



Application by Enso Green Holdings D Ltd for the Helios Renewable Energy Project (the Proposed Development)

The Examining Authority's written questions and requests for information (ExQ2)

Issued on 27 March 2025

The following table sets out the Examining Authority's (ExA's) written questions and requests for information – ExQ2, noting that no questions were asked at the timetabled date of 6 February 2025 for ExQ1. Consideration has been given to submissions made during the examination up to deadline 4 and a commentary has been provided under each of the Principal Issues shown in annex C to the Rule 6 Letter dated 1 November 2024, modified as appropriate. If necessary, the examination timetable enables the ExA to issue a further round of written questions timetabled as ExQ3.

Column 2 of the table either provides the ExA's commentary on progress or indicates which interested parties (IPs) each question is directed to. The ExA would be grateful if all persons named could respond fully or explain why they consider the question is not relevant to them. This does not prevent an answer being provided to a question by a person to whom it is not directed, should the question be relevant to their interests.

If you are responding to a small number of questions, answers in a letter will suffice. If you are answering a larger number of questions, it will assist the ExA if you use a table based on this one to set out your responses. Please quote the question reference number in your response. An editable version of this table in Microsoft Word is available on request from the Case Team: please contact HeliosRenewableEnergy@planninginspectorate.gov.uk and include Helios Renewable Energy Project in the subject line of your email.

Responses are due by deadline 6: 9 April 2025



Abbreviations Used

Abbreviation	Definition
BoR	Book of Reference
CA	Compulsory Acquisition
CEMP	Construction Environmental Management Plan
DCO	Development Consent Order
DESNZ	Department for Energy Security and Net Zero
dDCO	Draft Development Consent Order
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
EA	Environment Agency
ES	Environmental Statement
ExA	Examining Authority
ExQ	Examining Authority's Written Questions
HRA	Habitats Regulations Assessment
HSE	Health and Safety Executive
IP	Interested Party
LIR	Local Impact Report
NE	Natural England
NGET	National Grid Electricity Transmission
NGESO	National Grid Electricity System Operator
NPS	National Policy Statement
NSIP	Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project



Abbreviation	Definition
NPS-EN1	Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy
NYC	North Yorkshire Council
NYFRS	North Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Service
oCEMP	Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan
oDEMP	Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan
OEMP	Operational Environmental Management Plan
oOEMP	Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan
PA2008	The Planning Act 2008
PADS	Principal Areas of Disagreement
PP	Protective Provision
RR	Relevant Representation
SoCG	Statement of Common Ground
SoS	Secretary of State
TP	Temporary Possession
WR	Written Representation

The Examination Library

References in these questions set out in square brackets (for example [APP-010]) are to documents catalogued in the Examination Library. The Examination Library can be obtained from the following link: [EN010140-000453-Examination Library Helios.pdf](#)

It will be updated as the examination progresses.

Citation of questions

Questions in this table should be cited as follows:

Question reference: issue reference: question number, for example ExQ2 1.0.1 – refers to question 1 in this table.



Index		
1.	Climate change and energy generation, storage and export	6
2.	Design, parameters and other details of the proposed development	6
3.	Site selection and alternatives	7
4.	Biodiversity, ecology and natural environment	7
5.	Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA)	8
6.	Compulsory acquisition, temporary possession and other land or rights considerations	8
7.	The draft Development Consent Order (dDCO) [REP4-004]	10
7.0	General	10
7.1	Part 1 Preliminary	11
7.2	Part 2 Principal powers	12
7.3	Schedule 1 Authorised development	12
7.4	Schedule 2 Requirements	13
7.5	Schedule 9 Protective provisions (PPs)	14
7.6	Schedule 11 Documents to be certified	14
8.	Health, safety, accidents, and incidents	15
8.1	Site fire safety	16
8.2	Aviation safety – Burn Gliding Club	16
9.	Heritage	16
10.	Landscape and visual	17
11.	Noise and vibration	17
12.	Socio-economic (including agriculture)	17
13.	Transport and access	18
14.	Water environment	18

