



PINS Document Number:
ENO10140/APP/9.17

The Applicant's Responses to ExQ3 and the ExA's commentary on dDCO

May 2025

Helios Renewable Energy Project

The Applicant's Responses to ExQ3 and the ExA's Schedule of Changes to the dDCO

Planning Inspectorate Reference: EN010140

May 2025

Prepared on behalf of Enso Green Holdings D Limited

Project Ref:	33627	
Status:	Draft	Issue
Issue/Rev:	00	01
Date:	May 2025	May 2025
Prepared by:	AB/AA	AB/AA
Checked by:	JB/CT	JB/CT

Stantec
7 Soho Square
London
W1D 3QB

Tel: 020 7446 6888



COPYRIGHT

The contents of this document must not be copied or reproduced in whole or in part without the written consent of Stantec

All Stantec stationery is produced using recycled or FSC paper and vegetable oil-based inks.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction..... 3

1.1. Overview..... 3

2. The Applicant’s Responses to ExQ3 4

2.1. Site Selection and Alternatives..... 4

2.2. Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) 6

2.3. Compulsory Acquisition, Temporary Possession and Other Land or Rights
Considerations 8

2.4. The Draft Development Consent Order (dDCO) [REP6-003]..... 9

3. The Applicant’s Responses to the ExA’s Schedule of Changes to the dDCO 10

1. Introduction

1.1. Overview

- 1.1.1. This document sets out the responses from Enso Green Holdings D Limited (the 'Applicant') to the Examining Authority's ('ExA') written questions and requests for information ('ExQ3') and the ExA's Schedule of Changes to the draft DCO published on 2nd May 2025 in relation to the Development Consent Order Application (the 'DCO Application') for the Helios Renewable Energy Project (the 'Proposed Development').
- 1.1.2. The Applicant's responses to ExQ3 are set out within Section 2 of this document, presented in a tabulated format.
- 1.1.3. The Applicant's responses to the ExA's Schedule of Changes to the dDCO are set out within Section 3 of this document, presented in a tabulated format.
- 1.1.4. The ExA also provided the Report on the Implications for European Sites (RIES) on 2nd May 2025. The ExA acknowledged in the RIES that all matters are resolved, and therefore the Applicant has no further comments.
- 1.1.5. References to the DCO Application documentation, as received by the Planning Inspectorate on 2 July 2024, are provided in accordance with the referencing system as set out in the Planning Inspectorate's 'Helios Renewable Energy Project Examination Library'.

2. The Applicant's Responses to ExQ3

2.1. Site Selection and Alternatives

Table 2.1: Site selection and alternatives

ExA Question Number	Question Addressed to:	Question	Applicant's Response
Q1.0.1	All IPs	<p>Submissions included information about proximity to housing:</p> <p>[REP5-025] Pamela Joy Spreckley on behalf of HALT includes: <i>"Note: The World Health Organisation (Submission ID: 28466) recommends that Solar Farms should be a minimum of 2 miles from residential properties..."</i></p> <p>[REP5-012] on behalf of the applicant includes: <i>"The resident stated that the World Health Organisation recommends that solar farms should be two miles from housing"</i></p> <p>[REP6-043] includes <i>"Still, in general, solar farms are required to be built at least 3 km (1.86 miles) from residential areas (26 Jul 2023) and in its submission (ID: 28466), the WHO recommends that Solar Farms should be 2 miles from residential properties."</i></p> <p>The ExA could not find a submission into the examination from the WHO and notes that ID: 28466 relates to a submission into the examination of the East Yorkshire Solar Farm DCO application, EN010143-000629-Beckitt and MacMillan - Other.pdf. This is consistent with [REP7-020] 9.14 The Applicant's Responses to Deadline 6 Submissions Rev. 1.</p>	<p>As set out in the Written Summary of the Applicant's Oral Submissions – Issue Specific Hearing 2 [REP5-012], <i>there is a range of guidance and best practice rules that you would follow when designing a solar farm more generally including for example set-off distances from watercourses, trees and wildlife designations. The Applicant explained that you start with a blank sheet and then start overlaying constraints. The Applicant confirmed that there is no single set of guidance for designing a solar farm.</i></p> <p>Regarding residential dwellings, there is no guidance which provides a specific required distance between residential dwellings and solar development. Rather, the most appropriate distance is determined on a site-by-site basis, informed by a combination of technical assessments including noise, glint and glare, landscape and visual impact. In the case of the Proposed Development, its effect on residential receptors has been assessed within the ES, which confirms that there will be no significant adverse effects on residential dwellings.</p>

