



Little Crow

Solar Park

Little Crow Solar Park, Scunthorpe

DRAFT STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND WITH NLC

Revision:
APFP Reg:
PINS Reference:

Submission
5(2)(q)
EN010101

Author:
Date:

March 2020

LITTLE CROW SOLAR PARK

**LAND TO THE EAST OF STEEL WORKS,
SCUNTHORPE**

**DRAFT STATEMENT OF COMMON
GROUND (SOCG)**

1ST DRAFT FOR NLC TO REVIEW

11 MARCH 2020

BETWEEN:

- I. LITTLE CROW SOLAR PARK; AND
- II. NORTH LINCOLNSHIRE COUNCIL

ON BEHALF OF INRG SOLAR (LITTLE CROW) LTD

Pegasus Group

First Floor | South Wing | Equinox North | Great Park Road | Almondsbury | Bristol | BS32 4QL

T 01454 625945 | **F** 01454 618074 | **W** www.pegasusgroup.co.uk

Birmingham | Bracknell | Bristol | Cambridge | Cirencester | East Midlands | Leeds | Liverpool | London | Manchester

PLANNING | **DESIGN** | **ENVIRONMENT** | **ECONOMICS**

CONTENTS:

Page No:

1.	INTRODUCTION	1
2.	DEVELOPMENT DESCRIPTION	3
3.	CONSULTATION UNDERTAKEN	9
4.	POLICY FRAMEWORK	11
5.	SOCIO ECONOMIC IMPACTS	27
6.	LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL	28
7.	ECOLOGY AND BIODIVERSITY	32
8.	CULTURAL HERITAGE	45
9.	TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORT	57
10.	NOISE AND VIBRATION	60
11.	AIR QUALITY	62
12.	GROUND CONDITIONS & LAND CONTAMINATION	67
13.	AGRICULTURAL LAND	72
14.	HYDROLOGY AND DRAINAGE	73
15.	ARBORICULTURE	75
16.	COMMUNITY BENEFITS	79
17.	DECLARATIONS	80

APPENDICES:

APPENDIX 1:	LAND USE ZONING PLAN
APPENDIX 2:	PLANNING APPLICATION DRAWINGS

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 This draft Statement of Common Ground has been prepared as part of the application process for a Development Consent Order for the Little Crow Solar Park [“the Development”]. This draft document has been prepared jointly between the applicant and North Lincolnshire Council.

North Lincolnshire Council

1.2 North Lincolnshire Council is the governing body of the unitary authority of North Lincolnshire. Situated on the northern border of Lincolnshire, just below the Humber Estuary, North Lincolnshire covers an area of approximately 85,000 hectares. It provides a range of functions to local residents and business. These include its functions as the local planning authority, minerals and waste authority, Highways Authority, Lead Local Flood Authority, business development, education, learning & culture, leisure, trading standards, licensing, governance and partnerships, adult social care and children's services.

Purpose of Document

1.3 This draft statement of common ground is a working document prepared jointly by the applicant and North Lincolnshire Council. The document has been structured to reflect the matters and topic relevant between the applicant and North Lincolnshire Council.

1.4 The remainder of this document is split into individual topic-specific statements.

1.5 As this is a working document, the general approach for each topic-specific section is to provide common ground text set out in a tabulated format for North Lincolnshire Council to comment upon and then either agree, disagree or identify the need for further negotiations. A second table is then provided which discusses the comments made during the consultation phases.

1.6 As the SoCG evolves, the aim will be to provide each topic-specific sections with three distinct tables covering (i) matters that are agreed, (ii) matters which are subject to further negotiations and (iii) matters not agreed.

1.7 The remainder of this document is split into the following sections:

- Section 2:** Development Description
- Section 3:** Consultation Undertaken
- Section 4:** Policy Framework
- Section 5:** Socio-Economic Impact
- Section 6:** Landscape and Visual
- Section 7:** Ecology and Biodiversity
- Section 8:** Cultural Heritage
- Section 9:** Traffic and Transport
- Section 10:** Noise and Vibration
- Section 11:** Air Quality
- Section 12:** Land Contamination
- Section 13:** Agricultural Land
- Section 14:** Hydrology and Flood Risk
- Section 15:** Arboriculture
- Section 16:** Community Benefits
- Section 17:** Declarations

2. DEVELOPMENT DESCRIPTION

- 2.1 The main element of the Development is the construction, operation, maintenance and decommissioning of a ground mounted solar park with a maximum design capacity of up to 150MWp (megawatts peak) and battery storage capacity of up to 90MW. Battery storage will allow the development to fully utilise the network connection capacity when the solar park is not exporting at peak capacity. The battery element of the proposal would be available to store energy from and release electrical energy to the electricity network.
- 2.2 The solar and battery elements could either be delivered and connected to the electricity network independently of each other or at the same time. They could therefore be constructed and become operational either independently or together. An operational lifespan of 35 years is sought for each element and, subject to when they are constructed, the operational lifespans could run concurrently or interdependently.
- 2.3 A single main substation compound will serve the whole Development, and this will be required for the duration of the Development and retained thereafter. The substation compound would be located near the northern perimeter of the site and to the east of the existing double row of 132kV overhead electricity pylons which traverse the site and duly provides the point of connection to the local electricity network.
- 2.4 The Development area can be effectively split into seven land use zones, these are:-
- Zone 1: Ground mounted solar photovoltaic arrays
 - Zone 2: Battery Compound Yard
 - Zone 3: Ecological corridors
 - Zone 4: Central substation compound and connection to the national grid
 - Zone 5: Main access track
 - Zone 6: Perimeter development buffer
 - Zone 7: Temporary construction compound

- 2.5 The proposed land use zoning plan is provided at Appendix 1. The proposed layout drawings are provided at Appendix 2.

**APPENDIX 1 – LAND USE ZONING PLAN
APPENDIX 2 – PLANNING APPLICATION DRAWINGS**

Solar Arrays

- 2.6 All solar photovoltaic (PV) modules will be located within the fields enclosures / Zone 1 as defined on the zoning plan. The total solar output will not exceed 150MW with land coverage of the PV modules would be 800,000 sq m.
- 2.7 The PV modules would be static, mounted on aluminium metal racks. The racks will be laid out in multiple parallel rows running east to west across the various field enclosures. The distance between the arrays would respond to topography but would typically be between 3.5 metres to 6 metres. The maximum height of the solar panels fixed onto the framework would be under 2.5m. All PV modules will be south facing.
- 2.8 The mounting system will be primarily formed of piled posts set approximately 3.75m apart, except within areas of archaeological interest where the posts will be fixed into concrete pads resting on top of the ground. The PV modules would be dark blue, grey or black in colour with the frame constructed of anodized aluminium alloy.
- 2.9 For archaeological interests, a development exclusion zone has been provided around the area containing the former Gokewell Priory. No arrays or cable runs will go through this area. The area will be used to provide biodiversity measures and will be delineated with a stock-proof fence. The existing public right of way (Footpath 214) running through this area will be retained.
- 2.10 Inverters, transformers and associated switch gear which are required to convert the DC electricity produced by the arrays into AC energy, will be spread equally across the site. Insulated DC cables from the solar modules will be routed in channels fixed on the underside of the framework. The electrical cabling from each array will be concealed through shallow trenches linking the modules to the inverters and transformers and then to the main substation. AC cables will also be laid in trenches and would run directly to the main substation compound.

- 2.11 The arrays would be set within stock-proof fencing up to 2m in height with wooden supporting posts placed at intervals of c. 3.5m. The stock proof fencing would be either green or galvanised aluminium in finish. The minimum distance between the edge of the arrays and the stock-proof fence would be 3m. Land between and beneath the panels would be used for biodiversity enhancements and seasonal sheep grazing.
- 2.12 A CCTV system mounted on poles would be positioned at intervals along the inside face edge of the stock-proof fencing (between the fence and the arrays).

Battery Storage Compound

- 2.13 The battery storage compound consists of industrial batteries that can store energy and are able to release or absorb energy from the power network. Being able to absorb and release energy, the battery storage at Little Crow can be used to contribute towards the frequency balancing services, where the power is being generated or absorbed statically or dynamically depending on the system frequency.
- 2.14 When there is not enough power, batteries are discharged to balance under frequency, preventing black and brown outs. To balance over frequency, batteries are charged to prevent dangerous spikes across electricity infrastructure¹.
- 2.15 All batteries will be located within the Zone 2 as defined on the zoning plan. The total land coverage of the battery compound would not exceed 3,500 m sq. The total storage capacity would not exceed 90MW.
- 2.16 The compound would be made secure by a 3m gated palisade fence. Battery containers would have a maximum length of 17m, maximum width of 3m and a maximum height of 4m. The maximum storage capacity of a single battery container would be c6MW. The battery containers would be dark green in colour. The maximum development footprint of the battery storage compound will be 55m by 100m and will be surfaced with stone chippings.

¹ The National Electricity Transmission System is an islanded network with no AC connections to other networks. In order to manage the system frequency within the normal operating range 49.5Hz to 50.5Hz, National Grid relies on frequency balancing service providers to modulate their active power output or consumption in order to minimise the imbalance between generation and demand on the system. The extent of the required modulation is determined by the deviation of the system frequency from 50Hz. A change in grid frequency is caused by an imbalance of supply and demand.

Substation

- 2.17 A single substation compound will be required for the Development and this will be constructed at the start of the development of the whole site. Following construction and commissioning the substation compound will be adopted and become the property of the District Network Operator (DNO, who will maintain the compound throughout the lifetime of the Development. The decommissioning of the substation is not considered as part of the Application as this will be the property of the DNO and as such would be outside the gift of the developer to decommission.
- 2.18 The maximum development footprint of the substation yard will be 80m by 80m and will be surfaced with stone chippings. Under normal conditions the site would be unmanned.

Landscape and ecological management plan

- 2.19 The Development proposal presents considerable opportunity for landscape and biodiversity mitigation and enhancement. The Landscape and Biodiversity proposal are discussed in detail in the supporting Landscape and Ecological Management Plan.
- 2.20 Ecological and biodiversity measures are promoted across the entire site and these enhanced areas are shown as land zone 3, as shown on the zoning plan. Land between and beneath the panels would be used for biodiversity enhancements and seasonal sheep grazing. Tree planting would be introduced along the north east section of the development boundary.
- 2.21 The existing woodland plantations that surround the various field enclosures would continue to be managed by the landowner as part of its woodland forestry licence. The hedgerows surrounding the field edges will also be managed via the Landscape and Ecological Management Plan.

Access

- 2.22 It is proposed that construction traffic will arrive from the M180 junction 4, the A15, the A18, the B1208 and B1207 to the site access. From the M180 junction 4 vehicles will use the A15 northbound to the Briggate Lodge Roundabout and then travel east along the A18 towards Brigg. From the A18, vehicles will turn left onto the B1208. The B1208 measures between approximately 5.5 and six metres wide.

Vehicles will travel along the B1208 to the junction with the B1207 and then continue straight ahead into the site access.

- 2.23 No construction vehicles associated with the development proposal would travel through Broughton.

