

Request for Further Information

We understand that the applicant Bramford Green Limited has submitted some updated documentation. Our team have reviewed the information in the new documentation and a number of questions and inconsistencies have arisen. We would like clarification on these queries before we submit our final response to the new information.

1. In Drawing BR6.0 Rev02 Fence & Gate Elevations submitted 18th August 2021 it states “high-tensile, galvanized steel, plan wire deer fence, 2m height.” *Will the applicant please confirm they are no longer using welded mesh fencing as it was described in the earlier documentation? What is the measurement between the vertical wires and horizontal wires in this new fencing? Will this new fencing be the same for all fencing on the site, including the solar panel areas, the battery storage area, and the substation? What is the security rating of this fence?*
2. In the Application Update One response to Suffolk Wildlife Trust the applicant states “Neutral Grassland with Wildflowers and Scrub: Those parts of this grassland type that are within 50m of ponds known to be used by great crested newt will be cut in late summer at an elevated height of 100mm. Tussocky Grassland With Wildflowers: This grassland type will be cut in late summer (after the skylark breeding season has finished) at an elevated height of 100mm every two years.” *Would the applicant confirm what specific month(s) they mean when they say “late summer”? How often will the applicant monitor other ponds in and around the site not currently identified for GCN? Will the management of these ponds be updated to match those where GCN is currently present?*
3. In the same section, it states “Only one area has the combination of being outside the fenced solar array, with recreational access and a low density of planted trees, this being the nature area to the south east of Somersham Park woodland. To provide for safe nesting areas for skylark in this particular nature area the LEMP describes the rotational cutting every second year that will minimise inadvertent disturbance. The management, as described in Paragraph 4.3.3.5, will mean that the nature area will not be a smooth surface over which there might be total public access but have areas of short grass that are ‘desire’ lines through which the public can walk and longer, tussocky grass that will act as a natural deterrent to people and provide secure nesting sites for birds.” *How often, what method, and when will the ‘desire’ lines be cut? What does the applicant propose to keep dogs and young children out of the tussocky grass?*
4. In the same section, it states “In the event the MSDC and BDC require additional reassurance as to the protection of the skylark mitigation area within the described nature area above, it is suggested that access by walkers is prevented through the provision of a low level stock proof fence alongside the PRoW together with an information board explaining the objectives of the nature area.” *We could find no drawings for this fence type. Please provide this so that the full impact of fencing can be assessed properly.*
5. In the Application Update One document the applicant response by AEM states “In the event planning permission is granted, a planning condition could be applied requiring the submission of a CEMP that will include a description of the measures taken to avoid adverse impacts from light during the temporary construction period. This would include avoiding light spill on to natural features such as hedgerows and the adjacent Somersham Park CWS (that is outside the Proposed Development boundary).” In previous documents that applicant has clearly stated that there would be no lighting on site during the construction phase, operational phase, nor decommissioning phase. *Will there or will there not be the need for lighting for the development?*
6. *What condition will the battery storage containers arrive? Will the equipment inside be installed offsite and transported to site as a whole container unit? Or will they arrive as empty containers with the internal components arriving separately to be installed onsite?*
7. In Appendix 2 the applicant includes a diagram for the swept path analysis between fields 1 and 2 which cross Somersham Road. However drawing B2.0 Proposed Site Plan Rev10A does not show any internal access tracks in the vicinity of this new crossing. Nor does it show any crossing at all. *Will there be additional internal tracks between those shown in the site plan to bridge the gap between fields 1 & 2 for the crossing shown in the swept path analysis? Will these be retained for the duration of the site ready for*

decommissioning, or will they be removed and reinstated again during decommissioning? As the visibility splays do not meet the minimum requirements as set out by the local highways authority for an industrial site (DM04) a speed survey is required to confirm acceptance of a shorter visibility splay. When will the speed survey be provided?

8. The crossing between fields 1 & 2 in the previous point would be a new crossing. No agricultural access exists here. But a ditch does. *How does the applicant plan to bridge the ditch from the field to the road? Will the applicant be filling in the ditch to do so? How will the applicant manage water drainage to prevent it from building up on the road?*
9. Within the Landscape and Visual Impact Addendum the applicant states “would become Neutral on balance given the enhancements proposed as part of the Proposed Development.” for all types of visual receptor – group 2, 10, 13 of the public footpath users, and both bridleways. *What “enhancements” specifically is the applicant referring to in each section please? It is unclear as they are not specified for each receptor group.*
10. In the Cultural Heritage Addendum, p 7.4.11 states “This ZVI is predominantly a result of the proposed access track which passes the church to the west of Blood Hill.” And p7.4.27 states “though the access track comes within c800 m of the shell summerhouse at Nettlestead Chace.” *Which access track is this please? Is this the same access track between the northern and southern parcels of land which the applicant stated in the first set of application documents was no longer a viable option. Is this access track now part of the development again?*
11. The Arboricultural Impact Report states that the row of Black Poplar trees between field 1 and 2 are category B trees where it is desirable to retain them. In the summary it states “The proposals will require the removal of a minimal amount of hedgerow (maximum of 6 linear metres) but an appropriate level of mitigation planting can be provided” with no mention of any tree removal. However in previous documentation, and the site plan, they state these trees will be removed. *Would the applicant please confirm if they plan to remove the Black Poplar trees or not?*
12. Paragraph 7.4.11 appears to be a complete shambles. “The church is otherwise best appreciated in close proximity within Flowton, particularly from the junction of Flowton Road and Blood Hill where its architectural interest can be appreciated. The church lies on the edge of the ZVI with visual influence from the proposed development extending north along Blood Hill and east and west along Flowton Lane. This ZVI is predominantly a result of the proposed access track which passes the church to the west of Blood Hill.” *Flowton Road and Blood Hill do not have a junction together. The development does not extend north of Blood Hill based on the site maps supplied by the applicant. Blood Hill is not near St Mary’s Church, Flowton. And the two cannot be seen from each other. No access track runs west of Blood Hill based on the site maps supplied. We believe we know where the applicant is talking about, but anyone not local may struggle. Especially with the conflicting site development details. Would the applicant please supply the correct information for this paragraph?*