Helios Renewable Energy Project

The Applicant's Responses to ExQ3 and the ExA's Schedule of Changes to the dDCO

ExA Question Number	Question Addressed to:	Question	Applicant's Response
		<p>In trying to find the source of statements attributed to the WHO the ExA notes this: What is a Safe Distance to Live from a Solar Farm?</p> <p>The ExA invites comments from IPs</p>	<p>The webpage linked from Go Solar Florida State is not a verified guidance document and as such, the Applicant would not expect this to hold any weight in the examination. However, it is noted that the source sets out that there are multiple factors to consider when evaluating the safest distance, as per the Applicant's response above.</p>

2.2. Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA)

Table 2.2: Habitats regulations assessment

ExA Question Number	Question Addressed to:	Question	Applicant's Response
Q2.0.1	The applicant	<p>To ensure completeness of information, can the applicant update the HRA Report to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> confirm whether the Lower Derwent Valley and Humber Estuary SPA and Ramsar sites are in a favourable or unfavourable condition include the conservation objectives of the Lower Derwent Valley and Humber Estuary Ramsar sites 	<p>Please see Environmental Statement Appendix 8.9 – Information to inform HRA Issue V6 [Deadline 8 Submission].</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To the Applicant's knowledge, Special Protection Areas (SPAs) are not assessed for the 'favourable' or unfavourable' condition. The favourable assessment process applies to Sites of Scientific Interest (SSSIs), whereas SPAs are measured against their stated Conservation Objectives, which are set out in the HRA. It is acknowledged that the Lower Derwent Valley and Humber Estuary SPA are underpinned by corresponding SSSI's; however, the special interest features of the SSSIs are not fully aligned with the qualifying features for the SPA, e.g. by including habitats and not fully detailing all bird species. The Proposed Development will not have any impacts on the condition (favourable or otherwise) of the SSSIs which are separate, or in addition to, those addressed when considering the SPAs, as there are no additional relevant SSSI features for which the SSSI is designated for. Any potential impacts on the qualifying feature bird species for which the SPA is designated have been assessed in the HRA, and measures against most recently available population levels as is required by Natural England. Therefore it is not considered appropriate or relevant to transpose the SSSI

Helios Renewable Energy Project

The Applicant's Responses to ExQ3 and the ExA's Schedule of Changes to the dDCO

ExA Question Number	Question Addressed to:	Question	Applicant's Response
			<p>condition to the SPA or refer to these in the HRA process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• To the Applicant's knowledge, Conservation Objectives are published only for SPAs and Special Areas of Conservation (SACs), but not for Ramsar sites. For completeness, the HRA has been updated to include Ramsar Information Sheets (as Annex 4).

2.3. Compulsory Acquisition, Temporary Possession and Other Land or Rights Considerations

Table 2.3: Compulsory acquisition, temporary possession and other land or rights considerations

ExA Question Number	Question Addressed to:	Question	Applicant's Response
Q3.0.1	The applicant	The ExA confirms the request for the applicant to update Annex A for each remaining deadline and provide a tracked changes version where changes occur.	The Applicant notes the request to provide a tracked changes version of Annex A where changes occur. The Applicant has provided clean and tracked changes versions of Annex A at Deadline 8.

2.4. The Draft Development Consent Order (dDCO) [REP6-003]

Table 2.4: dDCO [REP6-003] - General

ExA Question Number	Question Addressed to:	Question	Applicant's Response
Q4.0.1	All IPs	All IPs are asked to review and comment on the ExA's proposed changes to the dDCO published on 2 May 2025	Please see Section 3 of this document.

3. The Applicant's Responses to the ExA's Schedule of Changes to the dDCO

Table 3.1: The Applicant's Responses to the ExA's Schedule of Changes to the dDCO