Construction phase & Temporary Construction Compound

- 2.24 As stated elsewhere in this section, the solar and battery elements could either be constructed and connected to the electricity network independently of each other or at the same time. If all elements were constructed as at the same time, then the construction period would take approximately 11 months (up to 47 weeks).

- 2.25 Construction activities will be carried out Monday to Friday 07:00-18:00 and between 08:00 and 13:30 on Saturdays. Where possible, construction deliveries will be coordinated to avoid HGV movements during the traditional AM peak hour (08:00-09:00) and PM peak hour (17:00-18:00).

- 2.26 During the construction phase (or phases) one main construction compound will serve the development proposal and this will be located off the main site entrance, thus reducing the distance delivery vehicles will need to travel after reaching the site's entrance.

- 2.27 The temporary construction compound would comprise: -

- Temporary portacabins providing office and welfare facilities for construction operatives
- Parking area for construction and workers vehicles
- Secure compound for storage
- Temporary hardstanding
- Wheel washing facilities
- Temporary gated compound
- Storage bins for recyclables and other waste

All construction vehicles will exit through the wheel wash area in order to reduce the spread of mud and dirt onto the local highway network. Temporary roadways may be utilised to access parts of the development site and this would be guided by weather conditions at time of construction.

Temporary Diversion of Public Rights of Way

- 2.28 A temporary diversion of a section of the right of way (footpath 214) traversing the site will be required during the construction and subsequent decommissioning phases. The temporary diversion will only be required to allow the build out and removal of the solar park and main substation compound and this will be for a maximum of 11 months. The proposed temporary diversion is presented at Appendix 3.

APPENDIX 3 - PROPOSED TEMPORARY DIVERSION OF PUBLIC FOOTPATH 214

Decommissioning

- 2.29 An outline decommissioning strategy is included within the Environmental Statement and sets out details of the decommissioning programme to be carried out after a 35 year generation period. It includes the methods for the removal of all the solar panels, cabins, structures, batteries, enclosures, equipment and all other apparatus above and below ground level from the site and details of their destination in terms of waste/recycling, and details of how the site is to be restored.

3. CONSULTATION UNDERTAKEN

3.1 This section provides an overview of the phased pre-application consultation process undertaken by and on behalf of the applicant.

3.2 The main phase of consultation are summaries below.

Consultation Phase	Key Dates	Description
Non-Statutory engagement and consultation	December 2017 to November 2018	Non-statutory discussion with public and statutory consultees through extensive informal consultations. Public exhibitions were held in January 2018 which introduced the preliminary designs to the host community.
Agreeing the SOCC	3rd August 2018 to 28th November 2018	The approach to the formal statutory consultation was agreed with North Lincolnshire Council in November 2018.
Statutory Consultation	3rd December 2018 to 4th March 2019	The Statutory pre-application consultation was carried from 3rd December 2018 to 4th March 2019. This included public exhibitions held in December 2018.
Environmental Impact Assessment Scoping Direction	19 December 2018 to 25th January 2019	Applicant made request to the Secretary of State, via Planning Inspectorate, for EIA Scoping Direction. Planning Inspectorate issued Screening

		Direction after consultation with prescribed bodies.
Post-Statutory Engagement	March 2019 to March 2020	Consultation and continued engagement undertaken between March 2019 and September 2019 to keep stakeholders informed of progress and to keep consultees informed on final minor refinements to schemes.

4. POLICY FRAMEWORK

- 4.1 By virtue of its potential generating capacity, which stands at over 50MW, this project constitutes a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP). Therefore, instead of applying to the local authority for Planning Permission, the developer must apply to the Planning Inspectorate for a different permission called a Development Consent Order (DCO). The process for applying for a Development Consent Order is set out in the Planning Act 2008 (the 'Act')².
- 4.2 The Act introduced a new system for consulting on, examining and determining NSIPs as defined by Section 14 of the Act. The main legislative and procedural requirements relating to NSIPs are set out within the following:
- The Act;
 - The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009 (the APFP Regulations)³; and
 - The Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2009 (the 2009 EIA Regulations) and The Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (the 2017 EIA Regulations)⁴.

Relevant Policy

- 4.3 National Policy Statements (NPSs) form the overarching policy documents when determining an application for NSIPs and form the basis for determination of decisions. Policies in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the extant Development Plan for North Lincolnshire, as set out later, do form material considerations relevant to the decision making body, but do not supersede policy set out in NPSs.
- 4.4 The application must primarily therefore demonstrate accordance with the relevant NPSs. In the case of renewable energy projects the following NPSs must be taken into account:-

² The Project constitutes a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP) by virtue of section 14 (1)(a) and section 15 of the Planning Act 2008 (PA 2008) which includes within the definition of an NSIP any onshore electricity generating station in England or Wales of 50 Megawatt capacity or more. Under section 31 PA 2008 a development consent order (DCO) is required to develop a NSIP. Under section 37 PA 2008 this can only be granted if an application is made to the Secretary of State (SoS).

³ <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2009/2264/contents/made>

⁴ <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2017/572/contents/made>

- National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1);
- National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy Infrastructure (EN-3); and,
- National Policy Statement for Electricity Networks (EN-5)

National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1) dated July 2011

- 4.5 The National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1) sets out the national policy for energy infrastructure, which encompasses renewable energy schemes generating more than 50MW. EN-1 is part of a suite of national policy statements issued by the Secretary of State for Energy and Climate Change and ratified by Parliament.
- 4.6 It has effect in combination with the relevant technology specific NPS, National Policy for Renewable Energy Infrastructure (EN-3), and together they provide the primary basis for decisions made by the Examining Authority.
- 4.7 EN-1 is divided into five parts.
- 4.8 **Part 1** sets out the background to the policy document. **Paragraph 1.71** identify how all energy NPSs have been subject to an Appraisal of Sustainability ["AoS"], as required by the Planning Act 2008. The key points from the AoS for EN-1, as set out at **paragraph 1.7.2**, are: -
- The energy NPSs should speed up the transition to a low carbon economy and thus help realise UK climate change commitments sooner than continuation under the current planning system.
 - The energy NPSs are likely to contribute positively towards improving the vitality and competitiveness of the UK energy market by providing greater clarity for developers which should improve the UK's security of supply and, less directly, have a positive effects for the health and well-being in the medium to longer term through helping to secure affordable supplies of energy and minimizing fuel poverty, positive medium and long term effects are also likely for equalities;
- 4.9 **Part 2 of EN-1** sets out the Government policy on energy and energy development infrastructure. It confirms the following;

- Government is committed to meeting its legally binding target regarding greenhouse gas emissions, which is now to reach carbon zero by 2050.
- the need to effect a transition to a low carbon economy so as to reduce greenhouse gas emissions; and
- the importance of maintaining secure and reliable energy supplies as older fossil fuel generating plant closes as the UK moves towards a low carbon economy

4.10 Government's wider objective for energy infrastructure includes contributing to sustainable development and ensuring that energy infrastructure is safe.

4.11 **Paragraph 2.2.27** of the EN-1 goes on to state

"Sustainable development is relevant not just in terms of addressing climate change, but because the way energy infrastructure is deployed affects the well-being of society and the economy."

4.12 **Part 3 of EN-1** defines and sets out the need that exists for nationally significant energy infrastructure. With regards to decision making, paragraph 3.1.1. of EN-1, states that

"the UK needs all the types of energy infrastructure covered in this NPS in order to achieve energy security at the same time as dramatically reducing greenhouse gas emissions."

4.13 **Paragraph 3.1.2** states

"It is for industry to propose new energy infrastructure projects within the strategic framework set by Government. The Government does not consider it appropriate for planning policy to set targets for or limits on different technologies".

It then goes on to identify how NSIP applications should therefore be assessed on the basis that the Government has already demonstrated that there is a need for those types of infrastructure and that the scale and urgency of that need is as described in the EN-1.

4.14 In terms of the planning balance, **paragraph 3.1.4 of EN-1** states

"The [determining authority] should give substantial weight to the contribution which projects would make towards satisfying this need when considering applications for development consent under the Planning Act 2008".

4.15 **Section 3.3 of the EN-1** discusses the need for new nationally significant electricity infrastructure projects. The key reasons why Government believes there is an urgent need for new electricity NSIPs are identified as: -

- Meeting the energy security and carbon reduction objectives;
- Need to replace closing electricity generating capacity;
- The need for more electricity capacity to support an increased supply from renewables.
- Future increases in electricity demand; and
- The urgency of the need for new electricity capacity.

4.16 **Paragraph 3.3.11** identifies how renewable sources, such as solar, are intermittent and as such will require back-up sources at times when the availability of intermittent renewable sources is low. **Paragraph 3.3.12** goes on to identify how electrical storage technologies can be used to compensate for the intermittence. The application proposal delivers on both of these fronts.

4.17 **Part 3.4 of EN-1** specifically discusses the role of renewable energy and states: -

The UK has committed to sourcing 15% of its total energy (across the sectors of transport, electricity and heat) from renewable sources by 2020 and new projects need to continue to come forward urgently to ensure that we meet this target. Projections suggest that by 2020 about 30% or more of our electricity generation – both centralised and small-scale – could come from renewable sources, compared to 6.7% in 2009. The Committee on Climate Change in Phase 1 of its advice to Government in September 2010 agreed that the UK 2020 target was appropriate, and should not be increased. Phase 2 was published in May 2011 and provided recommendations on the post 2020 ambition for renewables in the UK, and possible pathways to maximise their contribution to the 2050 carbon reduction targets.

Large scale deployment of renewables will help the UK to tackle climate change, reducing the UK's emissions of carbon dioxide by over 750 million tonnes by 2030. It will also deliver up to half a million jobs by 2020 in the renewables sector...

4.18 With regards to the urgency for renewables, **paragraph 3.4.5** explains that in order to largely decarbonize the power sector by 2030, it is necessary to bring forward new renewable electricity generation projects as soon as possible. It goes on to state: -

"The need for new renewable electricity generation projects is therefore urgent".

4.19 This urgency has now escalated as Government has subsequently set a target of achieving carbon zero by 2050.

4.20 **Part 4 of EN-1** sets out certain strategic principles to be applied in respect of nationally significant energy infrastructure schemes including the presumption in favour of development.

4.21 **Paragraph 4.1.2** states how the determining authority should start with the presumption in favour of granting consent to applications for energy NSIPs. That presumption applies unless any more specific and relevant policies set out in the relevant NPSs clearly indicate that consent should be refused.

4.22 The presumption is also subject to the provisions of the Planning Act 2008.

4.23 **Paragraph 4.1.4** of EN-1 states how in considering any proposed development, and in particular when weighing its adverse impacts against its benefits, the determining authority should take into account: -

- Its potential benefits including its contribution to meeting the need for energy infrastructure, job creation and any long-term or wider benefits; and
- Its potential adverse impacts, including any long-term and cumulative adverse impacts, as well as any measures to avoid, reduce or compensate for any adverse impacts.

4.24 Development consent obligations that are agreed with local authority is considered through **paragraph 4.1.8** and states that the determining authority may take these into account provided that they are relevant to planning, necessary to make

the proposed development acceptable in planning terms, directly relates to the proposed development, fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the proposed development, and reasonable in all other respects.

