

Consultee and Comment	Response
<i>Cambridgeshire Ramblers</i>	
<p><b>Panels near Weston Green / Cocksedge Farm in Area C and the construction access</b></p> <p>a) There is no reasonable HGV vehicle access for this site. Routing through Weston Colville or along Brook Lane Byways 40/7, 40/9 and 251/15 are not good options.</p> <p>b) The proposal is to temporarily convert Brook Lane Byways 40/7, 40/9 and 251/15 to be used by heavy goods vehicles. Brook Lane is subject to flooding near the river crossing. Brook Lane is very rural in character, and a largely tree lined lane that is very pleasant to use for non-motorised users. Many public rights of way link into it, creating a wide range of circular and linear walks and rides.</p> <p>c) There are no estimates of how many HGV movements there might be along Brook Lane in Table 11.19, nor for how long these will continue.</p> <p>d) It results in the permanent loss of part of Public Right of Way footpath 251/18 part of a route between Weston Green and Carlton.</p> <p>e) There are no proposals for any new PRoW so footpath 40/15 would become a dead-end path and unlikely to be used regularly leading to a further loss of footpath through disuse. Proposals could have been made for a new PROW to connect footpath 40/15 to footpath 40/16 near Cocksedge Farm and byway 251/15 running in a NW/SE direction thus mitigating having a dead-end path and some compensation for the permanent closure of 251/18</p>	<p>a) Byways 40/7 and 40/9 would not be used for construction traffic. An internal Construction Haul Route is proposed to bring traffic away from highways, byways and PRoWs. This would run alongside PRoW 40/7. A short section of PRoW 251/15 would be used as a construction road to route traffic from the motorised highway, and shared space would be managed between PRoW users through measures within the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) and Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan (PRoWMP).</p> <p>b) As above.</p> <p>c) Brook Lane would not be used for construction traffic. The proposed Construction Haul Route would run alongside PRoW 40/7.</p> <p>d) Following review, PRoW 251/18 is no longer identified for diversion and would remain in-situ.</p> <p>e) PRoW 251/18 is no longer identified for diversion and would remain in-situ - PRoW 40/15 therefore remains connected to PRoW 251/18 at its southern end, and the intersection of Byway 40/12 and footpaths 40/16 and 40/14 at its northern end.</p>
<p><b>Impact on the Icknield Way</b></p> <p>f) There are panel arrays on both sides of the path with the risk of turning the path into a developed corridor, completely altering the experience of walking in the countryside.</p>	<p>f) An increased set back has been implemented in the layout in this area in recognition of the importance and quality of the Icknield Way.</p> <p>g) This point is being reviewed.</p> <p>h) Strengthening of existing and re-instating of historic field boundaries and hedgerows is proposed as the primary strategy for visual mitigation. This will</p>

Consultee and Comment	Response
<i>Cambridgeshire Ramblers</i>	
<p>g) The length of path that is affected by panels on both sides is the section Byway 254/17 south of Green End Farm and Bridleway 40/2 east and west of Cricks Farm. These sections make a total length of 3 kilometres that would take some 50 minutes to walk through.</p> <p>h) There are further footpaths with arrays on one side of the Icknield Way Byway 254/3 and 40/1, a distance of 0.41 kilometres. It could take up to an hour to walk along the Icknield Way with panel arrays alongside. Tables 7.12 and 7.15 all assess the visual impact along this section as high impact but there are no proposals for how to mitigate the high visual impact.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Targeted Consultation Update:</b> <i>For walkers and horse riders the distance along the Icknield Way impacted by having panels alongside has increased from 3.41 kilometres to around 4.6 kilometres. Our objection is based on the fact this is an historic route much appreciated for being in the countryside. It will change the walk to being in a developed environment and could take walkers around 75 minutes to walk past. This significantly changes the nature of a rural walk.</i></li> </ul> <p>i) There is a section of the Icknield Way that is along Grange Road for 0.41 kilometres between grid refs 603545 and 607548. This road is proposed to be a main access road for the construction and maintenance heavy goods vehicles. The road is very narrow with no pavement or grassy verge and presents a risk to walkers and horse riders especially during the construction phase that could be 24-36 months long. To keep this section of the Icknield Way open we would expect that a temporary footpath could be created along the field edge behind the hedgerow on the western side for this section of Grange Road. Ideally this temporary footpath could be made into a permanent PROW to create a more pleasant section for the Icknield Way instead of road walking.</p>	<p>be reviewed with the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) team to make sure that adequate measures are implemented adjacent to the Icknield Way where it runs through the development.</p> <p>i) A new permissive path is proposed already to address this issue and will be retained as so for the life span of the project.</p> <p>j) Icknield Way is proposed to be crossed by a Temporary Construction Haul Road (40/2FP) and an Internal Construction Road (40/2BR and 254/1). Measures would be in place to manage crossings as will be set out in the Outline CTMP and Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan (PRoWMP).</p> <p>k) The proposals include a significant setback at the Icknield Way, approximately 20 metres so that the fencing can be set back and softened by planting and to reduce the loss of openness along the route. The existing hedgerow will be enhanced by infilling gaps with new hedgerow where necessary. Tall sward meadow grass, or an equivalent will be planted at field boundaries where suitable, to improve biodiversity. The final planting proposal will be defined at the detailed design stage.</p>

