

**Proposed Solar PV Development**

# Preliminary Environmental Information Report

## Appendix 4.3 EIA Scoping Opinion Response Matrix

Byers Gill Solar

Reference: EN010139

Revision 1 | May 2023



© JBM

**JBM Solar**  
33 Broadwick St  
London  
W1F 0DQ  
United Kingdom  
[www.jbm-solar.com](http://www.jbm-solar.com)

EN010139 | Revision 1 | May 2023 | JBM Solar

## Contents

---

<b>1.</b>	<b>EIA Scoping Opinion Response Matrix</b>	<b>1</b>
-----------	--	----------

### Tables

Table 1	EIA Scoping Opinion Response Matrix	1
---------	-------------------------------------	---

# 1. EIA Scoping Opinion Response Matrix

1.1.1 The table below provides a summary of the comments raised by the Planning Inspectorate (PINS) within the EIA Scoping Opinion. The purpose of the table is to demonstrate how the JBM Solar (the Applicant) has addressed the points raised within the EIA Scoping Opinion as the baseline surveys, design and environmental assessments are progressed. The table provides as clarification of where the information has been provided within the Preliminary Environmental Information Report (PEIR) or will be provided within the Environmental Statement (ES) and other documents which will be submitted in support of the Development Consent Order (DCO) application.

**Table 1 EIA Scoping Opinion Response Matrix**

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Response
<b>Description of the Proposed Development</b>				
2.1.1	Paragraph 2.3.9	Parameters for on-site support equipment and battery energy storage	The Scoping Report identifies that there will be approximately 44 inverter containers and 53 hybrid containers approximately the size of a shipping container, however, it does not explain the anticipated height of these structures i.e. whether they can/will be stacked or what the footprint would be; as is done for the substation. The ES should set out the maximum parameters of the proposed on-site support equipment and identify where these will be located. This should also be established for the battery energy storage systems.	Chapter 2 of the PEIR confirms the maximum parameters for inverters, transformers and Battery Energy Storage Systems (BESS) as the following:  <i>“At this stage, it is anticipated that there would be an approximate combination of up to 53 hybrid containers (which include an inverter and BESS) and up to 44 inverter only containers located across the Proposed Development, placed on a concrete pad foundation, and measuring approximately 3m in height, 2.5m in width and 12m in length.”</i>
2.1.2	Paragraph 2.4.6	Number and location of construction compounds and access tracks	Whilst this is currently unknown, the ES should quantify and locate the construction compounds. The Applicant should make effort to locate the compounds where existing access to the construction site can be secured reducing the need for new accesses and the resultant impacts.	Figure 12.1 presents the proposed access routes to the Site Area and temporary construction compounds.
2.1.3	Section 2.3	Cable depth	The ES should define the maximum depth and width of cable corridors and final easements and use this to inform a worst-case scenario in aspect assessments where relevant.	Chapter 2 of the PIER confirms the maximum dimension of the cable trench would be 1600mm depth x 2000mm wide.
2.1.4	Section 2.4	Construction timeframe	Whilst the Scoping Report states that construction will last 12 months, an anticipated timeframe for each relevant stage of construction (enabling works, construction and commissioning) has not been provided. The ES should provide	Anticipated timeframes for the construction stages will be provided within the ES.

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Response
			an anticipated timeframe for each stage of the construction period as this will usefully correspond to the characteristics of the likely impacts and effects.	
<b>EIA Methodology and Scope of Assessment</b>				
2.2.1	N/A	Transboundary	The Inspectorate on behalf of the SoS has considered the Proposed Development and concludes that the Proposed Development is unlikely to have a significant effect either alone or cumulatively on the environment in a European Economic Area State. In reaching this conclusion the Inspectorate has identified and considered the Proposed Development's likely impacts including consideration of potential pathways and the extent, magnitude, probability, duration, frequency and reversibility of the impacts. The Inspectorate considers that the likelihood of transboundary effects resulting from the Proposed Development is so low that it does not warrant the issue of a detailed transboundary screening. However, this position will remain under review and will have regard to any new or materially different information coming to light which may alter that decision. Note: The SoS' duty under Regulation 32 of the 2017 EIA Regulations continues throughout the application process. The Inspectorate's screening of transboundary issues is based on the relevant considerations specified in the Annex to its Advice Note Twelve, available on our website at <a href="http://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/legislation-andadvice/advice-notes/">http://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/legislation-andadvice/advice-notes/</a>	Noted.
<b>Climate Change</b>				
3.1.1	Table 5.2	Temperature change	Temperature changes are not anticipated to be exacerbated by the Proposed Development; the Inspectorate is content to scope this matter out on this basis.	As this matter has been agreed to be scoped out, this has not been included within the assessment
3.1.2	Table 5.2	Impacts to and from sea level rise	Since the Proposed Development is not identified as being located in an area with potential to be impacted by or to exacerbate impacts from sea level rise therefore, the Inspectorate agrees that this matter can be scoped out.	As this matter has been agreed to be scoped out, this has not been included within the assessment

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Response
3.1.3	Table 5.2	Precipitation change	The Inspectorate is content to scope this matter out on the basis that precipitation changes are not anticipated to be exacerbated by the Proposed Development; it is noted and agreed that impacts to the Proposed Development from increased frequency and duration of precipitation events is scoped in.	The impacts of increased precipitation have been assessed as part of the Climate Change Resilience (CCR) Assessment (Appendix 5.1). As confirmed within the Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) (Appendix 10.1), a 40% increase in rainfall will be taken into account in sizing of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) features.
3.1.4	Table 5.2	Wind	Wind impacts from climate change are not anticipated to be exacerbated by the Proposed Development; the Inspectorate is content to scope this matter out on this basis. It is noted and agreed that impacts to the Proposed Development from an increase in strong wind events is scoped in.	As this matter has been agreed to be scoped out, this has not been included within the assessment. The impacts of wind have been assessed as part of the CCR Assessment (Appendix 5.1).
3.1.5	Paragraph 5.7.2.2 and Table 5.7	Resilience to impacts from climate change during construction and decommissioning	The Inspectorate agrees that this can be scoped out of the assessment on the basis that impacts from flooding will be assessed in the Flood Risk Chapter and that mitigation measures to manage potential extreme weather events, including use of weather alert systems and appropriate storage of materials, will be implemented.	As this matter has been agreed to be scoped out, this has not been included within the assessment. The impacts of extreme weather events have been assessed as part of the CCR Assessment (Appendix 5.1).
3.1.6	Paragraph 5.5.7	Future scenario 2040 – 2059	Scoping Report paragraph 5.5.7 states that the future climate change scenario is 2040 to 2059 as this best represents the future baseline, however, on the premise that construction is likely to start at the earliest in 2023 and therefore complete in 2024, the lifetime of the development will exceed 2059. The Inspectorate considers that the future climate change scenario should either be fully justified or changed to reflect the extent of the Proposed Development's lifetime.	Agreed, the UKCP18 modelling data dates have been extended to 2070 to capture the entire lifecycle of the Proposed Development. For further details, see Chapter 5 Climate Change.