Ref No.	Provision	Proposed Change	ExA Reasoning	Applicant's Response
DCO-PC01	Whole dDCO	1. Please check internal references, statutory citations and references and legal footnotes and update as required. 2. Please review additions to the dDCO ensuring that the titles and numbering of all provisions remains consistent throughout and with the Table of Contents. Also please undertake a check to ensure spelling and punctuation is correct throughout.	To ensure the accuracy of the final dDCO.	The Applicant has reviewed the dDCO and made amendments accordingly. Such amendments are illustrated in the dDCO submitted and the Schedule of Changes both submitted at Deadline 8.
DCO-PC02	PART 1 PRELIMINARY Interpretation 2.—(1)	“apparatus” has the same meaning as in section 105(1) of the 1991 Act (except where stated to the contrary);	The ordinary meaning is considered to be sufficient for the purposes of the dDCO, other than within Schedule 9 on protective provisions which is accepted. The New Roads and Street Works Act 1991 (the 1991 Act) definition is limited. In fact, s105 of the 1991 Act is entitled “ <i>minor definitions</i> ” and s105 (1) says ““ <i>apparatus</i> ” includes any structure for the lodging therein of apparatus or for gaining access to apparatus” This strongly suggests that the 1991 Act itself relies upon the ordinary meaning of apparatus.	As referenced in 9.12 The Applicant's Responses to the Examining Authority's written questions and requests for information (ExQ2) [REP6-035] , the recently updated Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects - Advice Note Fifteen: drafting Development Consent Orders (24 March 2025) (Advice Note Fifteen), states that the DCO: <i>should define, either in the relevant Article or paragraph (if only used once) or in a general definitions Article (if used more frequently), all terms not defined in the PA2008 or the Interpretation Act 1978, or</i>

Helios Renewable Energy Project

The Applicant's Responses to ExQ3 and the ExA's Schedule of Changes to the dDCO

Ref No.	Provision	Proposed Change	ExA Reasoning	Applicant's Response
				<p>where the term uses its ordinary meaning.</p> <p>On this basis that the Applicant considers that a definition is required and considers that the ExA and SoS will be following Advice Note Fifteen if the DCO is made.</p> <p>However, the Applicant has reviewed the definition and is content to update it to reflect more recent solar DCOs such as Byers Gill, Oaklands and the recently made Heckington Fen and East Yorkshire solar DCOs. The dDCO submitted at D8 has amended the definition to:</p> <p><i>“apparatus” has the same meaning as in Part 3 (street works in England and Wales) of the 1991 Act except that, unless otherwise provided, it further includes pipelines (and parts of them), aerial markers, cathodic protection test posts, field boundary markers, transformer rectifier kiosks, electricity cables, telecommunications equipment and electricity cabinets;</i></p>

Ref No.	Provision	Proposed Change	ExA Reasoning	Applicant's Response
DCO-PC03	PART 2 PRINCIPAL POWERS	Defence to proceedings in respect of statutory nuisance 9.—(1) Where proceedings are brought under section 82(1) (summary proceedings brought by person aggrieved by statutory nuisances) of the Environmental Protection Act 1990(d) in relation to a nuisance falling within paragraph (g) of section 79(1) of that Act (noise emitted from premises so as to be prejudicial to health or a nuisance) no order is to be made, and no fine is to be imposed, under section 82(2) of that Act if — (a) the defendant shows that the nuisance — (i) relates to premises used by the undertaker for the purposes of or in connection with the construction or maintenance of the authorised development and that the nuisance is attributable to the carrying out of the authorised development in accordance with a notice served under section 60 (control of noise on construction sites), or a consent given under section 61 (prior consent for work on construction sites) of the Control of Pollution Act 1974(e); Act; or (ii) is a consequence of the construction, maintenance or decommissioning of the authorised development and cannot reasonably be avoided; or (b) the defendant shows that the nuisance is a consequence of the use of the authorised development and cannot reasonably be avoided. (2) Section 61(9) (prior consent for work on construction sites) of the Control of Pollution Act 1974 Act does not apply	This provision includes modification to s82 of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 (the 1990 Act). It proposes to add as a defence to s82 proceedings, brought by an aggrieved person, the situation where the work is covered by a construction noise notice issued by the local authority under s60 or s61 of the Control of Pollution Act 1974 (the 1974 Act). Under the 1990 Act, this defence only applies to proceedings brought by the local authority under s80 of the 1990 Act, that is to say the same authority that would have issued the notice under the 1974 Act. The applicant's proposed powers seek to add to the range of defences available to alleged noise nuisance by an aggrieved person over and above those provided by the 1990 Act. At the same time the applicant is saying in its assessment that such an occurrence would be unlikely through its conclusion that the noise effect is negligible. More explicitly the applicant says in its statutory nuisance statement [APP-237] <i>"As informed by the ES, it is considered that no claim against statutory nuisance in respect of noise and vibration is therefore</i>	Whilst it is not expected that a claim should arise there is still a gap between section 158 PA 2008 as it does not extend to the rare situation by which if, somebody considers that the local authority ought to be tackling a nuisance using its statutory nuisance powers, but it is not, that person may apply to the magistrates' court under section 82 of the Environmental Protection Act 1990. As section 158 does not distinguish between different types of nuisance, the logical position is that this article should apply to all categories of nuisance. However, as a matter of practice other NSIPs have been more discriminating and have asked whether there is any possibility of a statutory nuisance occurring, leading to specific types of nuisance being referred to. The undertaker has followed this approach by seeking to restrict the application of this article so that it only applies to nuisances that have been identified as potentially resulting (even if not envisaged to actually arise), from the authorised