Consultee and Comment	Response
<b>Cambridgeshire Ramblers</b>	
<p>j) There are two construction HGV access routes that cross the Icknield Way. As a minimum safety signage needs to be put in place to alert drivers to pedestrians crossing and vice versa.</p> <p>k) The Ramblers would like to see the position of the solar panel arrays adjusted to be set back from the Icknield Way and to have a ten-metre strip of woodland and hedgerow planting on either side of this historic route</p>	
<p><b>BESS and Construction Use of PRow</b></p> <p>l) The proposed site for the BESS in Area B is along Byway 251/23 to the east of a triangle of woodland Old Cambridge Road Plantation. What measures are in place to ensure the safety of non-motorised users with the HGV traffic?</p> <p>m) Our objection is that it Turns Byway 251/23 into a haul road for HGVs and creates a large building disrupting the views of a farmed landscape.</p>	<p>l) Byway 251/23 will not be used as a construction haul road. The byway will remain open to motorised traffic and walkers, cyclists and horse riders and used in the same way as present – though a short section of 254/19 will need to be closed for a period of 4-6 weeks during the construction phase.</p> <p>m) Byway 251/23 will not be used as a construction haul road.</p>
<p><b>Loss / Diversion of PRow</b></p> <p>n) The potential loss or diversion of PROWs temporary or permanent. PROWS have legal protection through the Highways Act 1980.</p> <p>o) The Ramblers would like to be consulted during the development of the PRow Management Plan</p>	<p>n) There would be no permanent closure of PRow during the operational phase, and some PRow will be enhanced alongside the addition of new Permissive Paths within the network. The DCO would give the Developer powers to close PRow but this is likely to be extremely limited and temporary (during construction) and subject to the commitments in the oPRowWMP, which would be controlled and discharged by CCC (in consultation with the Ramblers).</p> <p>o) The oPRowWMP includes a commitment to develop a working group including the Ramblers and other local organisations and community representatives, to support the delivery of Detailed PRowWMPs.</p>
<p><b>Biodiversity</b></p> <p>p) The reduction of wildlife, flora and fauna, observed on walks. What are the ecological and landscape enhancements being considered?</p>	<p>p) This will be set out in the landscape and mitigation masterplan and the Outline Landscape Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP). Impacts and any loss of habitat will also be accounted for with the BNG report.</p>