4.25 **Part 4.4** deal with alternatives. **Paragraph 4.4.1** states

"From a policy perspective this NPS does not contain any general requirement to consider alternatives or to establish whether the proposed project represents the best option".

4.26 That said **paragraph 4.4.2** identified how applicants are obliged to include in their ES, as a matter of fact, information about the main alternatives they have studied and this should include an indication of the main reasons for the applicant's choice, taking into account the environmental, social and economic effects.

4.27 **Paragraph 4.4.3** goes on to state that where there is a policy or legal requirement to consider alternatives the applicant should describe the alternatives considered in compliance with these requirements.

4.28 On the issue of design for energy infrastructure, **paragraph 4.5.1** of the EN-1 identifies how (inter alia)

"Applying "good design" to energy projects should produce sustainable infrastructure sensitive to place, efficient in the use of natural resources and energy used in their construction and operation, matched by an appearance that demonstrates good aesthetic as far as possible. It is acknowledged, however that the nature of much energy infrastructure development will often limit the extent to which it can contribute to the enhancement of the quality of the area".

4.29 **Paragraph 4.9.1** of the EN-1 recognises that

"The connection of a proposed electricity generation plant to the electricity network is an important consideration for applicants wanting to construct or extend generation plant".

It goes on to state how

"In the market system, it is for the applicant to ensure that there will be necessary infrastructure and capacity within an existing or planned transmission or distribution network to accommodate the electricity generated".

4.30 **Part 5 of the EN-1** sets out the generic impacts that may or may not be pertinent to specific projects, these are lists as: -

4.31 Table 5.1 EN-1 Generic Impacts

Topic	Commentary
Land use	<p>With regards to agricultural land classification, para 5.10.8 states how applicants should seek to minimize impacts on the best and most versatile agricultural land except where this would be inconsistent with other sustainability considerations.</p> <p>Paragraph 5.10.15 identifies how the determining authority should ensure that applicants provide justification when locating sites on best and most versatile agricultural land. With regards to mitigation, EN-1 states that there may be little that can be done to mitigate the direct effects of an energy project on the existing use of the proposed site.</p>
Landscape and Visual	<p>Paragraph 5.9.8 sets out that for nationally significant energy infrastructure, projects need to be designed carefully, having regard to siting, operational and other relevant constraints the aim should be to minimize harm to the landscape, providing reasonable mitigation where possible and appropriate.</p>
Biodiversity and geological conservation	<p>As a general principle, development should aim to avoid significant harm to biodiversity and geological conservation interests, including through mitigation and consideration of reasonable alternatives; where significant harm cannot be avoided, then appropriate compensation measures should be sought.</p>
Historic Environment	<p>Paragraph 5.8.8 states that as part of the ES the applicant should provide a description of the significance of the heritage assets assessed by the proposed development and</p>

	<p>the contribution of their setting to that significance. The level of detail should be proportionate to the importance of the heritage asset and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on the significance of the heritage asset.</p> <p>Paragraph 5.8.12 goes on to state that in considering the impact of the proposed development on any heritage asset, the determining authority should take into account the particular nature of the significance of the heritage assets and the value that they hold for this and future generations. This understanding should be used to avoid or minimize conflict between conservation of that significance and proposals for development.</p>
<p>Dust, odour, artificial lighting</p>	<p>Paragraph 5.6.3 of EN-1 recognises that for energy NSIP, some impacts on amenity for local communities is likely to be unavoidable. The aim should be to keep impacts to a minimum, and at a level that is acceptable.</p>
<p>Flood Risk</p>	<p>Applications for energy projects of 1 hectare of greater in flood zone 1 should be accompanied by a flood risk assessment.</p> <p>The surface water drainage arrangements for any project should be such that the volumes and peak flow rate of surface water leaving the site are no greater than the rate prior to the proposed project, unless specific off-site arrangements are made and results in the same net effect.</p>
<p>Air Quality and Emission</p>	<p>Paragraph 5.2.6 states "<i>Where the project is likely to have adverse effects on air quality the applicant should undertake an assessment of the impacts of the proposed project as part of the Environmental Statement</i>". The ES should describe: any significant air emissions, their mitigation and any residual effects distinguishing between the project stages and taking account of any significant emissions from any</p>

	<p>road traffic generated by the project; the predicted absolute emission levels of the proposed project, after mitigation methods have been applied; existing air quality levels and the relative change in air quality from existing levels; and any potential eutrophication impacts.</p>
<p>Socio Economic</p>	<p>Paragraph 5.12.3 states "<i>Where the project is likely to have socio-economic impacts at local or regional levels, the applicant should undertake and include in their application an assessment of these impacts as part of the ES</i>". The effects should consider: the creation of jobs and training opportunities; the provision of additional local services and improvements to local infrastructure, including the provision of educational and visitor facilities; effects on tourism; the impact of a changing influx of workers during the different construction, operation and decommissioning phases of the energy infrastructure. This could change the local population dynamics and could alter the demand for services and facilities in the settlements nearest to the construction work (including community facilities and physical infrastructure such as energy, water, transport and waste). There could also be effects on social cohesion depending on how populations and service provision change as a result of the development; and cumulative effects – if development consent were to be granted to for a number of projects within a region and these were developed in a similar timeframe, there could be some short-term negative effects, for example a potential shortage of construction workers to meet the needs of other industries and major projects within the region.</p>
<p>Traffic and Transport</p>	<p>With regards to decision taking, EN-1 recognises that a new energy NSIP may give rise to substantial impacts on the surrounding transport infrastructure and the Planning Inspectorate should therefore ensure that the applicant has sought to mitigate these impacts, including during the</p>

	<p>construction phase of the development. Where the proposed mitigation measures are insufficient to reduce the impact on the transport infrastructure to acceptable levels, the IPC [now PINS] should consider requirements to mitigate adverse impacts on transport networks arising from the development.</p>
<p>Water Quality</p>	<p>Where the project is likely to have effects on the water environment, the applicant should undertake an assessment of the existing status of, and impacts of the proposed project on, water quality, water resources and physical characteristics of the water environment as part of the ES or equivalent</p>

National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy Infrastructure (EN-3)

4.32 EN-3 contains policies specifically relating to specific renewable energy infrastructure and it is designed to be read in conjunction with EN-1. The document focuses on schemes relating to onshore wind, offshore wind and energy from biomass. Paragraph 1.8.2 states that the NPS does not cover any other types of onshore renewable energy generation that were technically viable over 50MW when the document was published in July 2011. The emergence of large scale ground mounted solar projects therefore follows the publication of this document.

National Policy Statement for Electricity Networks (EN-5)

4.33 The National Policy Statement on Electricity Networks Infrastructure (EN-5) was adopted in July 2011. Whilst EN-5 principally covers above ground electricity lines of 132 kV, paragraph 1.8.2 confirms that EN-5 will also be relevant if the electricity network constitutes an associated development for which consent is sought, such as a generating station.

4.34 Part 2 of EN-5 sets out a number of assessment and technology specific matters. Paragraph 2.2.2 points out that the location of electricity networks will often be determined by the particular generating station and the existing electricity network. Part 2 sets out particular generic impacts concerning biodiversity and geological conservation, landscape and visual, noise and vibration, and electric and magnetic field effects.

4.35 The Development will incorporate a new substation and a relatively short underground 132kV connection to the existing 132kV underground cable located close to the centre of the site, and as such minimises the scale and extent of the new development required as existing infrastructure can be utilised. In line with EN-5, the new Development substation has been assessed as part of the Development and the findings of its effects on the environment are set out in the ES.

National Planning Policy Framework 2019 (2nd Edition version 3)

4.36 The revision to the Framework, which came into force on February 2018, has affected both its contents and structure whereby the document is now set into 17 topic based chapters. Overall, for the NPPF 2nd edition, the over-arching presumption in favour of sustainable development remains.

4.37 Whilst the NPPF does not contain any specific policies for NSIP development, paragraph 5 of the NPPF states that:

"These are determined in accordance with the decision making framework in the Planning Act 2008 (as amended) and relevant national policy statements for major infrastructure, as well as any other matters that are relevant (which may include the National Planning Policy Framework). National policy statements form part of the overall framework of national planning policy, and may be a material consideration in preparing plans and making decisions on planning applications."

4.38 Material for this application is how Government has placed a greater emphasis on the delivery of infrastructure, including energy and how this is integral towards fulfilling the economic arm of achieving sustainable development. **Paragraph 8** of the Framework identifies how the planning system has three overarching objectives towards achieving sustainable development.

4.39 The revised NPPF stated how these objectives are interdependent and need to be pursued in mutually supportive ways so that opportunities can be taken to secure net gains across each of the different objectives. Paragraph 8(a) 'an economic objective' has been strengthened and the NPPF now makes it clearer how **"identifying and coordinating provision of infrastructure"** is integral towards fulfilling the economic arm of achieving sustainable development. The three overarching objectives are listed as:-

a) an economic objective – to help build a strong, responsive and competitive economy, by ensuring that sufficient land of the right types is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth, innovation and improved productivity; and by identifying and coordinating the provision of infrastructure;

b) a social objective – to support strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by ensuring that a sufficient number and range of homes can be provided to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by fostering a well-designed and safe built environment, with accessible services and open spaces that reflect current and future needs and support communities’ health, social and cultural well-being; and

c) an environmental objective – to contribute to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment; including making effective use of land, helping to improve biodiversity, using natural resources prudently, minimising waste and pollution, and mitigating and adapting to climate change, including moving to a low carbon economy.

4.40 **Paragraph 9** advises how these overarching objectives should be delivered through the preparation and implementation of plans and the application of policies in the Framework. Paragraph 10 states *"So that sustainable development is pursued in a positive way, at the heart of the Framework is a **presumption in favour of sustainable development**"*.

4.41 **Paragraph 15** of the Framework sets out how the planning system should be genuinely plan-led. **Paragraph 20** identifies how, in line with the presumption on favour of sustainable development, plans should make sufficient provision for the provision of infrastructure and energy.

4.42 **Section 14** of the NPPF relates to meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change. **Paragraph 150** of the NPPF sets out the planning policy perspective with regards to increasing the use and supply of renewable and low carbon energy. Through the paragraph, Government requires the decision maker to:-

a) provide a positive strategy for energy from these sources, that maximises the potential for suitable development, while ensuring that adverse impacts are addressed satisfactorily (including cumulative landscape and visual impacts);

b) consider identifying suitable areas for renewable and low carbon energy sources, and supporting infrastructure, where this would help secure their development; and

c) identify opportunities for development to draw its energy supply from decentralised, renewable or low carbon energy supply systems and for co-locating potential heat customers and suppliers.

4.43 Section 15 of the NPPF relates to conservation and enhancement of the natural environment. **Paragraph 170** highlights that new development should be prevented from contributing to or being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by unacceptable levels of soil, air, water or noise pollution or land instability. It identifies how decisions should provide net gains for biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures.