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
1.	Climate change and energy generation, storage and export	
Q1.0.1	The applicant	<p>With regard to the Connection Statement [APP-230]:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The applicant explains the distinction between National Grid Electricity Transmission (NGET) and National Grid Electricity System Operator (NGESO) at 1.1.6, please could this be clear throughout the document, for example should 'National Grid Drax...' more correctly be referred to as 'NGET Drax...'? • The applicant states that it has a bilateral agreement with NGESO at 2.1.1, and that agreement places responsibilities on NGESO and NGET at 2.2.1. Which items are the responsibility of NGET and how are they bound by the agreement referred to if it is a bilateral agreement with NGESO? • Please could the applicant clarify the wording in 2.3 for example 'HREP On Site'? • In the conclusions 5.1.2 would it be clearer to use the term 'National Electricity Grid' used in the Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (NPS-EN1) rather than the 'National Grid'? • Given the urgency as mentioned several times in EN1 when would the proposed development be connected for the purposes of exporting electricity to the National Electricity Grid? • Please could the applicant provide evidence of the agreement? • Please would the applicant agree to update the Connection Statement consistent with the provisions of the Energy Act 2023 by Deadline 8?
2.	Design, parameters and other details of the proposed development	
Q2.0.1	North Yorkshire Council (NYC)	Would the council consider it helpful if the applicant provided an outline design principles document, including design parameters, in a certified document which would be secured by a requirement? (also see sub-section 7.7 on the draft Development Consent Order (dDCO))
Q2.0.2	NYC	If the answer to Q2.0.1 is yes then please could the council comment in general terms on the adequacy of the outline design principles document provided for the Heckington Fen Solar Park, order made 24 January 2025, recognising that it would have to be made specific to the proposed development?

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		EN010123-000953-7.1 - Outline Design Principles - Rev 4.pdf
Q2.0.3	The applicant	In response to the submission from Ofgem [REP4-054] please could the applicant confirm that it has engaged with the cyber security team within the Department for Energy Security and Net Zero (DESNZ) to answer the question around project ownership? Please could the applicant provide details to evidence their response?
3. Site selection and alternatives		
Q3.0.1	All interested parties (IPs)	With regard to Alternative Site Assessment [APP-227]: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the applicant or any other IP aware of any guidance on the siting of solar farms in relation to dwellings in England, if there is what does it say, please provide a reference? Is the applicant or any other IP aware of any guidance on the siting of solar farms more generally in relation to dwellings, for example the World Health Organisation or internationally, if there is what does it say, please provide a reference? Is there any research available or emerging research on the impact of living near a solar farm? If so, what does it indicate?
4. Biodiversity, ecology and natural environment		
Q4.0.1	Commentary	The ExA has considered Natural England's (NE) relevant representation (RR) [RR-268] which identified a number of areas where further information was required. The ExA has also considered the draft statement of common ground (SoCG) [REP4-040] submitted by the applicant, which shows a smaller number of areas still under discussion. The ExA has also considered the principal areas of disagreement (PADs) [REP4-055] submitted by NE where NE considers resolution of these remaining concerns to be likely. The ExA has considered NYC's local impact report (LIR) [REP2-034] and the draft SoCG [REP4-042] submitted by the applicant, which shows all matters agreed with the exception of monitoring in relation to biodiversity net gain and other matters. The ExA has also considered the PADs [REP4-051] submitted by NYC which shows all matters resolved with the exception of matters under biodiversity.
Q4.0.2	North Yorkshire Council	With regard to unresolved matters, what is NYC seeking, for example a new/ modified requirement, a new/ modified certified outline plan secured by a requirement, or a development