Consultee and Comment	Response
<i>Cambridgeshire Ramblers</i>	
<p><b>Footpath Width</b></p> <p>q) Security fencing either side of a footpath could lead to a sense of being enclosed in a corridor particularly along the Icknield Way.</p> <p>r) The minimum standard width for a footpath is 1.5 metres and a bridleway 3 metres. We would suggest that the minimum width of any fenced path should be significantly wider, reflecting the change in environment and especially the potential for churning up of soft surfaces which must be retained. Bridleways must be wide enough for horses to pass easily.</p> <p>s) Footpaths naturally connect one area to another so they can be the opportunity to create good wildlife corridors with good planting of wildflowers and hedgerows providing a good habitat and supporting wildlife to travel from one area to another.</p> <p>t) Having footpath widths of 5 metres or more reduces the sense of walking in a corridor and maintains the sense of being in the countryside</p>	<p>q) This will be standard deer proof stock fencing and not security grade fencing. The design specifies setbacks in this location to avoid a sense of enclosure.</p> <p>r) The Design Commitments set out that PRow would be required to be set within a minimum 10m corridor.</p> <p>s) The Proposed Development would not create any new Bridleways, but any existing Bridleways would also be set within a minimum 10m corridor.</p> <p>t) The Design Commitments set out that PRow would be required to be set within a minimum 10m corridor – and wider in many locations.</p>
<p><b>Fencing and Planting</b></p> <p>u) There are no particular details of the fencing and natural planting around the solar arrays. Any new natural planting will take three to seven years to establish and become an effective screen.</p> <p>v) Given that the panels highest point is 3.5 metres above ground it is likely that screening will take the maximum period to reduce the visual impact.</p> <p>w) We would expect to see Kingsway Solar being required to have an active maintenance programme for the hedgerows and PRow throughout the lifetime of the solar farm.</p> <p>x) In the first two years watering is a critical activity so as not to see the failures like we have along the A14.</p>	<p>u) This will be set out in the landscape and mitigation masterplan and the oLEMP. This will also be addressed during detailed planning. The LVIA makes an assessment of effects at year 1 in winter conditions i.e. unmitigated as a worst case. Assumptions are made regarding the predicted growth of proposed vegetation which for trees and woodland is 1m growth every 3 years, so 5m growth in 15 years. Where trees are planted at 1.5m height they can expect to reach 4.5m in 9 years, Hedgerows, where allowed to grow, develop at a similar rate and would effectually screen views of adjacent fields when 1.5-2m high, so within 3 years. The residual effects assessment takes this into account. Where possible and advantageous, advance planting will be carried out to ensure early establishment of planting.</p>

Consultee and Comment	Response
<b>Cambridgeshire Ramblers</b>	
<p>y) Also trimming the hedgerows to avoid the footpaths becoming overgrown or neglected.</p>	<p>v) As above.</p> <p>w) Commitments to the maintenance of vegetation, ensuring access to PRoW and the management of landscape and ecology, are set out in the Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan (OEMP) and the oLEMP.</p> <p>x) Noted. This will be set out in the landscape and mitigation masterplan and the oLEMP. Mulch mats will also be proposed within the specification of all planting within grassland or adjacent to infrastructure.</p> <p>y) Commitments to the maintenance of vegetation, ensuring access to PRoW and the management of landscape and ecology, are set out in the OEMP and the oLEMP.</p>
<p><b>Footpath 251/8 (Targeted Consultation)</b></p> <p>z) Footpath 251/8 in the south of Area C will now have panel arrays alongside between the two woods the Grove and the coniferous strip at the top of the hill. As this is a high point there are good views over the surrounding countryside and is very regularly walked by Ramblers Groups and local people.</p>	<p>z) Noted. There is no PROW at the high point of this ridgeline, Footpath 251/8 runs below and parallel to the ridgeline. It is noted that no representative viewpoints have been selected from along this length of footpath, but there should be. A nearby viewpoint has been moved to this location.</p>
<b>British Horse Society</b>	
<p><b>Opportunity for new PRoW</b></p> <p>a) Since only 23% of the site is proposed for development, it provides a wonderful opportunity to create a network of public rights of way to at least bridleway status but preferably restricted byway status to mitigate some of the loss of amenity caused by the development on other rights of way.</p> <p>b) The network should comprise a natural surface, at least 4m wide peripheral route linking to existing rights of way.</p>	<p>a) All new permissive paths or PRoW's will be delivered to bridleway parameters.</p> <p>b) As above</p> <p>c) Noted. This will be reviewed.</p>