## Biodiversity

3.2.1	Paragraph 6.6.5 and Table 6.4	Construction, operation and decommissioning – Direct impacts on national and non-statutory designated sites	Scoping Report paragraph 6.6.5 states that impacts on designated sites are unlikely as no land is required directly from designated sites and indirect effects such as pollution will be mitigated through best practice measures secured through the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP). Table 6.4 only scopes out potential impacts to national and non-statutory designated sites. The Inspectorate agrees these matters can be scoped out. For clarity, indirect effects to	A Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) screening assessment will be undertaken and included within the ES.
-------	-------------------------------	---	--	---

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Response
			internationally designated sites should be scoped into the ES as there is potential for the Proposed Development to impact land functionally linked to the Teesmouth and Cleveland Coast Special Protection Area (SPA) and Ramsar site (paragraph 6.5.3).	
3.2.2	Table 6.4	Operation and decommissioning – Permanent loss of habitat Operation – temporary loss of habitat	The Inspectorate agrees that this matter can be scoped out on the basis that impacts during construction take account of any continued habitat loss through the operation and decommissioning phases.	
3.2.3	Paragraph 6.6.8 and Table 6.4	Construction, operation and decommissioning – Loss of habitat and incidental harm and mortality of great crested newts (GCNs)	The Applicant intends to offset the effects of the Proposed Development on Great Crested Newts (GCN) by obtaining a licence through the Natural England District Level Licensing (DLL) scheme. The Inspectorate understands that the DLL approach includes strategic area assessment and the identification of risk zones and strategic opportunity area maps. The ES should include information to demonstrate whether the Proposed Development is located within a risk zone for GCN. If the Applicant enters into the DLL scheme, NE will undertake an impact assessment and inform the Applicant whether their scheme is within one of the amber risk zones and therefore whether the Proposed Development is likely to have a significant effect on GCN. The outcome of this assessment will be documented on an Impact Assessment and Conservation Payment Certificate (IACPC). The IACPC can be used to provide additional detail to inform the findings in the ES, including information on the Proposed Development's impact on GCN and the appropriate compensation required.	The ES will provide information to demonstrate whether the Proposed Development is located within a risk zone for GCN which will be carried out as part of the DLL scheme.
3.2.4	Table 6.4	Construction, operation and decommissioning – Loss of habitat incidental harm and mortality of reptiles	Scoping Report paragraph 6.6.1 identifies potential impacts to reptiles however, impacts are then stated to be unlikely in paragraph 6.6.9 due to the majority of habitat on site being sub-optimal for reptiles; this is supported by a Preliminary Ecological Appraisal. Table 6.4 identified that reptiles identified on site will be relocated before a destructive search with the final landscape design enhancing habitat and connectivity for	As this matter has been agreed to be scoped out, this has not been included within the assessment.

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Response
			reptiles across the Proposed Development site. On this basis, the Inspectorate agrees to scope this matter out.	
3.2.5	Paragraph 6.6.11 and Table 6.4	Construction, operation and decommissioning – loss of trees supporting roosting bats	Scoping Report paragraph 6.6.11 confirms that trees identified with potential for roosting bats will be retained. Provided this is secured through the DCO, the Inspectorate agrees to scope this matter out.	This will be secured through the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) and the Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (LEMP) via a requirement of the DCO.
3.2.6	Table 6.4	Construction, operation and decommissioning – loss of bat foraging habitat	Bat foraging habitat is proposed to be retained aside from small sections of hedgerows that will be temporarily removed (and subsequently reinstated) to accommodate cable routes during construction. The ES should identify the locations and extent of hedgerow removal and the timeframes for reinstatement. No baseline information has been provided in relation to bats and surveys are identified to be ongoing in Table 6.2. Without understanding how bats use the site, the Inspectorate cannot agree to scope this matter out. The ES should establish the baseline and assess significant effects where they are likely to occur.	Revised layout will enable the retention of habitats suitable for foraging, commuting and roosting bats such as field margins, woodland, scrub and the majority of hedgerows and associated trees. Bat foraging baseline data is contained within this report and will be provided within the ES.
3.2.7	Paragraph 6.6.12 and Table 6.4	Construction, operation and decommissioning – disturbance to badger setts	Scoping Report paragraph 6.6.12 states that badger setts identified from surveys (Table 6.2) would be retained and a standoff distance implemented to a likely minimum of 30m to avoid/minimise disturbance. Fences will also include mammal gates to allow for movement. The Scoping Report does not discuss how the presence of the solar farm would impact badger use of the site during operation. The ES should describe and secure mitigation measures through the DCO and use evidence to explain how badgers might use the site during operation. Any assumptions and limitations should be described.	Baseline data relating to badgers is contained within PEIR Chapter 6 and will be provided within the ES. The ES will describe how the design of the Proposed Development has avoided direct impact on badgers and will seek to secure relevant mitigation measures.
3.2.8	Table 6.4	Construction, operation and decommissioning – fragmentation of habitat due to security fencing	The security fencing, at all stages of the Proposed Development, will incorporate mammal gates to reduce/avoid fragmentation. Provided this is secured through the DCO, the Inspectorate agrees this matter can be scoped out.	This will be secured through the construction Environmental Management plan (CEMP) and the Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (LEMP) via a requirement of the DCO.
3.2.9	Paragraph 6.6.1	Disturbance and displacement of reptiles, GCNs and hares	The Scoping Report identifies the potential for reptiles, GCNs and hares on site in paragraph 6.6.1 however, disturbance is not listed as a potential impact on these species. The ES	Reptile and hare baseline data is contained within this PEIR and will be provided within the ES.

