.
Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council	Conclusion	<p>5.8.19. As no significant effects to population are expected across any of the five matters detailed in LA 112, it is proposed to exclude population from the scope of the EIA. However, socio-economic benefits as a result of the</p>		Socio-economics statement will be produced and submitted in support of the DCO application.

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		<p>Proposed Development are expected with regards to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase in the level of temporary employment; • The subsequent gross value added to the economy; • Uptake in the occupancy rate for beds in local hospitality venues; and • A small number of long-term employment opportunities during operation. <p>5.8.20. Therefore, a Socio-Economic Benefits Statement will be submitted in support of the DCO Application, highlighting the positive socio- economic impacts of the Proposed Development on the local and regional area. This statement will be produced outside of the EIA process and thus to avoid any potential for confusion or repetition, the Applicant does not consider it necessary to consider socio-economic impacts in an EIA context as well. Observation. The preceding observations demonstrate that the conclusions set out above in 5.8.19 are flawed in that the EIA proposes scoping out many factors of significance which will invalidate its very purpose. The missing factors should be made to be part of this EIA exercise</p>	
West Lindsey District Council			
West Lindsey District Council		<p>Planning Policy Context: The site is a good distance (approximately 8.8 miles) outside the closest West Lindsey District boundary near Cherry Willingham. The statutory development plan for the purposes of S38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 is the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan 2012-2036. It is expected that the</p>	<p>Noted. The Proposed Development will be assessed in accordance with the relevant policies and will be part of the individual ES chapters and assessed within the Planning Statement as part of the DCO application.</p>

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		<p>Central Lincolnshire Local Plan Review will be adopted on 13th April 2023 following examination and acceptance of all modifications recommended by the examining inspector. This would then have full weight as part of the Development Plan. As the district of West Lindsey is part of Central Lincolnshire its statutory development is also the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan 2012- 2036, soon to be Central Lincolnshire Local Plan Review. The Environmental Statement should consider National Planning Policy and Guidance as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF); - National Planning Practice Guidance (to include): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Climate Change - Historic Environment - Environmental Impact Assessment - Air Quality Ian Elliott @west-lindsey.gov.uk 5th April 2023 Page 2 of 3 - Light Pollution - Healthy and Safe Communities - Natural Environment - Noise - Renewable and Low Carbon Energy - Travel Plans, Transport Assessments and Statements in Decision-taking - Water Supply, Wastewater and Water Quality - National Design Guide 2019 - National Design Model Code 2012 	

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1)* · Overarching National Policy Statement on Renewable Energy Infrastructure (EN-3)* <p>* Currently under review by Central Government1</p>	
	Landscape and Visual	<p>As set out in the SR the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) should follow the guidance of the Landscape Institute “Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment 3rd Edition (2013), as proposed. An iterative approach, which guides the layout and scheme design should be followed.</p> <p>The location of the proposed Solar Park would be approximately 8.8 miles (14.3 kilometres) to 12.3 miles (19.9 kilometres) from the shared North Kesteven and West Lindsey district boundary. The height of the development (including infrastructure) would primarily be no more than around 6 metres high, however paragraph 2.4.43 of the SR states that “The National Grid Substation compound would have an approximate footprint of 500m x 500m in plan, and up to 15m in height. The majority of the infrastructure would be up to 6m in height, however, the steel gantries are assumed to be up to 15m in height”. The SR in paragraph 2.4.39 assumes that the National Grid Substation would be on the site. It is requested that more clarity and certainty is provided in the ES statement in terms of the location and appearance of the National Grid Substation which would have structures up to 15 metres in height.</p>	The LVIA will be undertaken in accordance with the identified guidance document.

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		<p>Given the height of the development subject to the location of the 15 metre high unit it would either not be expected to be in view from any parts of the West Lindsey District or if in view would not be expected to have an unacceptable harmful visual impact on the West Lindsey District. Therefore it is not considered likely that any viewpoints from West Lindsey would be necessary and no residential properties in West Lindsey are expected to be affected.</p>	
	Cumulative Effect	<p>West Lindsey which is part of Central Lincolnshire, with North Kesteven District Council and Lincoln City Council, and is expecting four large scale solar projects (nationally significant infrastructure) to be applied for through a Development Consent Order in addition to Springwell Solar Farm. These are (with update):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 600MW Cottam Solar Project Proposed across 3 sites on land (1270Ha) in proximity of Sturton by Stow and Willingham by Stow, Corringham and Blyton. The Planning Inspectorate (PINS) confirmed on 9th February that this project has been accepted for examination. - 500MW Gate Burton Solar Project The development is proposed on a 684Ha site to the south of Gainsborough/Lea. It was accepted for examination on 22nd February, - 480MW West Burton Solar Project Proposed across 3 sites (788Ha) on land to the south of Sturton by Stow. The Planning Inspectorate have advised they received an application for a Development Consent Order (DCO) on 21st March. They will make a decision on whether to accept the application for examination, by 18th April. 	<p>Chapter 15 of the PEIR sets out the Cumulative effects, methodology for carrying out the assessing and Zone of Influence for each Environmental Factor. This is a preliminary assessment is based on publicly available information at the time.</p> <p>Further consultation with North Kesteven District Council and Lincolnshire County Council to agree the final short list for inclusion in the ES will be undertaken</p>

Statutory Consultee	Description	Statutory Consultee Comments	Response
		<p>· 500MW Tillbridge Solar Project 1400Ha site on land between Corringham and Glentworth. It is anticipated by PINS, that the developer will submit their application in Q4 2023. Before that, the developer will be required to advertise and undertake public consultation, which is anticipated they will hold around May/June 2023.</p> <p>Whilst the structure of the ES appears to be generally acceptable it is imperative that any Environmental Impact Assessment clearly considers within its structure the cumulative effect of Springwell Solar Farm with these other solar farm projects and any other solar Farms in Central Lincolnshire such as the Fiskerton Solar project, which is an extant development, with consent to expand. There are questions as to how all these developments taken together will affect Central Lincolnshire's character, as traditional rural Lincolnshire Countryside.</p>	