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		consent obligation agreed with the Applicant? Could the council provide details and evidence of policy, guidance, research or comparable precedent that would support its case?
5. Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA)		
Q5.0.1	The applicant	Section 4.6 of the Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) Report [REP4-021] does not include the geographical extent of impacts. Can the applicant set out the potential geographical extent of the impacts identified in the HRA Report paragraph 4.6.2?
Q5.0.2	The applicant	No list of sites and qualifying features and what impact pathways might affect them is provided and it is unclear what impacts and features of each site has been screened out and why. Can the applicant provide a list of the qualifying features of the identified European sites and what impacts have been assessed for those features during which phases of the development. This should be presented in a tabular format and make it clear what impact pathways for which features are screened in and screened out and the reasoning for it?
Q5.0.3	The applicant	The HRA Report [REP4-021] does not explain the approach to assessing in-combination effects. Can the applicant update the HRA Report to include the methodology used for assessing in-combination effects at the screening stage?
6. Compulsory acquisition, temporary possession and other land or rights considerations		
Q6.0.1	The applicant	Diligent enquiry and monitoring of land rights objections Whilst the ExA has not received any requests for a compulsory acquisition (CA) hearing the applicant is requested to complete the attached Objections Schedule at Annex A with information about any objections to its CA and temporary possession (TP) requests. The applicant is requested to update this schedule, with reasons, if there are any changes. If there are no objections when the first schedule is submitted, an empty schedule should be provided.
Q6.0.2	The applicant	Crown land and consent monitoring The ExA understands that there is no Crown land/ interest affected by the proposed development and that there is no Crown body from which consent under the Planning Act (PA2008) s135(1)(b) and/ or s135(2) is required. If this changes, for example land passing to the Crown the applicant is asked to provide a schedule identifying the land and the Crown interest and explaining what action is proposed to be taken in relation to it?

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
Q6.0.3	The applicant	<p>CA Powers: Permanent acquisition of land</p> <p>With reference to dDCO [REP4-004] article 21, the applicant is requested to confirm that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • it does not need or seek the permanent acquisition of any land (as distinct from the permanent acquisition of rights) in order to deliver and operate the proposed development including any of dDCO Schedule 1 Work Nos. 1 to 9 inclusive? • that all installation, operation and maintenance of the proposed development can occur pursuant to acquisition of rights alone and that no permanent acquisition of land is required for any of these purposes? <p>If the position set out in the applicant's response to this question changes prior to any subsequent deadline, the applicant is requested to advise the latest position and the reason for the change at that deadline, up to Deadline 8?</p>
Q6.0.4	The applicant	<p>CA Powers: Permanent acquisition of rights and TP of land</p> <p>At paragraph 1.4.1, the Statement of Reasons [AS-011] identifies the scope of CA and TP as being:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> permanent acquisition of new rights (including restrictive covenants) (article 23 of the dDCO) – shown edged red and shaded blue on the Land Plan; acquisition of subsoil (article 26 of the DCO) – shown edged red and shaded blue on the Land Plan as it is presented together with new rights on the top section of the relevant plots; temporary use of land to permit construction and maintenance where the Applicant has not yet exercised powers of compulsory acquisition (articles 30 and 31 of the DCO) – shown blue where for a specific plot both temporary possession and new rights are sought. <p>The applicant is asked to confirm that all land shown edged red and shaded blue on the Land Plan [REP4-003] is subject to all three of these classes of acquisition? If that is not the case and there are plots where one or two, but not all three classes of acquisition are sought, the applicant is asked to provide a separate annotated (coloured) plan for each of the proposed classes of acquisition in a), b) and c) above? An accompanying table should explain the specific basis for the classes of acquisition sought on each plot.</p>

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
Q6.0.5	The applicant	<p>Confirmation of permanent acquisition of rights</p> <p>With reference to paragraph 1.4.1 of the Statement of Reasons [AS-011] categories a) and b) rights, notwithstanding that the ES [APP-023] has assessed a project lifespan of 40 years, the powers of acquisition are permanent. With reference to existing law and practice, the ExA understands that there is no well-established or secure legal mechanism for the compulsory acquisition of a term of years (a lease). Nevertheless, the applicant is asked to explain:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • why permanent rights are sought? • what (if any) other mechanisms or measures it has investigated with a view to avoiding the permanent taking of rights? • why are such mechanisms or measures deemed not to be fit for purpose?
Q6.0.6	The applicant	<p>Options for Lease: Effects on the need for CA</p> <p>The Statement of Reasons Table (up to [REP4-008/ 009]) records progress to a point of options for lease being concluded with a number of landowners. The applicant is asked to clarify whether the CA powers in the dDCO (articles 21 with 23 and/ or 26) are still required and justified in relation to plots once an option for lease is signed?</p>
Q6.0.7	The applicant	<p>Confirmation of ‘No Works Without Rights’</p> <p>The applicant is requested to confirm that there are no proposed works in locations at which the applicant does not hold or propose to acquire relevant temporary and/ or permanent rights?</p> <p>For example, the applicant might confirm that it does not seek to conduct any cabling works in a highway purporting to rely on electricity distribution network operator permitted development and in relation to which it has not sought specific temporary or permanent rights?</p>
7.	The draft Development Consent Order (dDCO) [REP4-004]	
7.0	General	
Q7.0.1	Commentary	<p>Government guidance Planning Act 2008: Content of a Development Consent Order required for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects - GOV.UK was published on 30 April 2024 (2024 guidance). The applicant has referred to a selection of made orders in its explanatory</p>