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Response
3.2.10	Section 6.5	Receptors – water dependent habitats and species	<p>should assess disturbance during construction on hares, GCNs and reptiles where significant effects are likely to occur.</p> <p>Whilst main and ordinary watercourses are discussed in Scoping Report section 6.5 hydrology, water dependent habitats (such as ditches) and species (such as fish) are not. The ES should include sufficient baseline ecological survey data to evaluate the potential impacts on water dependent habitats and species and assess significant effects where they are likely to occur.</p>	Design of the Proposed Development has avoided direct impact on watercourses with a standoff distance from watercourse features. Pollution prevention control measures outlined in CEMP will reduce potential for adverse effects.
3.2.11	Paragraph 6.6.13 and Table 6.5	Increase in floral and insect species-richness	Scoping Report paragraph 6.6.13 identifies an increase in floral and insect species diversity as an impact during operation but this is not scoped into the assessment in Table 6.4. The ES should provide specific detail regarding the anticipated change in species richness and diversity in order to understand any potential significant effects. The ES should assess significant effects where they are likely to occur.	To be provided within the ES.
3.2.12	Paragraph 6.6.1 and Table 6.2	Other identified species from ongoing surveys	The Inspectorate notes that Table 6.2 identifies that some surveys are incomplete and are ongoing. Therefore, the Inspectorate does not consider that the potential impacts of the Proposed Development listed in paragraph 6.6.1 are in full as receptors are identified but possibility remains for further receptors to be identified e.g. hazel dormouse, veteran trees etc. The ES should report the full survey findings and list all receptors identified as potentially present on site and assess significant effects where they are likely to occur.	Baseline data provided within this PEIR and to be provided within the ES.
3.2.13	N/A	Confidential Annexes	Public bodies have a responsibility to avoid releasing environmental information that could bring about harm to sensitive or vulnerable ecological features. Specific survey and assessment data relating to the presence and locations of species such as badgers, rare birds and plants that could be subject to disturbance, damage, persecution, or commercial exploitation resulting from publication of the information, should be provided in the ES as a confidential annex. All other assessment information should be included in an ES chapter, as normal, with a placeholder explaining that a confidential annex	Badger sett locations and figure are contained within a confidential appendix within the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal Report (Appendix 6.1) with its distribution to be limited to relevant project staff, relevant councils. Natural England and the Badger Trust.



ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Response
			has been submitted to the Inspectorate and may be made available subject to request.	
<b>Landscape and Visual</b>				
3.3.1	Table 7.3	Effects on national landscape designations	The Inspectorate is content to scope this matter out on the basis that there are no national landscape designations within 5km of the Proposed Development.	As this matter has been agreed to be scoped out, the assessment does not consider effects on nationally designated landscapes.
3.3.2	Table 7.3	Effects on local landscape designations beyond 2km	The Scoping Report states that this matter has been scoped out as effects on local landscape designations beyond 2km are expected to be negligible as visibility is expected to be limited. However, the Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) illustrated in Figures 7.3 to 7.8 shows that the solar panels would be visible beyond 2km and therefore have potential to impact local landscape designations. The ES should identify, locate and assess impacts to local landscape designations within the ZTV where significant effects are likely to occur.	Subsequent discussion at a meeting with Darlington Borough Council indicated that this request was based on a misunderstanding of the ZTV study – thinking that where visibility was shown it meant wide areas of the Proposed Development would be visible and not screened by intervening vegetation. It was explained that the ZTV studies reflect theoretical visibility of at least one small part of the Proposed Development, which may be screened by vegetation not modelled (such as hedgerows and individual of small groups or lines of trees). With this understood it was agreed that a 5km study area would be used for the PEIR, with a view to reducing to 2km for the EIA stage should the PEIR establish that effects beyond 2km would not be significant. For further details, see Chapter 7 Landscape and Visual.
3.3.3	Table 7.3	Effects on national landscape character areas	The Applicant proposes to scope out effects on National Character Areas (NCAs) due to scale of the Proposed Development in comparison to the broad nature of NCAs. However, NCAs are not identified in the Scoping Report landscape and visual baseline or as sensitive receptors. The ES should identify, locate and assess impacts to National Character Areas where significant effects are likely to occur.	
3.3.4	Table 7.3	Effects on local landscape character areas beyond 2km	The Applicant intends to scope this matter out as effects on local landscape character areas beyond 2km are expected to be negligible given visibility is expected to be limited. However, the ZTV shows that the Proposed Development would be visible beyond 2km. The ES should assess impacts to local landscape character areas within the ZTV where significant effects are likely to occur.	
3.3.5	Table 7.3; Figures 7.3 to 7.8	Effects on views and visual amenity beyond 2km	The Scoping Report states that effects on visual receptors beyond 2km are expected to be negligible given expected visibility. However, the Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) illustrated in Figures 7.3 to 7.8 show that the panels will be visible beyond 2km. The ES should assess potential effects on	As indicated by the Natural England scoping response and best practice as set out at paragraph 5.14 of Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment 3 (GLVIA3), local character studies provide the most appropriate scale for detailed assessment, with the National Character Areas (NCA) providing additional

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Response
			views and visual amenity within the ZTV where significant effects are likely to occur.	context to the baseline, and this is the primary approach taken within this assessment. PINS suggested further clarification with Natural England and a response was received on 11 February 2023 indicating that effects on the NCA should be considered where significant effects on local character was identified. This assessment follows that suggested approach.
3.3.6	Paragraph 7.7.1	Viewpoints	The ES should explain the process used to determine appropriate viewpoints through the consultation process and should take into account topography, long-distance views, views from Public Rights of Way and the setting of heritage receptors.	Consultation regarding viewpoint selection is described within Appendix 7.4, and within this table. The ZTV studies used to inform viewpoint selection model the influence of topography on visibility. Viewpoints are included for a range of distances (up to 5km) and visual receptors (including PRoW users). The setting of heritage receptors is not a matter for LVIA and is considered in Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage and Archaeology. That chapter sets out how viewpoints have informed the heritage assessment.
3.3.7	Section 7.3	ZTV / Study Area	The Scoping Report states that the ZTV has been calculated using a set height of 4.35m as this is the maximum height used for tracking solar PV modules. However, the Proposed Development involves associated infrastructure, including CCTV poles, security fencing, substation, inverters, and Battery Energy Storage Systems (BESS), which may exceed the maximum height used to calculate the ZTV. Consequently, the ZTV may not be representative of the full extent of visibility. The ES should clearly evidence and justify the final extent of the ZTV used and ensure that any assessment of significance is based on the worst-case scenario. Effort should also be made to agree appropriate ZTVs with relevant consultation bodies.	Most of the elements (fencing, inverters and CCTV poles) would not be taller than the panels. The substation and transmitter mast would be taller, however given an increased 5km study area has been used, a further increase is not required to consider these elements. Given the increase to a 5km study area as noted at reference 3.3.2 above, a further increase is not warranted given the pattern of visibility identified by Figure 7.3.
<b>Cultural Heritage and Archaeology</b>				
3.4.1	Table 8.5	Direct impacts to known and unknown archaeological remains during operation	Potential indirect impacts to archaeology remaining in situ during the operation include impacts from alteration of drainage patterns as a result of the existence of the Proposed Development. This could cause increase decomposition of	This has been taken account, and an assessment is provided within Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage and Archaeology.