North Lincolnshire Local Development Framework (LDF)

4.44 The legal requirement under s38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 to determine applications for development consent in accordance with North Lincolnshire's Development Plan documents does not apply to applications under the 2008 Act. However, NPS EN-1 paragraph 4.1.5 provides that the policies contained within the Development Plan documents and other Local Development Framework documents may be considered important and relevant in planning decision making, but national policy will prevail where there is a conflict with the Development Plan for the purpose of the Secretary of State's planning decision making. The Development Plan is therefore a material consideration for the Secretary of State and has accordingly been considered as part of the policy.

4.45 The components of the Development Plan pertinent to the application site and development proposal comprises: -

i. Core Strategy Development Plan Document (adopted June 2011).

4.46 The Core Strategy DPD was adopted by North Lincolnshire Council in June 2011 and it sets out the local policy framework to deliver sustainable growth within the administrative area up to plan period of 2026. One of the strategic objectives of the Core Strategy (objective no. 7) is to promote the use of renewable energy and

support the reduction in the consumption of non-renewable resources such as fossil fuels. This application proposal achieves these requirements.

4.47 The relevant policies pertinent to the development proposal are set out below:-

- Policy CS1: Spatial Strategy for North Lincolnshire
- Policy CS2 Delivering Quality Design in North Lincolnshire
- Policy CS5 Delivering More Sustainable Developments
- Policy CS6 Historic Environment
- Policy CS17 Biodiversity
- Policy CS18 Sustainable Resource and Climate Change
- Policy CS19 Flood Risk

4.48 Each policy is identified in turn below.

4.49 **Policy CS1** of the Core Strategy sets out the broad framework around which the spatial development strategy for North Lincolnshire is based upon. **Policy CS2** considers sustainable development and states that only development which is essential to the functioning of the countryside will be allowed to take place. Notably it states sustainable development includes increasing the use of renewable energy in construction and operation.

4.50 The amplification to the policy states at paragraph 5.59 *"Whilst policy CS1 sets out the principle elements that make up the overall spatial strategy, policy CS2 sets out how this will be implemented using a sequential approach to the location of future development that is based on the settlement hierarchy and taking into account other sustainability criteria. This meets national and regional planning policy requirements to deliver development in the most appropriate places"*.

4.51 This sequential approach sets out how development proposals within North Lincolnshire should focus on previously developed land and buildings within the Scunthorpe urban area, followed by other suitable infill opportunities within the town, then by appropriate greenfield urban extensions.

-
- 4.52 **Policy CS5** sets out the design principles for all new development within the administrative area of North Lincolnshire and states that all new development should be well designed and appropriate for their context. It should contribute to creating a sense of place. A key criterium is the incorporation of appropriate landscaping and planting which enhances biodiversity or geological features.
- 4.53 **Policy CS6** relates to historic environment and promotes the effective management of North Lincolnshire’s historic assets including preserving and enhancing the rich archaeological heritage.
- 4.54 **Policy CS17** relates to biodiversity and states that development must retain, protect and enhance features of biological and geological interest to produce a net gain in biodiversity by designing in wildlife, and ensuring any unavoidable impacts are appropriately mitigated.
- 4.55 **Policy CS18** relates to sustainable resources and climate change. The policy aims to foster development which reduces North Lincolnshire carbon footprint. The preamble of the policy states at **paragraph 11.21** of the Core Strategy is pertinent to this application proposal and states ***"The key issue for the LDF is how it reconciles the need to reduce reliance on fossil fuels such as coal, oil and gas by generating energy from renewable resources with the need to protect and enhance our landscapes and minimise their impact on communities"***. The proposal contributes to these requirements.
- 4.56 The policy actively promotes the delivery of renewable and low carbon energy in appropriate locations including the following criteria:-
- Supporting renewable sources of energy in appropriate locations, where possible, and ensuring that development maximises the use of combined heat and power, particularly at the South Humber Bank employment site and where energy demands for more than 2MW are required for development.
 - Supporting new technology and development for carbon capture and the best available clean and efficient energy technology, particularly in relation to the heavy industrial users in North Lincolnshire, to help reduce CO2 emissions.

4.57 **Policy CS19** considers flood risk and states that the council will support development proposals that avoid areas of current or future flood risk, and which do not increase the risk of flooding elsewhere.

Other Relevant Material Considerations

4.58 There is an array of other material considerations that are considered relevant to the Development and many of these are acknowledged within the various chapters of the ES, notably Chapter 5.

4.59 Rather than set all of this in the main body of this Statement, a simple list of sources are provided with any key policy or other legislative drivers summarised in Section 5. This is not a definitive list of material considerations and is not intended to provide a review of all documents assessed throughout the full ES.

4.60 Other material planning considerations include:-

- North Lincolnshire's Supplementary Planning Document – Planning for Renewable Energy (published November 2011);
- North Lincolnshire's Supplementary Planning Guidance – Planning for Solar Photovoltaic (PV) Development (published January 2016);
- National Planning Practice Guidance Suite, including;
 - i. Renewable and Low Carbon Energy (last updated 18 June 2015)
 - ii. Practical Guidance on Climate Change (last updated 27 March 2015)
- European Directive 2009/28/EC
- UK Renewable Energy Strategy (2009);
- Energy Security Strategy (2012);
- Energy Act (2013); and
- Clean Growth Strategy (2017).

5. SOCIO ECONOMIC IMPACTS

5.1 The lead consultant on behalf of the applicant on socio economic impacts is Pegasus Group.

Table 5.1 Socio Economic Impacts Common Ground

<i>Applicant comments</i>	<i>NLC comments</i>	<i>Status e.g. Agreed / not agreed N/A</i>
In total, the Proposed Development could support 100 construction workers on-site during the peak build period. The overall build timeframe is expected to be six months and the jobs figure is based on analysis undertaken to inform the Construction & Traffic Management Plan for the scheme.	Agreed	Agreed
Permanent on-site jobs supported once the scheme is operational are not expected to be significant. Based on previous experience of similar projects elsewhere, a maximum of 10 gross full-time equivalent (FTE) jobs are expected.	Agreed	Agreed

6. LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL

6.1 The lead consultant on behalf of the applicant on landscape and visual matters is Pegasus Group.

Table 6.1 Landscape and Visual Common Ground

<i>Applicant comments</i>	<i>NLC comments</i>	<i>Status e.g Agreed / not agreed N/A</i>
<p>Description</p> <p>The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) Technical Chapter has been prepared by Chartered members of the Landscape Institute at Pegasus Group.</p>	Agreed	Agreed
<p>Methodology</p> <p>The LVIA has considered the potential landscape and visual effects of the proposed little Crow Solar Park development. The primary source of best practice for LVIA in the UK is The Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, 3rd Edition (GLVIA3) (Landscape Institute and the Institute for Environmental Management and Assessment, 2013). The assessment criteria adopted to inform the assessment of effects has been developed in accordance with the principles established in this best practice document.</p> <p>An appropriately sized study area of 5km has been selected, based on the scale of the proposed development, and a Zone of</p>	Agreed	Agreed

<p>Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) has been produced to help to identify the landscape and visual receptors with the potential for significant effects.</p>		
<p>Baseline</p> <p>Land use across the site is agricultural predominantly agricultural fields laid down to a mixture of arable and managed grassland.</p> <p>The site lies within a landscape which is characterised by the adjacent large scale industrial area and the electrical power which the area draws in from the national grid. It lies within a farmland area surrounding the town and industry of Scunthorpe, in which in addition to views of the town and the steel works, pylons cut across the landscape and views include other large scale industry and wind turbines beyond.</p> <p>The number of locations which offer the potential for views towards the proposed development are very limited, in part due to the surrounding woodland.</p>	<p>Agreed</p>	<p>Agreed</p>
<p>Mitigation / Enhancement Measures</p> <p>Planting of new hedgerows and wildflower seeding adjacent to the proposed security fencing.</p>	<p>Hedging should be of a mixed native species and wildflower seed should be of UK origin. Provision will need to be made for ongoing management for life of development.</p>	<p>Agreed</p>

<p>Operational Phase Effects</p> <p>Landscape Features: Moderate (not significant)</p> <p>Landscape Character: Major (within the site and its immediate environs only)</p> <p>Visual Receptors: Major (users of the PROW passing through the site only)</p>	<p>Agreed</p>	<p>Agreed</p>
<p>Construction Phase Effects</p> <p>Landscape Features: no additional temporary effects to the existing landscape features beyond those considered within the assessment of operation stage effects</p> <p>Landscape Character: Moderate temporary effect on landscape character of the site itself, over and above the permanent effects</p> <p>Visual Receptors: Moderate temporary visual effect over and above the permanent visual effects</p>	<p>Agreed</p>	<p>Agreed</p>
<p>Cumulative and In-combination Effects</p> <p>No significant cumulative landscape or visual effects have been identified.</p>	<p>Agreed</p>	<p>Agreed</p>

Table 6.2 Landscape and Visual Consultee Responses

<i>NLC comments</i>	<i>Applicant comments</i>	<i>Status e.g Agreed / not agreed N/A</i>
----------------------------	----------------------------------	--

<p>North Lincolnshire Council (7th March 2019)</p> <p><u>Landscape and Visual Impact</u></p> <p>“Having reviewed Chapter 6 of the PEIR I can confirm agreement to the approach to the assessment and mitigation of landscape and visual impacts.”</p> <p>The response also supports the planting of hedgerows adjacent to the security fence and the margins with wildflower seed. In summary the following comments are made.</p> <p>For wildflower seed to be effective the soil conditions must be appropriate and remedial actions may be required.</p> <p>Maintenance of the hedgerows and wild flower margins must form part of the maintenance proposals for the site and the lifetime of the project</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Further information on the delivery of the Landscape proposals is set out in the LEMP which confirms the requirements for hedgerow planting and maintenance and the sowing of and maintenance of the wildflower seed in line with the comments.</p>	<p>Agreed</p>
---	--	---------------

7. ECOLOGY AND BIODIVERSITY

7.1 The lead consultant on behalf of the applicant on ecology and biodiversity is Clarkson and Woods Ecological Consultants Ltd.