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		memorandum (EM) [APP-007]. The 2024 guidance for example points out that the 2009 model provisions have lapsed and that it is not sufficient to rely upon precedent.
Q7.0.2	The applicant	For example: the EM [APP-007] 4.2.20 onwards explains that Paragraph/Article 9 (Defence to proceedings in respect of statutory nuisance) is a model provision and there is widespread precedent. In the dDCO [REP4-004] whilst its scope is limited to noise, which in plain language says it is a defence for the undertaker to prove that it is doing what it has been told to do by the local authority or that it is doing all that it reasonably can do to avoid the nuisance. This seems to duplicate the provisions of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 s80 (7) and (9) so would appear unnecessary?
7.1 Part 1 Preliminary		
Interpretation paragraph 2.		
Q7.1.1	The applicant	“the 1974 Act” is defined but its use is very limited. s60 and s61 of the 1974 Act provide a pollution control regime with regard to construction noise. The policy (EN-1 4.12.10) position is that other pollution control regimes are assumed to be effective, and that the planning regime should complement rather than duplicate them, hence should references to the 1974 Act within the dDCO be removed?
Q7.1.2	The applicant	“the 2004 Act” is defined but not used hence should this be deleted?
Q7.1.3	The applicant	“address” hardly seems worthy of consideration as one of the “key terms in the DCO” (2024 guidance) so could this be deleted?
Q7.1.4	The applicant	“apparatus” using s105 of the 1991 Act to define apparatus is so limiting that it usually needs extending, see the Heckington Fen Solar Park Order 2025 (HFSPO 2025). There are multiple definitions and uses of ‘apparatus’ specific to each part or schedule of the dDCO so could this be deleted?
Q7.1.5	The applicant	“building”, “CCTV”, “electronic transmission” same suggestion as Q7.1.3, could these be deleted?
Q7.1.6	The applicant	“construction compound” is used in schedule 1 where it is explained sufficiently hence could this be deleted?

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
Q7.1.7	The applicant	“DEMP” should this definition be extended to include restoration, and the title of the outline plan amended accordingly?
Q7.1.8	The applicant	“substation” the term is in general use and the dDCO does not modify its meaning so could this be deleted?
Q7.1.9	The applicant	‘watercourse’ is very similar to the definition in schedule 9 part 4, would a single definition be appropriate?
7.2 Part 2 Principal powers		
Q7.2.1	The applicant	Paragraph 3. The 2024 guidance refers to “the parameters of the authorised development and permitted limits of deviation” could the applicant provide this information for the various numbered works as relevant, including limits of deviation on heights and other dimensions? (see also sub section 7.6)
Q7.2.2	The applicant	Paragraph 4. ‘Maintenance of the authorised development’ should this be restricted to ‘within Order limits’? based on precedent (HFSP0 2025) and be within the environmental statement envelope - see the 2024 guidance? HFSP0 2025 may offer suitable wording?
Q7.2.3	The applicant	Paragraph 5. ‘Operation of generating station’ shouldn’t this be broadened to ‘authorised development’ and the text modified accordingly, as the photovoltaic generating station is one component of the authorised development?
Q7.2.4	The applicant	Paragraph 9. Defence to proceedings in respect of statutory nuisance, for the reasons set out in Q7.0.2, could this paragraph be removed entirely?
7.3 Schedule 1 Authorised development		
Q7.3.1	Commentary	It is clear from the submissions that there are options regarding the configuration of the elements comprising Works no.1 hence the use of the defined term “balance of solar plant”. In other regards the applicant may find it helpful to rely upon to definitions at s64 of the 1989 Act to simplify these, with reference to the 2024 guidance.
Q7.3.2	The applicant	Paragraph 1. “battery energy storage” and “energy storage”: only the former term is used hence could the latter and its definition be deleted?