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Response
			archaeological remains therefore the Inspectorate does not agree to scope this matter out.	
3.4.2	Table 8.5	Direct impacts to known and unknown archaeological remains during decommissioning	The Applicant proposes to scope out the direct impact of decommissioning the Proposed Development on known and unknown archaeological remains as impacts are only likely to occur during construction. Given there is potential for ground disturbance during decommissioning and effects are likely to be similar to those experienced during construction the Inspectorate is of the opinion that this matter cannot be scoped out at this stage.	Following the provision of updated designs and the confirmation that no additional land take or excavation will be required for the decommissioning of the Proposed Development, there is no potential for any additional ground disturbance as set out in Chapter 8 Paragraph 8.9.11.
3.4.3	Table 8.5	Direct impacts to designated heritage assets	The Inspectorate agrees that direct physical effects on designated heritage assets can be scoped out as there are no designated heritage assets within the site boundary.	As this matter has been agreed to be scoped out, this has not been included within the assessment
3.4.4	Table 8.5	Direct impacts to any heritage assets beyond the development footprint	The Inspectorate agrees that the Proposed Development is unlikely to directly impact heritage assets beyond the development footprint and is content for this matter to be scoped out.	As this matter has been agreed to be scoped out, this has not been included within the assessment
3.4.5	Table 8.5	Indirect impacts to designated and non-designated heritage assets within the Site Area during construction and decommissioning	The Scoping Report states that indirect impacts to designated and non-designated heritage assets within the Site Area are considered operational and occur due to a change of setting as a result of the finished built form of the Proposed Development. The Inspectorate notes that the use of temporary construction compounds within the Site Area has the potential to indirectly impact the setting of designated and non-designated heritage assets during construction and decommissioning of the Proposed Development. However, given the anticipated short duration of the construction and decommissioning stages, significant effects are considered unlikely and the Inspectorate is content to scope this matter out.	As this matter has been agreed to be scoped out, this has not been included within the assessment
3.4.6	Table 8.5	Indirect impacts on designated and non-designated heritage assets within the 2km study area during construction and decommissioning	The Inspectorate considers that due to anticipated short duration of the construction and decommissioning stages, significant indirect effects to designated and non-designated heritage assets within the 2km study area are unlikely and the Inspectorate is content to scope this matter out.	As this matter has been agreed to be scoped out, this has not been included within the assessment

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Response
3.4.7	Table 8.5	Indirect impacts on highly designated heritage assets within the 5km study area during construction and decommissioning	The Inspectorate agrees that due to the anticipated short duration of the construction and decommissioning stages, significant indirect effects to highly designated heritage assets within the 5km study area are unlikely and the Inspectorate is content to scope this matter out.	As this matter has been agreed to be scoped out, this has not been included within the assessment
3.4.8	Table 8.5	Impacts on the Grade II* listed Wynyard Hall, the Grade II* registered Wynyard Park, the Grade II* listed Lion Bridge to East of Wynyard Hall, the Grade II* listed Wellington Obelisk to South East of Wynyard Hall	The Scoping Report states that impacts on these designated assets have been scoped out on the basis that they are all contained within the Grade II* registered Wynyard Park which is not considered to be within the setting of the Site Area. The Inspectorate agrees that the Proposed Development is unlikely to result in significant effects on these assets and is content to scope these assets out.	As this matter has been agreed to be scoped out, this has not been included within the assessment
3.4.9	Table 8.5	Impacts on the Grade II listed Hodgson Chest Tomb, 5m South of South Porch of Church of St Andrew, the Grade II listed 3, The Green, the Grade II listed Oakles Farmhouse, the Grade II listed 14, High Street, Lamp Post 7 Metres East of Number 7, The Green, the Grade II listed Church of St Andrew, the Grade II listed Headstone to John Gibson, 7 Metres South of South of South Port of Church of St Andrew and the Grade II listed Aycliffe War Memorial	The Scoping Report states that these assets are located within the built-up environment of Aycliffe and are in close proximity to the A1(M) and have been scoped out of the assessment as the Proposed Development would cause no further alteration to the setting of the assets. On this basis, the Inspectorate considers that significant effects are unlikely and agrees to scope these assets out.	As this matter has been agreed to be scoped out, this has not been included within the assessment
3.4.10	Table 8.5	Impacts on the Grade II* listed Heighington Hall and the Grade I listed Church of St Michael	The Inspectorate considers that as these designated assets are visually separated from the Site by a large number of buildings and vegetation and are not considered to share a relationship to the Site Area, significant effects are unlikely and the Inspectorate is content to scope this matter out.	As this matter has been agreed to be scoped out, this has not been included within the assessment
3.4.11	Table 8.5	Impacts on the Grade II* listed Goods Shed East South East of North Road Station, the Grade I	The Scoping Report proposes to scope out these assets on the basis that the significance to their setting is derived from their relationship with other assets within the urban	As this matter has been agreed to be scoped out, this has not been included within the assessment

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Response
		listed Butler House and the Rectory, the Grade I listed Church of St Andrew, the North Road Railway Station (Now Railway Museum) and the Grade I listed Skerne Bridge	environment and not from the Site Area. The Inspectorate is content that significant effects on these designated assets are unlikely and agrees to scope out this matter.	
3.4.12	Table 8.5	Impacts on the Grade II* listed Church of St Mary and the Grade II* listed Manor House	The Applicant considers that these assets are defined by the immediate rural setting and have no relationship to the Site Area, which is located in the distant landscape. Therefore, the Applicant intends to scope this matter out. Based on the information provided, the Inspectorate is content that significant effects are not likely to occur and agrees to scope these assets out.	As this matter has been agreed to be scoped out, this has not been included within the assessment
3.4.13	Table 8.5	Impacts on the Grade II* listed Gloucester House, the Grade II* listed 108, High Street , the Grade I listed Church of St Cuthbert, the Grade II* listed St Cuthbert's Vicarage, the Grade II* listed Church of St Peter, the Grade II* listed 48, Bridge Road, the Grade II* listed 74 and 76, Church Road, the Grade II* listed Town Hall, the Grade II* listed Market Cross, the Grade I listed Stockton Parish Church, the Grade II* listed War Memorial, the Grade I listed Parish Church of St Mary the Virgin, the Grade II* listed The Manor House, the Grade II* listed Columbia House, the Grade II* listed 32, Dovecot Street, the Grade II* listed Church of St Michael and All Angels, the Grade II* listed	The Applicant proposes to scope out these assets on the basis that they are located within the urban and sub-urban environment of Stockton-on-Tees and share no relationship to the Site. The Inspectorate agrees that the Proposed Development is unlikely to result in significant effects on these assets and is content to scope these assets out.	As this matter has been agreed to be scoped out, this has not been included within the assessment