Table 7.1 Ecology & Biodiversity Common Ground

<i>Applicant comments</i>	<i>NLC comments</i>	<i>Status e.g Agreed / not agreed N/A</i>
<i>Methodology</i>		
<p><i>Desk Study Methodology</i></p> <p>The Natural England/DEFRA web-based MAGIC database was used to identify internationally designated sites for nature conservation with 10km of the application site, and nationally designated sites with 5km. These are the correct search distances as potential impact pathways beyond those distances can be reasonably discounted.</p> <p>Data was purchased from the Lincolnshire Environmental Records Centre (LERC) in August 2017. This included data on protected species; red data book species; Species of Principal Importance; local Biodiversity Action Plan species and invasive species within 2km of the site. Records for notable and/or protected species within 1 - 2 km is considered to be of greatest relevance as this is usually the distance encompassing the typical home ranges of most of the species studied. Details of locally designated sites within 1km were also obtained. Due to the</p>	<p>Agreed</p>	<p>Agreed</p>

<p>nature of the proposals, non-statutorily designated sites beyond 1km are unlikely to be within the zone of influence of the development. It is understood that the scope of the desk study considered sufficient for the purposes of the assessment</p>		
<p><i>Survey Methodology</i></p> <p>A series of ecological surveys to establish the baseline have been undertaken between July 2017 and November 2019, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extended Phase 1 Habitat survey • Great crested newt Habitat Suitability Index (HSI) and eDNA testing • Arable Plants survey • Water Vole survey • Wintering Birds survey • Breeding Birds survey • Bat Activity survey • Badger survey <p>Surveys have employed methodologies which follow up-to-date best practice guidance.</p> <p>Full details of survey methodologies and results are provided in Appendix 7.1 (extended Phase 1 Habitat survey, great</p>		<p>Agreed</p>

<p>crested newts, arable plants, water vole), Appendix 7.2 (wintering birds), Appendix 7.3</p> <p>The scope of detailed surveys was agreed in January 2018, with NLC requesting that detailed survey for arable plants were undertaken. These were subsequently included within the survey programme.</p>		
<p><i>Assessment Methodology</i></p> <p>The standard approach applied in the UK to Ecological Impact Assessment (EcIA) is that developed by the Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (CIEEM) in 2016 and revised in 2018⁵. This methodology has been followed and used to evaluate existing conditions, and to assess the significance of likely effects on ecological features that may arise. The assessment methodology is considered appropriate.</p>	<p>Agreed</p>	<p>Agreed</p>
<p><i>Baseline Information</i></p>		
<p><i>Designated Sites</i></p> <p>Within the desk study search area the only internationally designated site present (Humber Estuary SPA and Ramsar) was considered to be outside of the zone of influence, due to the distances and intervening habitats. It is agreed that there would be no likely significant effect on this internationally designated site. It</p>	<p>Agreed</p>	<p>Agreed</p>

⁵ CIEEM (2018) Guidelines for Ecological Impact Assessment in the UK and Ireland: Terrestrial, Freshwater, Coastal and Marine. CIEEM, Winchester.

<p>has been agreed that a Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA) is not required. This is also agreed with Natural England.</p> <p>Of the five Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) located within 5km of the Site, only one was taken forward into the assessment as it is situated adjacent to the main route for construction traffic (Broughton Wood SSSI), and is of National importance. The remaining four SSSIs are considered to be beyond the zone of influence due to the distances, nature of the scheme and intervening landscapes.</p> <p>Of the eleven locally designated sites identified within the desk study, seven were considered to be within the zone of influence, primarily due to the proximity to the application site. Four were of sufficient distance that no direct or indirect impacts were deemed likely to occur.</p> <p>Locally designated sites within the zone of influence were: Broughton West Wood Local Wildlife Site (LWS), Manby Wood LWS, Heron Holt LWS, Broughton Far Wood LWS, Rowland Plantation LWS Broughton West Wood Site of Nature Conservation Interest (SNCI) and Santon Wood SNCI. Parts of Manby Wood and Broughton West Wood were identified as being Plantation on Ancient Woodland Site (PAWS). All locally-designated sites</p>		
--	--	--

<p>with the Zone of influence were evaluated as being of County importance</p> <p>The classification and evaluation of designated sites has been agreed.</p>		
<p><i>Habitats</i></p> <p>The majority of habitats within the construction zone were of low ecological value, as described in section 7.4 of the ES chapter. Habitats present on or adjacent to the Site which were classified as Important Ecological Features due to their being priorities of local or national were: Hedgerows, Arable Field Margins, Semi-Natural Broadleaved Woodland, Plantation Broadleaved Woodland, Ponds and Ditches, all of which were of Local importance</p> <p>The baseline evaluation of habitats has been agreed.</p>	<p>Agreed</p>	<p>Agreed</p>
<p><i>Species</i></p> <p>The following species or species groups were present on site and classified as Important Ecological Features, as set out in section 7.4 of the ES chapter:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bats – five species recorded utilising habitats at the field boundaries for foraging/commuting (classified as being of Local importance). • Brown hare (Local importance) 	<p>Agreed</p>	<p>Agreed</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Breeding birds of open farmland- Species assemblage containing Birds of Conservation Concern including breeding skylark, yellow wagtail, lapwing and meadow pipit (District importance) • Breeding birds of boundary habitats - Species assemblage containing 8 Birds of Conservation Concern, generally in low to modest numbers (Local importance). • Wintering birds of open farmland- Species assemblage containing Birds of Conservation Concern including skylark, lapwing and meadow pipit (District importance). • Great crested newts - Great crested newts have been confirmed as present within a pond 330m south of the application area and may therefore be found within a 500m radius of this pond. Approximately 7Ha of the application area lies within this 500m radius. Surveys of the remaining ponds, including all ponds within the application area indicated that no other population of great crested newt are known to be present on the site (Local Importance) 		
---	--	--

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Invertebrates (Local importance) • Badgers (Site importance - included due to the legal requirements). <p>The baseline evaluation of species is agreed.</p>		
<i>Impact Assessment and Mitigation</i>		
<p>As described in section 7.6 of the ES Chapter, key sources of impacts during construction were identified to be habitat loss, fragmentation, disturbance of species through noise and vibration, degradation of habitats by pollution or dust deposition and the incidental mortality of species during construction.</p> <p>The key mitigation measure to minimise construction related effects will be the implementation of a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP), a draft of which is provided as a technical Appendix (7.7).</p> <p>Fenced biodiversity protection zones are to be installed between habitats of high importance (namely woodland, hedgerows, ponds, ditches and trees) to protect from damage and degradation.</p> <p>Protection zones are also to be retained around badger setts to avoid damage/disturbance to setts and badgers therein, and thereby ensuring legal compliance.</p>	Agreed	<i>Agreed</i>

<p>The CEMP also outlines good practice measures to be adopted during construction with the purpose of protecting biodiversity.</p> <p>Proposed protection zones and good practice measures outlined in the CEMP are considered adequate to reduce construction phase impacts to acceptable levels.</p> <p>The proposals include planting of approximately 2.5km of new native hedgerow planting, which is expected to give rise to beneficial effects through increasing connectivity as well as foraging and nesting/sheltering habitat for a range of species.</p> <p>The assessment of impacts and key mitigation measures are considered to be common ground.</p>		
<p>Fewer operational phase effects were noted as post construction activity at the site would be minimal.</p> <p>A draft Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) has been prepared which sets out how the site will be managed post construction in order to maximise its ecological value and ensure the operational mitigation measures are implemented.</p> <p>The cessation of intensive arable farming practices and creation of grassland habitats will likely give rise to beneficial</p>	<p>Agreed</p>	<p>Agreed</p>

<p>effects for a range of ecological features. Sheep grazing is to be employed on the site to manage grassland. This has been noted in NLC comments as being welcomed although experience of other arrays within the area has been that sheep grazing is rarely implemented, primarily due to the general lack of flocks within the North Lincolnshire area. For this scheme the extent of grassland being created and the identification of different management prescriptions (summer and winter grazed areas) the site is of sufficient size to maintain a flock of sheep all year round. It is therefore the intention of the landowner to manage all habitat within the site using the sheep specifically acquired for the array. The positive effects of arable land given to grazed grassland is therefore confidently assumed.</p>		
<p>For the majority of features, construction-related impacts are likely to be temporary and only last the duration of construction. However the installation of panels on fields is likely to have more permanent impacts in terms of habitat loss/degradation on breeding and wintering birds of open farmland (skylarks, meadow pipits, lapwing and yellow wagtail) due to loss of open sightlines required by these species. It is acknowledged that the response of farmland birds to solar arrays is not well-established however.</p>	<p>Agreed</p>	<p>Agreed</p>

<p>Mitigation for identified impacts on farmland birds includes the retention of approximately 22ha of land which is to be specifically managed to maintain suitable conditions for breeding and wintering birds of open farmland during operation. An increase in foraging value across the rest of the site for these species is expected, although there is uncertainty to what level birds of open farmland will use land beneath solar arrays.</p> <p>NLC have been consulted during development of this mitigation design.</p>		
<p>Included with the CEMP, but set out in more detail in a Great Crested Newt Risk Avoidance Method Statement (GCN RAMS – Appendix 7.6), is the approach to safeguarding of great crested newts. The known population south of the site could feasibly use part of the south eastern corner of the site. The GCN RAMS sets out protocols for construction within this area to avoid harm or disturbance to newts and their key habitats. This is considered to be an adequate approach given the nature of habitats affected and the anticipated long-term beneficial impact of the proposed development upon great crested newt populations. The approach to protection of great crested newts was discussed and agreed with NLC in August 2019.</p>	<p>Agreed</p>	<p>Agreed</p>
<p>Operationally, ceasing arable farming practices would result in loss of suitable</p>	<p>Agreed</p>	<p>Agreed</p>

<p>conditions for arable plant species present at the site, particularly henbane which is listed as Vulnerable in the vascular plant Red Data Book for Great Britain⁶.</p> <p>Areas around the site (measuring approximately 2.5ha combined) are to be specifically managed (cultivated annually) to provide suitable conditions for arable plants (including henbane) to persist at the Site for the duration of operation. The areas and management prescriptions are set out in the LEMP.</p>		
<p><i>Residual Effects</i></p>		
<p>Residual effects after mitigation measures have been applied are described within section 7.4 of the ES chapter. Residual effects for all Important Ecological Features are either non-significant, or are considered to be positive effects which are significant at Local level. The description and classification of residual effects are agreed.</p>	<p>Agreed</p>	<p><i>Agreed</i></p>
<p><i>Enhancements</i></p>		
<p>A number of ecological enhancements are proposed which deliver additional ecological benefits beyond those expected to occur as a result of the mitigation measures described above. These are described in section 7.9 of the ES chapter. Management prescriptions designed to ensure delivery of the</p>	<p>Agreed</p>	<p><i>Agreed</i></p>

⁶ Cheffings, C.M. & Farrell, L. (2005) Species Status Report No 7: The Vascular plant red data list for Great Britain. Joint Nature Conservation Committee, Peterborough.