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
Q7.3.3	The applicant	Paragraph 1. “inverters”, “transformers”, “switchgear”, “substation”, “solar panel”: these are all terms that are in general use and would not appear to need definition for the purposes of the dDCO as the dDCO does not modify their meaning. Could they be deleted?
Q7.3.4	The applicant	Paragraph 1. defining electric cables as an ‘electric line’ see s64 of the 1989 Act would appear to cover all conductors of electricity and the equipment used to support and protect them. The other items, for example optical fibre cables, trench lighting and other construction related items could simply be omitted for the same reasons as Q7.3.3, would that not be simpler?
Q7.3.5	The applicant	Paragraph 3. Work No. 6 and elsewhere include references to ‘National Grid’. To avoid any ambiguity should all such references be to NGET, with suitable supporting definition?
7.4 Schedule 2 Requirements		
Part 1 Requirements		
Q7.4.1	The applicant	Paragraph 1. Expiry: Could the applicant explain why five has changed to 5, for example compare with HFSPO 2025?
Q7.4.2	The applicant and North Yorkshire Council	Paragraph 7. Operational Environmental Management Plan (OEMP): Do the applicant and the council agree that operational noise is sufficiently covered within the outline Operational Environmental Management Plan (oOEMP) and that there is no need for a separate requirement on noise?
Q7.4.3	The applicant	Paragraph 9. Battery fire safety management plan, sub paragraph (3): Please could the applicant check the latest Health and Safety Executive (HSE) position on this. It is the ExA’s understanding that the council only needs to consult with North Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Service (NYFRS) on a plan that diverges from the outline plan. Please could the Applicant amend appropriately if this is confirmed to be the case?
Q7.4.4	The applicant and North Yorkshire Council	Paragraph 13. Construction working hours: in addition to audibility not satisfying the test of precision, to form part of a requirement, would it not be better for the detail on this issue to be within the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP)/outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) rather than on the face of the dDCO?
Q7.4.5	The applicant and North Yorkshire Council	Paragraph 13. Construction working hours: Whilst this matter appears to be agreed, in order to reduce the need for on-site lighting/ temporary power generation described in the oCEMP and

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		the adverse local effects that can cause, could construction be limited to daylight hours Monday to Friday only, potentially subject to 0700-1900 limit, or leave the matter to be agreed with the council via the CEMP/ oCEMP? (see also Q7.6.8)
7.5 Schedule 9 Protective provisions (PPs)		
Q7.5.1	The applicant, statutory undertakers	The ExA considers that given the interfaces between the proposed development and statutory undertakers' assets, for example National Gas Transmission and NGET, the statutory undertakers standard PPs are more likely to be appropriate, subject only to necessarily bespoke detailing, and would ask for agreement to be reached by Deadline 8?
7.6 Schedule 11 Documents to be certified		
Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) [REP4-016]:		
Q7.6.1	The applicant	General: isn't it likely that any CEMPs submitted for approval will be a 'contract specific' CEMP written by the Principal Contractor. Perhaps the use of contract specific would be clearer?
Q7.6.2	The applicant	General: wouldn't it be helpful within this document to include a generic indicative programme by calendar month, (there is not one included [APP-025]), given that some activities (including vegetation management as part of site preparation) will necessarily be seasonal?
Q7.6.3	The applicant	Paragraph 1.2.1 could this be clearer, perhaps just omit 'on Site'? or is 'the Site' defined somewhere else?
Q7.6.4	The applicant	Paragraph 1.5. wouldn't this section be more appropriate within a design principles document as it appears to be more about the what than the how?
Q7.6.5	The applicant	Paragraph 2.1.1 refers to "the Code of Construction Practice (CoCP)" – where is this or is the oCEMP intended to be 'self-sufficient' hence it can be removed as the oCEMP is, in effect, the code? Please could this be clarified?
Q7.6.6	The applicant	Paragraph 2.6 working hours it may be better to have this in here than on the face of the order. Would longer hours during the week avoid the need for weekend working?
Q7.6.7	The applicant	Paragraph 4.2.5 says: "The use of diesel or petrol powered generators will be avoided where practicable and mains electricity or battery powered equipment will be used instead where practicable". Would it not be appropriate for the undertaker to set up small solar/ battery