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Response
		Church of the Holy Trinity, the Grade II* listed 80, Church Road, the Grade II* listed 9, Finkle Street, the Grade II* listed Friends Meeting House and the Grade II* Registered Ropner Park		
3.4.14	Section 8.5	Archaeological fieldwork	The Applicant should ensure that the information used to inform the assessment is robust and allows for suitable characterisation of the archaeological baseline. The Applicant should make effort to agree the methodology for any intrusive investigations required with relevant consultation bodies.	The information used to inform the archaeological baseline is outlined and evidenced in the Archaeological Desk Based Assessment and Historic Environment Setting Assessments which are provided as PEIR Appendices 8.2 and 8.3.
3.4.15	Paragraph 2.3.23	Cable Plough	Paragraph 2.3.23 of the Scoping Report states that on-site cabling would be installed using a cable plough where possible. However, the potential effects of using the cable plough on buried archaeological remains is not considered in the Scoping Report. The ES should assess the potential effects of using a cable plough on buried archaeology and describe how below ground archaeology will be recorded and preserved.	Noted, the potential for direct impacts from a cable ploughing on potential buried archaeological remains has been included as part of the assessment as set out within Chapter 8 Cultural Heritage and Archaeology.

### Land Use and Socio-Economics

3.5.1	Table 9.4	Socio-economic effects related to the local population, excluding employment and supply chain effects	The Applicant proposes to scope out this matter on the basis that socio-economic effects relating to the local population, such as visual amenity and other amenity impacts, will be considered by other assessment chapters and mitigated through management plans. The Inspectorate is content with this approach and agrees to scope out this matter. The ES should ensure that socio-economic effect of amenity impacts is clearly addressed in the relevant chapters.	Specific potential impacts on the local population are considered in other PEIR chapters e.g., Chapter 7 Landscape and Visual, Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration and Chapter 12 Traffic and Transport.
3.5.2	Table 9.4	Impacts on minerals	The Scoping Report states that the part of the site area is located within Darlington Borough Council's Mineral Safeguarding Zones for limestone. However, consideration of impacts on minerals has been scoped out of the ES on the basis that the mineral assets would not be permanently sterilised and could be extracted once the Proposed Development has been decommissioned. The Applicant should confirm that there are no plans to extract this limestone	Consultation is ongoing with Darlington Borough Council and this point will be confirmed at ES stage.

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Response
			during the lifetime of the Proposed Development. Provided this has been confirmed the Inspectorate is content to scope this matter out. However, should plans to extract limestone from the area exist the ES should provide an assessment of the potential impacts of the Proposed Development on mineral assets.	
3.5.3	Table 9.4	Impact to soil resources during operation	The Inspectorate is content to scope this matter out as impacts to soil resources would be limited to the construction and decommissioning phases of the Proposed Development.	Noted. Impacts will take place during construction, and these have been reported in section 9.11 of Chapter 9 Land Use and Socio-economics.
3.5.4	Table 9.4	Impact on agricultural land during operation	The Inspectorate agrees that effects on agricultural land during the operation phase of the Proposed Development can be scoped out on the basis that significant effects on agricultural land are likely to be restricted to the construction and decommissioning phases.	As this matter has been agreed to be scoped out, this has not been included within the assessment
3.5.5	Table 9.4	Wider impact on farm holdings	The Scoping Report proposes to scope out this matter on the basis that landowners that form part of the Proposed Development have signed up to a voluntary agreement and have considered the potential effects on the viability of farm holdings. The Inspectorate is content to scope out this matter, subject to providing evidence of such agreements.	As this matter has been agreed to be scoped out, this has not been included within the assessment
3.5.6	N/A	Census data	New census data was published on 28 June 2022. This should be used to inform baseline data and the ES assessment	Baseline data presented in Chapter 9 Land Use and Socio-economics utilises the data published as part of the 2021 census outputs.
3.5.7	Paragraph 9.6.7	Continued agricultural uses	Paragraph 9.6.7 of the Scoping Report states that the Applicant is exploring the potential for continued agricultural use of the site within the solar PV module areas. The ES should set out the type of agricultural use being considered and assess potential effects on land use and socio-economics, where significant effects are likely.	The potential for continued agriculture on the site is still being explored and will be confirmed and considered at ES stage.
<b>Cumulative Effects</b>				
3.6.1	N/A	N/A	No matters have been proposed to be scoped out of the assessment.	No response required.
3.6.2	N/A	N/A	N/A	No response required.

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Response
<b>Topics Scoped Out</b>				
3.7.1	Section 11.2	Air Quality – construction dust and exhaust emissions (e.g. from plant machinery)	A construction dust assessment will be provided with the ES and appropriate mitigation measures in line with best practice Institute of Air Quality Management guidance will be secured through a CEMP. An example of such measures are provided in Scoping Report paragraph 11.2.19. The Inspectorate agrees that this matter can be scoped out.	A construction dust assessment is provided as Annex 1 to the draft Outline Environmental Management Plan (EMP) (Appendix 2.4 of the PEIR). An updated version of both documents will be submitted with the ES.
3.7.2	Section 11.2	Air Quality – road emissions from all phases	Background air pollutant levels as presented in Scoping Report Table 11.1, are below annual mean objective levels. The nearest Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) is located 20km away. Scoping Report paragraphs 11.1.13 to 11.11.15 and Table 11.11.14 anticipate the number and type of traffic movements during construction both alone and cumulatively. These are below the EPUK/IAQM planning guidance threshold criteria (paragraph 11.2.21). Mitigation measures are proposed to manage traffic movements in paragraphs 11.2.24 and will be secured via the CEMP. Paragraph 11.11.28 identifies that based on previous solar farm developments, the number of operational traffic movements are likely to be negligible and made up of light vehicles (not HGVs) however, the number is not quantified. On the basis that the ES can confirm that the number of traffic movements remains below the EPUK/IAQM planning guidance threshold criteria alone or cumulatively during construction, operation and decommissioning, the Inspectorate agrees to scope this matter out.	Mitigation measures to manage traffic movements will be included in the Outline EMP and Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP). An assessment of traffic movements will be provided within the ES. A preliminary assessment of traffic movements is provided in PEIR Chapter 12 Traffic and Transport.
3.7.3	Section 11.3, paragraphs 11.3.3, 11.3.20 to 11.3.25 and	Arboriculture – tree removal and reduction in canopy cover – all phases	Scoping Report Table 11.3 and paragraph 11.3.16 states that any tree/hedge removal will be minimal and where they are required to be removed this will be assessed in an arboricultural impact assessment which will be submitted with the DCO. Scoping Report paragraph 11.3.3 states that impacts to trees will be assessed in the biodiversity and landscape and visual Chapters of the ES therefore, the Inspectorate agrees that a separate Chapter for arboriculture can be scoped out.	As this matter has been agreed to be scoped out, this has not been included within the assessment



ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Response
	11.3.31 to 11.3.35			
3.7.4	Section 11.3, paragraphs 11.3.3, 11.3.20 to 11.3.25 and 11.3.31 to 11.3.35	Arboriculture – tree damage and impacts to ancient and veteran trees – all phases	Scoping Report Table 11.3 identifies that construction will be largely away from trees, woodlands and hedges and that best practice measures, including buffer zones, will be utilised to avoid/reduce impacts. Mitigation measures for all phases are described in paragraphs 11.3.20 to 11.3.25 and 11.3.31 to 11.3.35. Scoping Report paragraph 11.3.3 states that impacts to trees will be assessed in the biodiversity and landscape and visual Chapters of the ES therefore, the Inspectorate agrees that a separate Chapter for arboriculture can be scoped out.	As this matter has been agreed to be scoped out, this has not been included within the assessment
3.7.5	Section 11.4	Electric, Magnetic, and Electromagnetic Fields (EMF) during all phases	The Inspectorate considers that this matter may be scoped out on the basis that no cables will exceed 132kV.	As this matter has been agreed to be scoped out, this has not been included within the assessment
3.7.6	Section 11.5	Glint and Glare during all phases	A detailed glint and glare assessment is proposed to be submitted with the application to identify any required mitigation (as set out in Scoping Report paragraphs 11.5.17 to 11.5.22) to avoid/reduce any potential effects. Effects on landscape and visual receptors will be included in the relevant Chapter in the ES. The Inspectorate is content with this approach and agrees that a separate glint and glare assessment can be scoped out.	A Solar Photovoltaic Glint and Glare Study is provided as Appendix 2.2 of the PEIR.
3.7.7	Section 11.6	Ground Conditions – contaminated land – all phases	The Inspectorate agrees that this matter can be scoped out on the basis that a preliminary risk assessment (desk-based) identifies a low risk of contamination at the Proposed Development site. This should be submitted with the application. Additionally, potential contamination to the ground from the Proposed Development is proposed to be mitigated through best practice measures as identified in Scoping Report paragraphs 11.6.29 to 11.6.37 during construction and operation. These measures should be secured through the DCO.	A Phase 1 Geoenvironmental and Geotechnical Desk Study is provided as Appendix 2.1 of the PEIR. Best practice measure to mitigate potential contamination will be included in the Outline EMP submitted with the ES. A Draft Outline EMP is provided as Appendix 2.4 of the PEIR.
3.7.8	Section 11.6	Ground Conditions – mineral resources and geology – all phases	Please see commentary in box 3.5.2 of this Scoping Opinion regarding the assessment of effects on mineral resources.	This will be assessed as part of ES within Chapter 9 Land Use and Socio-economics.

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Response
3.7.9	Section 11.7	Human Health – all phases	<p>The Scoping Report proposes to assess impacts to Human Health in other relevant Chapters including Landscape and Visual and Land Use and Socio-Economics and within relevant mitigation plans including the PRow management plan, Landscape Environmental Management Plan (LEMP) and the outline CEMP. Impacts from air quality, traffic and transport, climate change, EMF and noise and vibration are not proposed to be assessed as these are proposed to be scoped out of the ES. Please see boxes 3.7.1, 3.7.2, 3.7.4, 3.7.11, 3.7.12 of this Scoping Opinion. Whilst impacts to human health are not scoped out of the climate change Chapter, the Inspectorate considers this is already embedded in the assessment methodology.</p> <p>Provided impacts on Human Health are addressed in the proposed Chapters, the Inspectorate agrees that a separate Chapter on Human Health is not required and can be scoped out. Impacts from potential fire/explosion in relation to battery storage should be assessed in the relevant Chapters where significant effects are likely to occur.</p>	<p>As this matter has been agreed to be scoped out, this has not been included within the assessment</p> <p>Impacts from potential fire/explosion in relation to the BESS will be assessed within the ES.</p> <p>An Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (oBSMP) will be submitted with the DCO application which will identify structures and processes to manage and control any safety risks during construction, operation and decommissioning of the Proposed Development.</p>
3.7.10	Table 11.8 and paragraph 11.8.13 to 11.8.39	<p>Hydrology – effects to water quality from siltation of runoff and pollution events – all phases</p> <p>And</p> <p>Hydrology – effects to water quality impacts to designated sites – all phases</p>	<p>The Scoping Report proposes to scope out effects on water quality from siltation of runoff and pollution events for all phases on the basis that earthworks would be 'minimal', any spoil would be managed in line with appropriate guidance and mitigation would be secured through the CEMP to avoid pollution events and to reduce scour (such as soil bungs, grass strip filters and silt traps). The Scoping Report anticipates that due to the nature of operation, the site would not provide a pathway for significant effects during operation.</p> <p>The Inspectorate notes that impacts from herbicide and pesticide mobilisation have not been discussed in the Scoping Report and that horizontal directional drilling may be required but a breakout plan is not proposed. Additionally, there is no evidence to support or secure that earthworks/excavations will be 'minimal' and not lead to adverse effects.</p>	<p>Impacts from herbicides and pesticides and construction on water quality is included within Chapter 10 Hydrology and Flood Risk.</p> <p>It is considered that a drilling fluid breakout plan is not required at this stage and will be conditioned prior to the start of construction.</p>