Consultee and Comment	Response
<b>Cambridgeshire Ramblers</b>	
c) Circular or 'figure of eight' loops could be created within the peripheral path to provide alternative routes.	
<p><b>Opportunity for Engagement / Input</b></p> <p>d) Once the principle of providing enhanced access for the duration of the solar farm is agreed, the network design could develop as the project designs progress.</p> <p>e) It is suggested that there could be a working group comprising interested parties such as The Ramblers, representatives from local groups both social and local authority, the Definitive Map Team / RoW Officer, as well as the BHS. The Cambridgeshire Local Access Forum might wish to have an input.</p>	<p>d) The principle of providing enhancements to the existing network, and delivering new permissive paths, while limiting any short-term or long-term changes in connectivity is accepted and reflected in the approach to the Environmental Masterplan and management plans such as the oPRoWMP and oLEMP.</p> <p>e) The oPRoWMP includes a commitment to develop a working group including the Ramblers and other local organisations and community representatives, to support the delivery of Detailed PRoWMPs. Community Liaison would also be a key principle of the oLEMP.</p>
<p><b>PRoW and Heritage</b></p> <p>f) Rights of way are not mentioned in comments about heritage.</p> <p>g) These paths cannot be replaced – they have evolved, along with the ecosystem, as a result of the number of feet and hooves which have trodden them.</p> <p>h) They should be protected in the same way as ancient monuments and be included in the Embedded Mitigation Measures</p>	<p>f) While PRoW have important status in the heritage of community and the historic right for continued public access, in the main they are not considered ancient monuments unless they are combined with archaeological or structured features that form part of the heritage landscape – for example Devils Dyke. Nonetheless, the ES recognises the sensitivity of PRoW that are protected and recognised as important community connections and/or long-distance, nationally significant routes with heritage aspect, such as the Icknield Way, attributing these routes higher sensitivity in assessment terms.</p> <p>g) PRoW will not be permanently displaced or diverted during the operational phase – any short-term closures would be temporary and limited to only a few routes (for 4-6 weeks at most) during the construction phase. Measures are in place to commit to enhancements to the existing network and delivering new permissive paths.</p> <p>h) Enhancements to the existing network, and delivering new permissive paths, is embedded mitigation within the Environmental Masterplan and their</p>

Consultee and Comment	Response
<i>Cambridgeshire Ramblers</i>	
	management and improvement secured by management plans such as the oPRoWMP and oLEMP.
<p><b>Traffic and Transport</b></p> <p>i) There is no mention of the PROW network as part of the transport network only mention of cycle paths.</p> <p>j) There is no undertaking within the provision for managing where traffic may have to cross PROWs, about protecting the PROWs themselves</p>	<p>i) Effects on PROW are considered across various sections of the ES. The traffic and Transport assessment focusses on highways impacts.</p> <p>j) Provisions for management of the interaction between PROW and construction routes within the Site are set out within the oPRoWMP. An assessment of pedestrian safety and severance, fear and intimidation and user amenity for WCH is set out within the Traffic and Access chapter of the ES, with any mitigation required secured by the oCTMP and the oPRoWMP.</p>
<p><b>Implementation of PROW Diversion</b></p> <p>k) The BHS objects to the assumption that any equestrian rights of way would be diverted either temporarily or permanently without significant consultation prior to any such agreement.</p>	<p>k) Effects on PROW accessible by horses are extremely limited (by design) and will be managed by the application of temporary crossing measures, signage, communication and safety measures to limit the interaction between construction traffic and PROW users, ensuring safety and amenity are retained – this is set out within the oPRoWMP. The oPRoWMP also commits to develop a working group including the BHS and other local organisations and community representatives, to support the delivery of Detailed PROWMPs.</p>
<p><b>NPPF and Enhancement to PROW</b></p> <p>l) How is this development proposing to mitigate and to meet the NPPF requirements to enhance and improve the rights of way network?</p>	<p>l) Enhancements to the existing network, and delivering new permissive paths, is embedded mitigation within the Environmental Masterplan and their management and improvement secured by management plans such as the oPRoWMP and oLEMP.</p>