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		installations within the construction compounds to minimise or avoid altogether the use of diesel/ petrol fuelled generators?
Q7.6.8	The applicant	Paragraph 4.3.3 says: “Furthermore, where possible, construction works will be restricted to daylight hours”. In the context of the proposed development would this be a reasonable default position, with planned exceptions authorised by NYC and unplanned exceptions allowed, for example, emergencies?
Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (oDEMP) [APP-123]:		
Q7.6.9	The applicant	General: please could the applicant review this in light of the above queries on the oCEMP as there are likely to be similar issues?
Q7.6.10	The applicant	General: would it not be appropriate to extend its scope to restoration?
Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan (oOEMP) [REP2-008]:		
Q7.6.11	The applicant	Paragraph 1.4 would this be better in an outline design principles document?
Q7.6.12	The applicant	Paragraph 2.5.1 please clarify the second sentence, looks like a couple of words have been left out?
Q7.6.13	The applicant	Various paragraphs: There are design commitments elsewhere in the document, (for example aspects of the Battery Energy Storage System, lighting, fencing) so a separate document may be preferable (see Design section 2.)?
Q7.6.14	The applicant	General: This document should outline the management of operations and maintenance from an environmental perspective (similar to the oCEMP for construction) so possibly should include more for example on roles and responsibilities, risk assessment and methods. Please could appropriate amendments be made?
8. Health, safety, accidents, and incidents		
Q8.0.1	Commentary	Public Health The ExA has considered United Kingdom Health Security Agency’s RR [RR-345]. The ExA has also considered NYC’s LIR [REP2-034] the applicant’s response to it [REP3-010] the draft SoCG [REP4-042] submitted by the applicant and the PADs [REP4-051] submitted by NYC.

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		Whilst NYC considers resolution of its concern to be unlikely, the ExA has no questions at this time.
8.1 Site fire safety		
Q8.1.1	North Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Service	The ExA has considered the draft SoCG [PDA-006] with North Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Service (NYFRS) submitted by the applicant and the statement of commonality [REP4-044] submitted by the applicant. The ExA would be grateful if NYFRS could confirm its position through the finalisation of the SoCG with the applicant?
Q8.1.2	The applicant	The dDCO [REP4-004] refers to an 'outline battery fire safety management plan' but the corresponding outline management plan [REP4-013] is entitled 'Outline Battery Safety Management Plan' please could this be aligned on the basis that it would appear to be the same document?
8.2 Aviation safety – Burn Gliding Club		
Q8.2.1	Commentary	Relevant representations were made by Burn Gliding Club [RR-043], the British Gliding Club Association [RR-039] and the Civil Aviation Authority [RR-072] concerned with the effect of the proposed development on the safety of Burn Gliding Club's flying operations. A draft SoCG [REP2-017] and a PADs [REP3-014] have been submitted respectively by the applicant and the gliding club with a number of flight safety matters unresolved.
Q8.2.2	The applicant	The club would not appear to be listed as a category 3 person in the Book of Reference and based on the Applicant's submissions is it reasonable to conclude that the Applicant considers that whilst there may be some increase in risk that they would not regard this as likely to cause a material effect on the operation of the club?
Q8.2.3	The applicant	If the club in due course considers they have suffered a loss as a result of the operation of the proposed development, would they be able to make a claim, and if so how?
9. Heritage		
Q9.0.1	Commentary	The ExA has considered Historic England's RR [RR-143], Written Representation [REP2-028] and the draft SoCG [REP4-043] submitted by the applicant, which shows all matters agreed. The ExA has also considered NYC's LIR [REP2-034] and the draft SoCG [REP4-042]