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Response
			<p>The Inspectorate does not consider enough evidence regarding the final design and control measures has been provided to scope this matter out during construction or decommissioning. The ES should identify relevant pathways of effect, the likely mitigation required to mitigate such effects and any monitoring required; this should include a drilling fluid breakout plan which should also be submitted with the Application.</p>	
3.7.11	Table 11.8 and paragraph 11.8.13 to 11.8.39	Hydrology – effects from surface water runoff from soil compaction, pluvial and fluvial flooding impacts – all phases And Hydrology – effects from flooding to designated sites – all phases	<p>Effects from pluvial and fluvial flooding and surface water runoff from soil compaction are proposed to be scoped out on the basis that the site is predominantly located in flood zone 1 (Figure 11.2) and that SuDS will be employed to ensure flood risk is not increased on site. Additionally, any sensitive infrastructure will be located outside of flood zones 2 and 3 and where solar panels are located in these areas, electrical equipment will be located above the design flood levels. A Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) is proposed to ensure that vehicle movements are minimised and restricted to access tracks and roads to reduce distribution and concentration of soil compaction.</p> <p>Impacts from groundwater flooding have not been considered in the Scoping Report. Sensitive receptors are also located within the red line boundary (principal aquifer and source protection zone) and Scoping Report paragraph 11.6.15 identifies that groundwater levels are 'high' across the Proposed Development site. Additionally, the Inspectorate considers that compaction can occur across the site as each panel will require machinery access for construction.</p> <p>The Inspectorate does not consider that sufficient evidence has been provided to scope this matter out. The ES should assess significant effects to/from flooding where they are likely to occur.</p>	<p>An assessment of flood risk is included within Chapter 10 Hydrology and Flood Risk, and is supported by the FRA in Appendix 10.1.</p> <p>The FRA considers groundwater flooding, such as identifying the likely areas of flooding and likely levels. The embedded design of the Proposed Development has avoided putting drainage features in these areas.</p>
3.7.12	Tables 11.10 and 11.12	Major Accidents and Disasters - flooding – all phases	Scoping Report Table 11.10 sets out a screening exercise that has been undertaken in line with the IEMA primer: 'Major Accidents and Disasters in EIA: A Primer' (2020). Scoping	An assessment of flood risk is included within Chapter 10 Hydrology and Flood Risk, and is supported by the FRA in Appendix 10.1.

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Response
			<p>Report paragraphs 11.8.32 to 11.8.39 set out mitigation to avoid impacts to/from flooding including use of SuDS during construction and operation and locating infrastructure out of the flood zone and above maximum flood heights accounting for climate change projections. Data from the Environment Agency will be used to inform hydrological modelling.</p> <p>The Inspectorate agrees this matter can be scoped out on the basis that an assessment of effects from flooding is included in the Hydrology Chapter of the ES and a submitted FRA (please refer to box 3.7.11 of this Scoping Opinion).</p>	
3.7.13	Tables 11.10 and 11.12	Major Accidents and Disasters - fire – all phases	<p>Impacts from fire are identified as those from battery storage, lightning strike and general construction. These impacts are proposed to be mitigated through implementation of the COMAH regulations and ensuring design of the Proposed Development is in accordance with the relevant Fire regulations and guidance from the Health and Safety Executive. An outline Battery Safety Management Plan (oBSMP) will also be submitted with the DCO as well as mitigation measures set out in Table 11.10 which will be secured through the DCO.</p> <p>The Inspectorate considers that the risk of battery fire/explosion should be addressed in the ES, including details of how measures to minimise impacts on the environment in the event of such an occurrence are secured.</p>	Impacts from potential fire/explosion in relation to the BESS will be assessed within the ES.
3.7.14	Tables 11.10 and 11.12	Major Accidents and Disasters - severe weather – all phases	Severe weather is anticipated to lead to either fire or flooding events therefore, please see boxes 3.7.12 and 3.7.13 of this Scoping Opinion.	Noted.
3.7.15	Tables 11.10 and 11.12	Major Accidents and Disasters - transport accidents – all phases	The Inspectorate agrees that based on the anticipated traffic movements (Scoping Report paragraph 11.11.28) significant effects are not likely to occur during operation. However, the ES should confirm the anticipated number of movements and demonstrate that these do not exceed relevant thresholds for further assessment (e.g. as set out in the Guideline for the Environmental Assessment of Road Traffic (the Institute of	An assessment of traffic movements will be provided within the ES. A preliminary assessment of traffic movements is provided in PEIR Chapter 12 Traffic and Transport.

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Response
			Environment Management and Assessment 1993) (GEART) guidance).	
3.7.16	Tables 11.10 and 11.12	Major Accidents and Disasters - system failures and impacts on utilities – all phases	<p>Mitigation measures proposed include review of utility plans to avoid any utilities and subsequent impacts during construction and decommissioning.</p> <p>The Inspectorate does not agree to scope this matter out as multiple assets have been identified by National Grid and the Health and Safety Executive (please see Appendix 2 for their responses). The ES should explain any mitigation to avoid/reduce impacts to utility assets and assess significant effects where they are likely to occur. Consultation should be undertaken with the relevant utility companies to inform design/mitigation measures.</p>	An assessment of impacts to utilities will be included within the ES.
3.7.17	Tables 11.10 and 11.12	Major Accidents and Disasters - pollution incidents – all phases	<p>Impacts from pollution to water are proposed to be mitigated through measures set out in Scoping Report section 11.8. This includes SuDs, such as vegetation planting, swales, access track drainage, silt traps, soil bunds and others. Storage and refuelling areas will also be bunded to avoid/reduce pollution impacts and due to the nature of the Proposed Development, during operation, pollution events are unlikely. A preliminary risk assessment has been undertaken for ground conditions which does not identify any made ground.</p> <p>The Inspectorate agrees this matter can be scoped out on the basis that all the appropriate mitigation measures described are included in the ES and secured through the DCO.</p>	<p>A Land Quality Preliminary Risk Assessment is provided as Appendix 2.1 of the PEIR.</p> <p>Pollution control measures will be included in the Outline EMP submitted with the ES. A Draft Outline EMP is provided as Appendix 2.4 of the PEIR.</p>
3.7.18	Tables 11.10 and 11.12	Major Accidents and Disasters - unexploded ordnance (UXO) – all phases	A desk-based study concluded that UXO risk is low based on the ground conditions and history of the site. The Inspectorate agrees to scope this out providing the evidence supporting this is submitted with the ES.	A Land Quality Preliminary Risk Assessment is provided as Appendix 2.1 of the PEIR which provides a report with UXO risk identified.
3.7.19	Table 11.13 and paragraphs 11.10.16 to 11.10.35	Noise and Vibration – from traffic – all phases	The anticipated number of traffic movements during construction is set out in Scoping Report paragraph 11.10.13. Paragraph 11.10.24 states that movements during operation will be minimal. Construction traffic is proposed to be managed through a CTMP. The ES should clarify the number of anticipated movements during construction and operation	<p>Mitigation measures to manage traffic movements will be included in the Outline EMP and Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP)</p> <p>An assessment of traffic movements will be provided within the ES. A preliminary assessment of traffic</p>