<p>proposed enhancements are set out within the LEMP.</p> <p>This includes easements of existing arable land sown with acid grassland seed mixes containing foodplants of target butterfly species (including grayling, wall and small heath) which are known to be present in the locality. Increasing opportunities for these species is a priority for NLC and was highlighted during correspondence in January 2018.</p> <p>A range of features for wildlife (including bat and bird boxes) are to be installed at the site, and existing habitats (including ponds, ditches and hedgerows) are to be brought under management to increase their value to wildlife.</p> <p>The enhancements have been designed within input from NLC and are expected to deliver positive impacts for biodiversity.</p>		
---	--	--

Table 7.2 Ecology and Biodiversity Consultee Responses

<i>NLC comments</i>	<i>Applicant comments</i>	<i>Status e.g Agreed / not agreed N/A</i>
<p>During initial discussion on the scheme and survey scope, Andrew Taylor (AT) requested that detailed survey for rare arable plants were included</p> <p>AT also highlighted the importance of the surrounding area for priority</p>	<p>An arable plant survey was incorporated into the survey programme for June 2018.</p> <p>Opportunities to deliver enhancements for the</p>	<p>Agreed</p> <p>Agreed</p>

<p>butterfly species of former industrial sites, namely wall, grayling and small heath</p>	<p>noted priority butterfly species as part of the scheme design and management of the operational site were considered and incorporated.</p>	
<p>Comments received from AT following his review of the Environmental Statement and supporting appendices. AT satisfied with the survey effort and mitigation measures proposed, and suggest enhancement measures for priority butterfly species.</p>	<p>C&W ensured enhancement measures for priority butterflies were prescribed within the LEMP. This included grassland seed mixtures which contain larval food plants, and maintenance of bare areas.</p>	<p>Agreed</p>
<p>The approach to, and classification of ecological features was discussed with AT and agreed. The approach to be adopted for the protection of great crested newts was also discussed and agreed, following the confirmation of presence of great crested newts in a pond off-site to the south.</p>	<p>A great crested newt Risk Avoidance Method Statement (RAMS) was prepared and is included as a technical appendix</p>	<p>Agreed</p>

8. CULTURAL HERITAGE

8.1 The lead consultant on behalf of the applicant on cultural heritage and archaeology is Cotswold Archaeology

Table 8.1: Cultural Heritage Common Ground Text

<i>Applicant comments</i>	<i>NLC comments</i>	<i>Status e.g Agreed / not agreed N/A</i>
<i>Description</i>		
<p>A full and comprehensive Heritage Assessment has been completed for the proposed scheme. Assessment works have included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cultural Heritage Baseline Study (Pegasus Group, August 2019). • Geophysical Survey Report (SUMO, September 2018). • Archaeological Watching Brief (Cotswold Archaeology, November 2018). • Archaeological Watching Brief (Cotswold Archaeology, November 2018). • Archaeological Watching Brief (Cotswold Archaeology, November 2018). <p>All works were undertaken in dialogue with and with agreement from Alison Williams (AW) Historic Environment Officer at NLC.</p>	Agreed	Agreed
<i>Methodology</i>		

<p>The ES Chapter, the Heritage Assessment and the methodology for the assessment of development effects have been informed by the following documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF; 2019); • NPPF Planning Practice Guidance: Historic Environment (July 2019); • Standard and Guidance for Historic Environment Desk-Based Assessment, published by the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists (CIfA; January 2017); • Historic England’s Conservation Principles: Policies and Guidance for the Sustainable Management of the Historic Environment (published by English Heritage in 2008); • Historic England’s Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 2: Managing Significance in Decision Taking (2015); • Historic England’s Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3: The Setting of Heritage Assets (2017). <p>In order to collect historic environment data, a minimum 1km study area around the Application Site</p>	<p>Agreed</p>	<p>Agreed</p>
---	---------------	---------------

(henceforward the Site) was adopted in the Heritage Baseline, as this area was considered to provide sufficient contextual information about the Site and its surrounding landscape, from which to assess the archaeological potential and potential impacts on the archaeological/heritage resource.

The following sources of publicly available archaeological and historical information were consulted as part of the preparation of the Heritage Assessment, completed in August 2019.

- National Heritage List for England for designated heritage assets, such as Listed Buildings and Scheduled Monuments;
- Historic England Archive data for information on non-designated heritage assets;
- North Lincolnshire Historic Environment Record for records of archaeology and heritage sites, finds and events recorded within the study area;
- Online sources, including British Geological Survey and additional historic mapping.

A geophysical survey was undertaken at the Site in July - September 2018.

<p>Ground investigation works undertaken at the Site were subject to an archaeological watching brief in September 2018.</p> <p>A 24.4% sample of the Site was subject to archaeological fieldwalking in September 2018.</p> <p>In June and July 2019, an archaeological evaluation, comprising 155 trial trenches, was carried out across the Site.</p>		
<p><i>Baseline</i></p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The possible remains of a prehistoric round barrow have been identified within the central area of the Site as cropmarks on aerial photographs. However, there were no upstanding physical remains identified during the Site visit, and no evidence for the feature was identified in the results of the geophysical survey or trial trench evaluation. It is possible that the feature has been incorrectly interpreted or affected/removed by agricultural processes. <p>Mitigation: a cable route moved to avoid potential impact on this feature.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The geophysical survey recorded a curvilinear anomaly to the east of the Site and the archaeological 	<p>Agreed</p>	<p>Agreed</p>

<p>evaluation confirmed the presence of a ring ditch at this location.</p> <p>Mitigation: a no-dig zone within which concrete pads will be utilised has been agreed around this feature.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The geophysical survey revealed a linear anomaly in the north-western part of the Site. Subsequent evaluation confirmed this anomaly relates to a substantial north-east/south-west orientated ditch, likely representing a Middle to Late Iron Age field boundary. No evidence for contemporary activity was found in the area. <p>Although of some archaeology potential the impacts of the scheme on this feature are considered to be limited.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The results of the archaeological fieldwalking at the Site show that there is a potential for the recovery of prehistoric artefacts. However, these are not expected to be in situ and would be of limited archaeological significance. <p>It is not considered likely that the scheme will have any impact on the archaeological interest of these artefact scatters.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The line of the prehistoric Jurassic Way trackway from Lincoln to 		
--	--	--

<p>Winteringham has been conjectured as passing through the Site. The location of the Site upon the high ground of a natural ridgeway does suggest a suitable location for an early route of movement but its alignment through the Site is conjectural.</p> <p>If remains were to be encountered, they would be of archaeological interest, however the archaeological investigations did not reveal any remains which could potentially be associated with this routeway.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ridge and furrow earthworks have been identified within the south of the Site although there were no upstanding remains identified during the Site visit. Some evidence for post-medieval/modern period field boundaries were recorded in the geophysical survey and trial trenching. <p>Such remains have little potential to contribute towards our understanding of medieval and post-medieval farming practices and would comprise non-designated heritage assets of limited, if any, archaeological interest.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site of a Cistercian priory is documented as lying beneath the remains of Gokewell Priory Farm, limited upstanding remains of which 		
--	--	--

<p>are visible within the Site. Whilst the later farm buildings reused the architectural fabric of the priory, leaving no original upstanding remains, it is likely that archaeological remains associated with the earlier priory survive within the area of the farm.</p> <p>Mitigation: The area of the medieval Gokewell Priory has been designated as an archaeological exclusion zone and therefore there will be no impacts associated with installation or operation of the arrays.</p> <p>In addition, a programme of archaeological recording will be implemented during the works within the periphery of the archaeological exclusion zone (i.e. around pylons to the east and during cable trench excavations within the south-east corner).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No cut features or deposits of medieval date were identified during the trial trench evaluation and it is considered that the focus of medieval activity falls within the archaeological exclusion zone defined around Gokewell Priory. • Archaeological fieldwalking and trial trenching identified a small amount of 12th to 16th century pottery. This was focussed in the south of the Site, 		
--	--	--

<p>with some directly south of Gokewell Priory.</p> <p>These artefacts are likely to have been dispersed from their original location through centuries of agricultural activity within the Site and are not expected to be of great archaeological interest.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An area of limestone extraction pits was recorded in the south-eastern part. <p>Such remains are of limited, if any, archaeological interest.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A heavy anti-aircraft battery has been recorded in documentary sources as being located within the eastern area of the Site. There is no upstanding evidence to identify the location of the asset, although large pieces of concrete seen within the plough soil may be associated with the structure. <p>Archaeological remains associated with the military use of the Site would be unlikely to be of more than local significance, however no remains of this asset were revealed in the trial trench evaluation and it is unlikely that any associated remains survive at this location.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aerial photographs and Lidar analysis have identified three possibly 		
---	--	--

<p>archaeological features within the western and south-western area of the Site. The exact nature and date of these features remains uncertain, although their form and location suggest possible medieval enclosures.</p> <p>Whilst such features, if present would most constitute non-designated heritage assets of archaeological interest no anomalies of archaeological potential were identified at these locations in the geophysical survey and no remains were recorded in trial trenches excavated at these locations and in their vicinity. As such, it is unlikely that these cropmarks/earthworks represent features of archaeological interest.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A large curvilinear ditch closely corresponding to a geophysical anomaly was recorded in the north-eastern part of the Site. Although undated, this ditch likely represents the remains of a large enclosure, with potential internal activity in the form of an L-shaped ditch. <p>These features are considered to comprise non-designated heritage assets of archaeological interest. Although of some archaeology potential the impacts of the scheme</p>		
---	--	--

<p>on this feature are considered to be limited.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Proposed Development at the Site is not deemed likely to impact on the settings of any designated assets to an extent that it alters the significance of the asset and as such there are no identified designated sensitive receptors in this respect. <p>General Mitigation Measures: in addition to the specific measures set out above archaeological monitoring (watching brief) will be carried out during ground works within sensitive areas in Fields 7 and 10, and during excavation of the swale to the west of the archaeological exclusion zone.</p>		
--	--	--

Table 8.2 Cultural Heritage Consultation Response

<i>NLC comments</i>	<i>Applicant comments</i>	<i>Status e.g Agreed / not agreed N/A</i>
<p>Discussion on archaeological strategy. Alison Williams (AW) Historic Environment Officer argues strongly for a very comprehensive package of archaeological evaluation works, to include Geophysical survey of the whole site, fieldwalking on all arable areas, and Targeted trial trenching. Also requested a large exclusion zone around Gokewell Farm and</p>	<p>Agreed to proceed to prepare an archaeological strategy for discussion with AW. Considered that archaeological fieldwork within the exclusion zone was not appropriate give that there will be no archaeological impacts.</p>	<p>Agreed</p>

<p>archaeological fieldwork within the exclusion zone.</p>		
<p>Further discussion on archaeology Strategy (a copy of which had been circulated before the meeting). AW unhappy with some elements and is insistent that fieldwalking should form part of the strategy. Agreed that we would look at a targeted fieldwalking strategy. Also agreed to extend the exclusion zone so that at its closest point it no less than 20m from the Gokewell Farm earthwork/AP features.</p>	<p>Exclusion Zone amended and Archaeological Strategy Updated.</p>	<p>Agreed</p>
<p>Email from AW regarding geophysical survey within Gokewell Farm buffer zone. Responded that as exclusion zone had been amended so that no construction would take place within 20m of the known archaeology that this was not directly relevant. AW conceded this to be the case by email on 25 July 2018.</p>	<p>No further action required.</p>	<p>Agreed</p>
<p>Written Scheme of Investigation for fieldwalking survey forwarded to AW for comment/approval and discussion regarding scope of geophysical survey.</p>	<p>Approved.</p>	<p>Agreed</p>
<p>November 2018: Provision of draft geophysical survey, GI watching Brief and Fieldwalking reports with an invitation to comment and a request</p>	<p>Reports agreed and signed off.</p>	<p>Agreed</p>

for advice on potential trial trenching on site.		
Discussion on scope of works for Trial trenching and trench locations. Various amendments requested and suggestions made about scope of works.	All changes requested adopted and all agreed in Written Scheme of Investigation.	Agreed
Number of minor issues raised in the Planning Inspectorate Scoping Opinion in January 2019	All issues addressed and ES chapter updated accordingly.	Agreed
Comments from AW on Draft Evaluation report.	Comments addressed and report signed off.	Agreed
Comments from AW on mitigation strategy.	All suggested mitigation measures incorporated into the Proposed Development, including the archaeological exclusion zone, avoidance measures, archaeological monitoring and request for the mitigation strategy to be included within the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP). These are discussed in detail in Section 8.5	Agreed

9. TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORT

9.1 The lead consultant on behalf of the applicant on transport and access is TPA.

Table 9.1 Traffic and Transport Common Ground

<i>Applicant comments</i>	<i>NLC comments</i>	<i>Status e.g Agreed / not agreed N/A</i>
All construction vehicles will access the site via the existing farm access road from the B1207, as shown at Figure 9.1 of the Construction Traffic Management Plan.	Discussions have been held with the applicant regarding the access arrangements.	Agreed
All traffic associated with the construction phase will follow the designated route as illustrated on Figure 9.2 of the Construction Traffic Management Plan.	Discussions have been held with the applicant regarding the routing arrangements.	Agreed
The forecast number of construction vehicles that will access set out Table 5.1 and Table 5.2 of the Construction Traffic Management Plan is acceptable.	Agreed	Agreed
The measures set out in the Construction Traffic Management Plan are appropriate to manage the effects of construction traffic.	Agreed	Agreed
The Construction Traffic Management Plan will be secured by the requirements of the DCO.	Agreed	Agreed
A before and after condition surveys of the B1208 will be undertaken, with B1208, with a commitment to making good any damage. This will form part of	Agreed	Agreed

the Construction Traffic Management Plan.		
The methodology for assessing the impacts of the development is appropriate.	Agreed	Agreed
In transport and access terms, the impact of the construction phase will be short-term, temporary and negligible in significance.	Agreed	Agreed
In transport and access terms, the impact of the operational phase will be negligible in significance.	Agreed	Agreed
In transport and access terms, the impact of the decommissioning phase will be short-term, temporary and negligible in significance.	Agreed	Agreed

Table 9.2 Traffic and Transport Consultee Responses

<i>NLC comments</i>	<i>Applicant comments</i>	<i>Status e.g Agreed / not agreed N/A</i>
<p>NLC Comment (March 2018) "I would suggest that the Transport Statement and CTMP should cover both the construction and operational phases and address the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • details of the scheme • number of staff working on site • deliveries to the site <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ number of vehicle movements per day ○ day/hours of operation 	<p>All of these elements have been included within the Construction Traffic Management Plan that has supported the submission and which will be secured by the requirements of the DCO</p>	<p>Agreed</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ any abnormal loads • proposed routeing to the site from the M180 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ reasons for choosing this route and how it will be enforced • proposed measures to ensure safe movement of all vehicles at the site access/B1208/B1207 crossroads, i.e. both delivery vehicles accessing the site and those travelling along the B1207 • a before/after condition survey of the highway network may be required • the proposed connection point to the national grid” 		
<p>“I’ve reviewed the Scoping Report submitted for the above proposals. I agree with the outline approach for assessing the traffic and transport impacts. The Transport Statement and Construction Phase Traffic Management Plan appear to cover all the issues that we would expect to see included”</p>	<p>Agreed</p>	<p>Agreed</p>
<p>“...the Council would expect to see before and after condition surveys of the B1208, with a commitment to making good any damage included within the CTMP”</p>	<p>A commitment to carry out a before and after condition survey is included within the CTMP</p>	<p>Agreed</p>

10. NOISE AND VIBRATION

10.1 The lead consultant on behalf of the applicant on noise and vibration is Clement Acoustics.

Table 10.1 Noise & Vibration Common Ground

<i>Applicant comments</i>	<i>NLC comments</i>	<i>Status e.g Agreed / not agreed N/A</i>
Noise is not expected to constitute a significant impact on surrounding receivers (with mitigation measures recommended accordingly), and a supplementary report to the Environmental Impact Assessment is therefore considered appropriate.	Agreed	Agreed
The measurement of baseline noise levels has been undertaken in accordance with relevant standards, with the timings of the survey and survey locations (see Table 10.2) agreed with the Environmental Health Officer [EHO] prior to the surveys.	Agreed	Agreed
British Standard 4142: 2014 is considered the appropriate standard to use when considering noise emissions from the operational site.	Agreed	Agreed
The noise emissions from the operational site will be calculated using the manufacturers' stated noise levels for each item of noise emitting machinery. Where necessary, mitigation measures will be recommended to ensure the guidance of the standard is complied with.	Agreed	Agreed

Table 10.2 Noise and Vibration Consultee Responses

<i>NLC comments</i>	<i>Applicant comments</i>	<i>Status e.g Agreed / not agreed N/A</i>
<p>Environmental Health Officer [EHO] Karen Robinson stated the following when consulted with regards to the proposed monitoring locations for the background noise survey: "Provided these locations are the nearest residential properties, then this department is satisfied with the positions. If it comes to light that there are nearer residents, further monitoring may be required."</p>	<p>Clement Acoustics have undertaken onsite visual inspections in combination with a search of online information. A further receiver was identified, and an additional survey position added accordingly. This was confirmed to the EHO.</p>	<p>Agreed</p>
<p>In the EHO preapplication response, the following is stated "The applicant has not provided any information in relation to operational noise of the development site including the use of battery storage containers. However, given the location and nature of the proposed development, it is likely that operational noise will not give rise to significant adverse impact provided that any necessary mitigation measures are included. This department would expect a planning application to include details of operational noise sources and predicted noise levels at relevant locations."</p>	<p>A noise impact assessment is being undertaken, which will calculate the predicted noise emission levels of the development, and mitigation measures will be undertaken accordingly.</p>	<p>Agreed. The Council's EHO will be able to provide further advice once the Noise Impact Assessment has been undertaken and mitigation measures reviewed.</p>

11. AIR QUALITY

11.1 The lead consultant on behalf of the applicant on air quality is Bureau Veritas.

Table 11.1 Air Quality Common Ground

<i>Applicant comments</i>	<i>NLC comments</i>	<i>Status e.g Agreed / not agreed N/A</i>
<i>Description</i>		
<p>Bureau Veritas UK Ltd was commissioned by INRG Solar (Little Crow) Ltd. to undertake an air quality assessment of construction traffic emissions together with a carbon offset assessment as a result of the proposed Little Crow Solar Park. ("Air Quality and Carbon Assessment for the proposed Little Crow Solar Park, Scunthorpe" – Report no. 6473981).</p> <p>The development site is located to the east of Scunthorpe, adjacent to the Scunthorpe Steel works and is accessed via the B1208. The nearby settlement of Raventhorpe (<5 miles south of the proposed development) contains an existing 78.5ha solar farm.</p> <p>The most significant source of air pollution is likely to derive from construction related traffic during the construction phase of the development. The construction traffic route is proposed to run along the B1208 in the direction of the A18, A15 and M180. This route bypasses the closest pollution receptors;</p>	Agreed	Agreed

residential properties in Broughton, located to the east of the proposed site boundary.		
<i>Methodology</i>		
<p>As it is anticipated that the proposed development will introduce additional road traffic and construction dust and, with consideration to the nearby AQMA, a construction phase impact assessment was undertaken together with the carbon offset assessment. The scope of the assessment was therefore to undertake:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A qualitative assessment of dust and air quality impacts during the construction works. The construction dust assessment involved the use of a Geographic Information System (GIS) and was undertaken with reference to current best-practice guidance, such as those published by the Institute of Air Quality Management (IAQM). ▪ Construction related road traffic emissions were considered relative to published guidance. Based upon the preliminary construction traffic management plan and indicative flows provided therein, Bureau Veritas do not consider there to be a requirement for detailed assessment of the road traffic emissions, rather a screening based 	Agreed	Agreed

<p>assessment against IAQM criteria is considered sufficient.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Mitigation measures during the construction phase including measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction and demolition. ▪ The carbon footprint of the construction phase activities, in the context of the associated traffic generation, will be calculated and subtracted against the carbon savings associated with the generation of electricity via solar power. 		
<p><i>Baseline</i></p>		
<p>North Lincolnshire Council has declared an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA), which incorporates part of Scunthorpe town centre and an area east of Scunthorpe, including the Scunthorpe Steel works site. The proposed Solar Park is located within this AQMA. The AQMA was declared due to exceedances of the 24-hour mean air quality objective for PM₁₀.</p> <p>The recorded annual mean concentration of PM₁₀ from the closest monitoring site, CM3, reported an annual mean concentration of 22µg/m³ in 2016 together with 25 exceedances of the 24-hour mean objective (50µg/m³ not to be exceeded more than 35 times a year). All nearby monitoring locations also reported</p>	<p>Agreed</p>	<p>Agreed</p>

<p>below the PM₁₀ annual mean AQS objective of 40µg/m³. Furthermore, there were no reported exceedances of the NO₂ annual mean air quality objective at any monitoring location within the council area.</p> <p>Furthermore, Defra’s 2017 background air pollution data for the proposed site suggests an annual mean background concentration of 11.2µg/m³ for NO₂ and 15.2µg/m³ for PM₁₀, which are both below the respective objectives (40µg/m³).</p>		
<p><i>Outcomes</i></p>		
<p>Construction Phase</p> <p>In regards to construction phase vehicle movements, the average number of two-way HDV movements per day is expected to be well below the 100 AADT criteria. Therefore it is not considered that there will be any potential for significant air quality effects from development related road traffic emissions during the construction phase. Such potential impacts have therefore been scoped out from requiring a detailed assessment on the basis of their low and negligible impacts.</p> <p>Effective mitigation measures were not specified as there is no risk defined. Furthermore, impacts from dust emissions during the construction phase would be not significant, which is supported by the low levels of annual</p>	<p>Agreed. The Council would support the implementation of good practice measures as proposed and that these can be secured via a site specific CEMP.</p>	<p>Agreed</p>

mean concentrations. It is considered that despite there not being a defined risk present, it is still advisable that a number of good practice measures are implemented, such as considerate traffic speed and observing minimal dust dispersion where at all possible during construction and transport activities.

Carbon Footprint

The estimated CO₂ offset from the Little Crow Solar Park is 35,186 tonnes for the first year taking into consideration the CO₂ produced as a result of the construction vehicle movements during the construction phase. The CO₂ generated as a result of the construction vehicles are a onetime occurrence and should not be factored into future years. Therefore, the following years CO₂ offset will likely be greater as the construction phase works will have been completed.