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		submitted by the applicant, which shows all matters agreed, with regard to both built heritage and archaeology. The ExA therefore has no questions at this time.
10.	Landscape and visual	
Q10.0.1	Commentary	<p>The ExA has considered NYC's LIR [REP2-034] and the draft SoCG [REP4-042] submitted by the applicant which shows a number of areas still under discussion. The ExA has also considered the PADs [REP4-051] submitted by NYC where NYC lists its areas of concern as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cumulative effects • Green Infrastructure Strategy • Local Landscape and visual effects • Long term maintenance and management
Q10.0.2	North Yorkshire Council	With regard to unresolved matters what is NYC seeking, for example a new/ modified requirement, a new/ modified certified outline plan secured by a requirement or a development consent obligation agreed the Applicant? Could the council provide details and evidence of policy, guidance, research or comparable precedent that would support its case?
11.	Noise and vibration	
Q11.0.1	Commentary	The ExA has considered NYC's LIR [REP2-034] and the draft SoCG [REP4-042] submitted by the applicant, which shows all noise and vibration matters agreed. The ExA therefore has no questions at this time.
12.	Socio-economic (including agriculture)	
Q12.0.1	Commentary	The ExA has considered NYC's LIR [REP2-034] and the draft SoCG [REP4-042] submitted by the applicant which show that NYC's concerns over the use of Best and Most Versatile agricultural land had not been resolved. The ExA has also considered the PADs [REP4-051] submitted by NYC where NYC considers resolution of its concern to be likely.
Q12.0.2	North Yorkshire Council	Would the council consider it helpful if the applicant provided an outline supply chain, employment and skills plan as a certified document which would be secured by a requirement?

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
Q12.0.3	North Yorkshire Council	<p>If the answer to Q12.02 is yes then please could the council comment in general terms on the adequacy of the outline supply chain, employment and skills plan provided for the Heckington Fen solar park?</p> <p>EN010123-001015-7.12 - Outline Supply Chain, Skills and Employment Plan - Rev 4.pdf</p>
13.	Transport and access	
Q13.0.1	Commentary	<p>The ExA has considered National Highways' RR [RR-267] and the final SoCG [REP2-016] submitted by the applicant, which shows all matters agreed. The ExA has also considered NYC's LIR [REP2-034] and the draft SoCG [REP4-042] submitted by the applicant, which shows all traffic and transport matters agreed. The ExA therefore has no questions at this time.</p>
14.	Water environment	
Q14.0.1	Commentary	<p>The ExA has considered Environment Agency's (EA) RR [RR-117] and the draft SoCG [REP4-039] submitted by the applicant, which shows all matters agreed with the exception of battery energy storage system floodplain compensation. The ExA has also considered the PADs [REP4-053] submitted by the EA which shows all matters resolved with the exception of 2080's flood risk where the EA considers resolution of its concern to be likely. The ExA has also considered NYC's LIR [REP2-034] and the draft SoCG [REP4-042] submitted by the Applicant, which shows all water environment matters agreed. The ExA therefore has no questions at this time.</p>

Helios Renewable Energy Project:

List of all objections to the grant of compulsory acquisition and/ or temporary possession powers ExQ2: Question 6.0.1

In the event of a new interest in the land, or category 3 person, being identified the applicant should inform those persons of their right to apply to become an interested party under s102A of the PA2008.

1. Obj no	2. Name/ Organisation	3. IP/ AP ref no	4. RR ref no	5. WR ref no	6. Other doc ref no	7. Interest	8. Permanent/ Temporary	9. Plot(s)	10. CA?	11. Status of objection

Column explanations:

1. ‘Obj no’ is short for objection number. All objections listed in this table should be given a unique number in sequence
2. The name of the person or organisation which has made the objection
3. Reference number assigned to each interested party (IP) and affected person (AP)
4. Reference number assigned to each relevant representation (RR) in the Examination Library
5. Reference number assigned to each written representation (WR) in the Examination Library
6. Reference number assigned to any other document in the Examination Library
7. This refers to parts 1 to 3 of the Book of Reference:
 - Part 1, containing the names and addresses of the owners, lessees, tenants, and occupiers of, and others with an interest in, or power to sell and convey, or release, each parcel of order land
 - Part 2, containing the names and addresses of any persons whose land is not directly affected under the order, but who “would or might” be entitled to make a claim under section 10 of the Compulsory Purchase Act 1965, as a result of the order being implemented, or part 1 of the Land Compensation Act 1973, as a result of the use of the land once the order has been implemented
 - Part 3, containing the names and addresses of any persons who are entitled to easements or other private rights over the order land that may be extinguished, suspended or interfered with under the order
8. This column indicates whether the applicant is seeking compulsory acquisition or temporary possession of land/ rights
9. The plot(s) in the Land Plan provided by the applicant to which the interest and objection relates
10. ‘CA’ is short for compulsory acquisition. The answer is ‘yes’ if the land is in parts 1 or 3 of the Book of Reference and the applicant is seeking compulsory acquisition of land/ rights
11. A summary of the status of negotiations with the AP