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Response
			<p>and explain why the number and vehicle type of construction traffic movements would not have potential to lead to significant effects in line with relevant guidance.</p>	<p>movements is provided in PEIR Chapter 12 Traffic and Transport.</p>
3.7.20	Table 11.13 and paragraphs 11.10.16 to 11.10.35	Noise and Vibration – from activities – all phases	<p>The Scoping Report proposes to scope out effects from noise and vibration from activities for all phases on the basis that construction and decommissioning would be controlled through the CEMP and the Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP) by adherence to best practice measures, specifically BS5228:2009+A1:2014 'Code of practice for noise and vibration control on construction and open sites – Part 1: Noise and Section 8 of British Standard 5228:2009+A1:2014 'Part 2: Vibration'. Effects during operation are not anticipated due to the nature of the infrastructure and where it has potential for impact e.g. battery storage would be located towards the centre of the array sites, away from receptors.</p> <p>The Inspectorate notes that some receptors identified in Scoping Report paragraph 11.10.8 are located within close proximity of the Proposed Development (10m). The Scoping Report does not anticipate the duration of and degree of impact from activities during construction and decommissioning relative to the baseline environment. The Inspectorate also considers there remains potential impacts during operation from battery cooling fans and tracker panels as the locations in relation to receptors have not been secured.</p> <p>The Inspectorate considers that the Scoping Report lacks clarity regarding the specific measures to be adopted to control noise impacts and does not consider that sufficient evidence has been provided to demonstrate that significant noise and vibration effects will not arise. The ES should provide data to characterise the baseline noise environment and demonstrate that construction activities (e.g. piling) and operational plant (e.g. battery cooling infrastructure) will not give rise to significant effects.</p>	Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration provides an assessment of impacts to receptors from construction, operation and decommissioning phases of the Proposed Development.

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Response
3.7.21	Table 11.14 and paragraph 11.11.28	Traffic and Transport – all operational impacts	Scoping Report paragraph 11.11.28 states that operational traffic will be minimal and therefore impacts in terms of severance, driver and pedestrian delay, pedestrian and cycling amenity and accidents and safety will be minimal. The ES should confirm the number of movements and demonstrate that these do not exceed relevant thresholds for further assessment (e.g. as set out in GEART).	The increase of traffic, at the construction and operational phase does not exceed the GEART threshold as described in Chapter 12 Traffic and Transport.
3.7.22	Tables 11.14 and 11.15	Traffic and Transport – severance – construction/ decommissioning	The total number of trips along the potential access routes is set out in Scoping Report Table 11.14 which has derived from other solar farm proposals; the total would be 72 trips per day during construction assuming a worst-case scenario. Whilst this has been considered against the baseline of the major roads, the baseline for the rural roads to be used to access the site are unknown as are the proposed access locations, and it is assumed that the change would be ,10% in line with GEART guidance. This also doesn't take into consideration the change in the type of traffic. The Inspectorate does not agree to scope out consideration of severance during construction/decommissioning. The ES should provide baseline data for the affected road network and characterise the construction traffic change in terms of number, types and routing of movements in line with relevant guidance, including that for construction workers, and assess significant effects where they are likely to occur.	An assessment of traffic movements will be provided within the ES. A preliminary assessment of traffic movements is provided in PEIR Chapter 12 Traffic and Transport.
3.7.23	Tables 11.14 and 11.15	Traffic and Transport – driver and pedestrian/cyclist delay amenity and accidents and safety – construction/decommissioning	The Scoping Report states that due to the rural nature of the road network, and that the increase in construction traffic is expected to be within the daily variation of traffic flows, minimal impacts are anticipated. However, this is not evidenced through provision of baseline data compared with the anticipated construction traffic movements and the capacity of the road network. Additionally, there is potential for weight and width restrictions on rural roads which is not discussed in the Scoping Report. The Inspectorate does not agree to scope out driver and pedestrian/cyclist delay and amenity and accidents and safety during	An assessment of traffic movements will be provided within the ES. A preliminary assessment of traffic movements is provided in PEIR Chapter 12 Traffic and Transport. There will be a total of 36 trips distributed across the six Panel Areas according to size. On average, the 36 trips added to the network per day will only increase rural road daily vehicle two-way traffic flow by 0.9% and on the lowest trafficked road (High House Lane) by 7.05% (due to the existing low usage).

ID	Ref	Description	Inspectorate's Comments	Response
			<p>construction/decommissioning. The ES should provide baseline data for the affected road network and characterise the construction traffic change in terms of number, types and routing of movements in line with relevant guidance and assess significant effects where they are likely to occur.</p>	<p>Additionally, the increase in HGV vehicles on the SRN, at the construction phase, is not significant as the change is below the allowed 30% change as set out in the Institute of Environmental Assessment's Guidelines for the Environmental Assessment of Road Traffic. It has been assumed that construction trips will be routed to and from the sites via the strategic network and that the shortest possible route to the strategic network will be taken, taking into consideration weight restrictions.</p>
3.7.24	Table 11.19	Waste	<p>The Inspectorate agrees that a standalone chapter on waste is not required within the ES. However, the ES should still contain a description of the potential waste streams from all phases of the Proposed Development, including estimated volumes and an assessment of the likely significant effects. In addition, the ES should describe any measures implemented to minimise waste and state whether the waste hierarchy will be utilised.</p> <p>The CEMP, DEMP and Site Waste Management Plan (SWMP) should include as much detail as possible on on-site waste management, recycling opportunities, and off-site disposal. If off-site disposal is required, an assessment of likely significant effects including intracumulative effects should be included within the ES</p>	<p>An Assessment of Likely Waste Arisings is provided in Appendix 2.3 of the PEIR.</p> <p>The Outline EMP, Framework DEMP and Outline SWMP will provide details around waste management, recycling opportunities, and off-site disposal.</p>