12. GROUND CONDITIONS & LAND CONTAMINATION

12.1 The lead consultant on behalf of the applicant on ground conditions and land contamination is Integral.

Table 12.1 Ground conditions & land contamination Common Ground

<i>Applicant comments</i>	<i>NLC comments</i>	<i>Status e.g Agreed / not agreed N/A</i>
<i>Description</i>		
<p>A comprehensive, targeted ground conditions and contamination risk assessment has been undertaken in the context of the proposed scheme. Phased assessment has included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Phase 1 Ground Conditions Desk Study (Final Version issued as Intégrale Report No. 1844, Version 6, August 2019) Geotechnical and Phase 2 Contamination Investigation. (Report Final Version issued as Intégrale Report No. 1997/02, Version 2, August 2019). <p>The scope of intrusive investigation was finalised following consultation with Liz Hamer and Adam Conley (Contaminated Land Officers at NLC).</p>	Agreed	Agreed
<i>Methodology</i>		
The Phase 1 Desk Study was based on data obtained from:	Agreed	Agreed

<p>Site reconnaissance photographs by others, Groundsure Environmental, Geological and Historical data reports, LandIS Soilsclapes Viewer & Soil Site Extended Report (Cranfield), British Geological Survey data & mapping, Humberside Minerals Resources data, Terrasearch Assess Report (mining & quarrying), UK Onshore Geophysical Library open-access resources, and information from the licence holder for the exploration oil well adjacent off-site.</p> <p>A Phase 2 intrusive investigation was undertaken by trial pitting and borehole drilling between September – November 2018 and included in situ testing, standpipe installations, and geotechnical and contamination laboratory testing. Groundwater and ground gas monitoring was continued periodically through to March 2019.</p>		
<p><i>Baseline</i></p>		
<p>The middle and lower areas of this sloping site are overlain by thick Blown Sand, with Alluvium in the lower parts. The bedrock forms a sequence of north-south outcrops: the higher eastern area of Jurassic limestones, the central area of Jurassic mudstones and locally limestones, the middle and lower slopes of mudstones and marls, including the commercially important Pecten Ironstone.</p>	<p>Agreed. The Council's EHO would recommend that a Requirement is included detailing the procedure to be followed in the case of unexpected contamination being found during construction.</p>	<p>Agreed</p>

<p>The complete site is classified as freely draining slightly acid sandy soils.</p> <p>Trial pitting and boreholes found little evidence of former ironstone working, but with localised minor backfilling in the extreme southwest. Groundwater stands below 2m in the higher area, at 1-1.5m centrally and at 0.5-1m depth in the lower area.</p> <p>Ditches in the lower area held water during late winter.</p> <p>The ground gas regime is near normal, with elevated carbon dioxide where the Alluvium is peaty.</p> <p>The investigation report gives geotechnical engineering advice including:</p> <p>Shallow spread foundations can be adopted for the limited structures proposed. The superficial silty sands will require care during construction to prevent erosion and run-off. Soakage testing confirmed the majority of rainfall infiltration will soak away rapidly.</p> <p>Contamination assessment concludes that: Any new water pipes require protection against chemical attack. Carbon dioxide could pose a risk to groundworkers if any confined space working is undertaken. No protective measures are considered necessary for in-ground plant. No contaminants</p>		
--	--	--

<p>were proven in excess of acceptance criteria adopted or human health protection. No evidence of significant leachable contamination has been found. A watching brief should be kept at all times while groundworks are occurring for any signs of unforeseen contamination.</p> <p>For the decommissioned off-site exploration well, desk study indicates it was sunk 35 years ago, has a cement seal to c.45m depth, and was used for test pumping, with the produced oil being tankered off-site. It was decommissioned by 1991 and the former compound since used for temporary agricultural storage.</p> <p>The overall ground slope falls to the east or northeast, away from the application site, due to regional dip of the bedrock. The compound is level and bunded, with only a central concrete slab. Future exploitation seems highly unlikely. Potential for significant remnant hydrocarbon contamination from the well test pump phase appears minimal. Potential for current or future failure of the well sealing and decommissioning such that hydrocarbons could pollute the solar development site is considered negligible given the siting, bunding, topography and the dip direction of the bedrock.</p>		
---	--	--

Table 12.2 Ground conditions & land contamination Consultee Responses

<i>NLC comments</i>	<i>Applicant comments</i>	<i>Status e.g Agreed / not agreed N/A</i>
<p>Environmental Health (Commercial) August 2018:</p> <p>"A desk study has been included with this application. The desk study has indicated that the current site has a prolonged history of agricultural usage, with no evidence of large scale ironstone extraction or landfilling within the boundaries. However due to the proximity to the steel works, this department would recommend checking for the location of ironstone gulleys and mineshafts in the area before any development is undertaken".</p>	<p>Each of these comments were taken account of in planning the targeted Phase 2 intrusive investigation, and updates made to the Phase 1 desk study. Comments on extraction and evidence for any backfilled areas have been given in the reports. The mining search has not identified any further data of concern.</p>	<p>Agreed.</p>

13. AGRICULTURAL LAND

13.1 The lead consultant on behalf of the applicant on agricultural matters is Daniel Baird.

Table 13.1 Agricultural Land Common Ground

<i>Applicant comments</i>	<i>NLC comments</i>	<i>Status e.g Agreed / not agreed N/A</i>
<p>A detailed Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) assessment of the site has found 36.6ha of Grade 3a and 173.5ha of Grade 3b agricultural land. Grade 3a land is considered to be among the best and most versatile agricultural land in England and Wales, but is the lowest quality of land in this category. Grade 3b land is not best and most versatile land.</p> <p>Planning policy guidance seeks to conserve the resource of best and most versatile land for future exploitation. It does not have any interest in how that agricultural land is managed.</p> <p>The proposed development is temporary and reversible. Furthermore, the majority of the land can continue in agricultural production with sheep grazing between and below the solar PV panels. This agricultural land resource would therefore not be lost to the proposed development.</p>	<p>Agreed</p>	<p>Agreed</p>

14. HYDROLOGY AND DRAINAGE

14.1 The lead consultant on behalf of the applicant on agricultural matters is Clive Onions Ltd.

Table 13.1 Hydrology & Drainage Common Ground

<i>Applicant comments</i>	<i>NLC comments</i>	<i>Status e.g Agreed / not agreed N/A</i>
<p>The proposal will change the routine use of the fields from arable farming, with winter harvesting, spraying, and bare fields etc, to a long-term vegetated surface with the character of meadow. Vegetated swales will be formed on the uphill side of existing watercourses.</p> <p>The Planning Officer has taken advice from the Council’s Drainage Officers and confirms that the Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy (FRADS) scope and detail of the report are acceptable.</p> <p>(NLC letter 7th March 2019, Extract in Appendix 3 of FRADS)</p>	Agreed	Agreed
<p>Maintenance of existing watercourses. NLC emphasised the importance of maintaining the watercourses within the development site throughout the lifetime of the development in accordance with the Operator’s riparian responsibilities.</p> <p>This is agreed and details confirmed in Section 10 of the submitted Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy</p>	Agreed	Agreed

Table 13.2 Hydrology & Drainage Consultee Responses

<i>NLC comments</i>	<i>Applicant comments</i>	<i>Status e.g Agreed / not agreed N/A</i>
North Lincolnshire Internal Drainage Board comment that the site is outside their area and refers the Applicant to the Environment Agency (EA) and NLC	Applicant consulted NLC and EA	Agreed
Environment Agency acknowledges that runoff will be maintained or reduced, but state that it is for the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) to satisfy themselves that the measures in the FRADS will adequately mitigate any risks to third parties.	Runoff from the site will be reduced by the proposals and risks to third parties will be reduced	Agreed. The Council's drainage team have agreed the use of swales on the western boundary to protect 3 rd party land/property from flooding.
Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) requested Land Drainage Consent Form to be issued for watercourse crossings.	Land Drainage Consent Form submitted to the LLFA for ditch crossings. (FRADS Appendix 1)	LLFA confirmed Consent 23 rd October 2019 (FRADS Appendix 1)
LLFA made no other comments on the proposals.	Proposals agreed	Agreed

15. ARBORICULTURE

15.1 The lead consultant on behalf of the applicant on arboricultural matters is Barton Hyett.

Table 13.1 Arboriculture Common Ground

<i>Applicant comments</i>	<i>NLC comments</i>	<i>Status e.g Agreed / not agreed N/A</i>
<i>Description</i>		
<p>The Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA), that forms a Technical Appendix, has been prepared in line with industry best practice and standards.</p> <p>The AIA considers the effects of any tree and woodland loss required to implement the detailed design as well as any reasonably foreseeable and potentially damaging activities proposed within the vicinity of retained trees and woodland.</p>	Agreed	Agreed
<i>Methodology</i>		
<p>The main standard that sets out best practice for assessment as part of an AIA is BS5837:2012: 'Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction - recommendations.</p> <p>The assessment approach adopted within the AIA has been developed in accordance with the principles established in BS5837:2012.</p> <p>This identified impacts within the AIA are cross referenced against tree, group,</p>	Agreed	Agreed

<p>hedgerow or woodland quality in order to provide an evaluation of the degree of significance.</p> <p>The AIA schedule subsequently sets out preventative measures and mitigation to reduce or eliminate the arboricultural impact and its corresponding significance. This results in an 'adjusted' significance of impact.</p>		
<p>Baseline</p>		
<p>Land use across the site is predominantly agricultural and the associated tree scape is typical for an agricultural setting.</p> <p>A comprehensive baseline survey of the site was undertaken in accordance with BS5837:2012.</p> <p>A desk-based search of MAGIC was undertaken in order to identify any areas of designated Ancient Woodland. (one area identified - G43).</p> <p>A desk-based search of any Statutory controls relating to trees (e.g. Conservation Area and Tree Preservation Order) was undertaken with NLC (one protected area identified - G2).</p>	<p>Agreed</p>	<p>Agreed</p>
<p>Mitigation</p>		
<p>The development design, including the location of the perimeter security fence, has been designed to retain trees and provide tree protection throughout the construction phase and beyond.</p>	<p>Agreed</p>	<p>Agreed</p>

<p>Specific, temporary tree protection measures (barriers and ground protection) are required and proposed in some parts of the site.</p> <p>New planting tree and hedgerow planting will mitigate the minor tree and hedgerow loss required by the development.</p>		
<p>Effects</p>		
<p>The AIA demonstrates the majority of arboricultural impacts of the proposed development are 'insignificant' (very short-term) and rising to 'minor' (short-term).</p> <p>There are also some 'moderate' (short to medium-term) and a small number of major (long-term) impacts. However, all these impacts are only likely to affect a small proportion of the arboricultural resource on site.</p> <p>The offsite area of Ancient Woodland (Ancient Replanted Woodland) will be retained and adequately protected in line with Paragraph 175 of the NPPF and associated Standing Advice from Natural England and the Forestry Commission.</p> <p>Positive impacts include:</p> <p>The cessation of ploughing and regular soil disturbance within rooting areas of trees and woodlands.</p>	<p>Agreed</p>	<p>Agreed</p>

The de-intensification of hedgerow and tree management for agricultural purposes		
--	--	--

16. COMMUNITY BENEFITS

Table 16.1 Community Benefits Common Ground

<i>Applicant comments</i>	<i>NLC comments</i>	<i>Status e.g Agreed / not agreed N/A</i>
<p>INRG Solar (Little Crow) Ltd have pledged a fund of £250,000.00 which North Lincolnshire Council have agreed to administer for distribution to the local areas of Broughton, Santon and Appleby.</p> <p>In terms of mechanisms, a representative from each of the three parish councils will be involved in the governance of the fund. The developer contribution will be made upon completion of construction and connection to the grid.</p>	<p>Agreed</p>	<p>Agreed</p>

17. DECLARATIONS

17.1 [to be completed following agreement].

APPENDIX 1

LAND USE ZONING PLAN

APPENDIX 2

PLANNING APPLICATION DRAWINGS