Helios Renewable Energy Project

The Applicant's Responses to ExQ3 and the ExA's Schedule of Changes to the dDCO

Ref No.	Provision	Proposed Change	ExA Reasoning	Applicant's Response
		where the consent relates to the use of premises by the undertaker for the purposes of or in connection with the construction, maintenance or decommissioning of the authorised development.	<p><i>envisaged is respect of a statutory nuisance under section 79(1)(g) or (ga) of the EPA</i>" This additional defence is therefore considered unnecessary and disproportionate. Removing the corresponding subparagraphs 9 (1) (a) (i) and 9 (2) would render the provision equivalent to what is provided in the 1990 Act on the basis that the reasonableness test in Article 9 would likely be interpreted as equivalent to the test of best practicable means as defined in the 1990 Act at s79. Hence it is recommended that the whole of Article 9 is struck out.</p> <p>The ExA has not during its investigations found any reasoned argument put forward by IPs in support of or against very similar provisions in other recently completed solar project examinations, for example Heckington Fen, Gate Burton, Byers Gill, East Yorkshire, and Oaklands.</p>	<p>development, as set out in the Statutory Nuisances Statement [APP-237]. This ensures that this article is focused only on those nuisances that may be of relevance, whilst also reflecting the logic and correct interpretation of section 158.</p> <p>The Applicant notes that the ExA has acknowledged that the same article (albeit with slight variations in wording) is included in other recent DCOs. The Applicant would add East Yorkshire Solar Farm DCO 2025 to that list.</p> <p>The Applicant considers that the article is necessary and as no interested party has raised any concerns and it is a heavily precedented article it should be retained in the DCO. The Applicant has therefore not removed it from the dDCO submitted at Deadline 8.</p>
PART 5 POWERS OF ACQUISITION				
DCO-PC04	Application of the 1981 Act 25 (3)	compulsory purchase order	Drafting correction	This is agreed. The dDCO has been amended accordingly and submitted at Deadline 8.

Helios Renewable Energy Project

The Applicant's Responses to ExQ3 and the ExA's Schedule of Changes to the dDCO

Ref No.	Provision	Proposed Change	ExA Reasoning	Applicant's Response
DCO-PC05	Modification of Part 1 of the Compulsory Purchase Act 1965 28 (2)	447 118	Drafting correction	This is agreed. The dDCO has been amended accordingly and submitted at Deadline 8.
SCHEDULE 1 Article 3 AUTHORISED DEVELOPMENT 1.				
DCO-PC06		<p>"electrical cables" means— electric line as defined in section 64 of the 1989 Act; (a) cables of differing types and voltages installed for the purposes of conducting electricity, auxiliary cables, cables connecting to direct current (DC) boxes, earthing cables and optical fibre cables; (b) excavations to install trenching, including storage of excavated material; and (c) provision of ducting or alternative means of conducting media including jointing pits hardstanding adjoining the jointing pits, combiner boxes, fibre bays, cable ducts, cable protections, joint protection, manholes, kiosks, marker posts, underground cable marker, tiles and tape, send and receive pits for trenchless installation techniques, trenching, lighting, and a put or container to capture fluids associated with drilling;</p>	<p>This is considered appropriate because the definition of electric line in the Electricity Act 1989 (the 1989 Act) is inclusive. Furthermore, Schedule 4 paragraph 6 (1) (a) of the 1989 Act refers to "<i>an electric line on, under or over any land</i>" so the 1989 Act envisages an electric line, as defined, being overhead, on the surface, or underground. This would seem to address the reason why the applicant considered it inappropriate to rely upon this definition in its response to ExQ2 [REP6-035].</p>	<p>The Applicant does not consider it appropriate to use the definition in section 64 of the 1989 Act for the reasons outlined in its response to ExQ2 [REP6-035]; the reference by the ExA in ExQ3 [PD-007] to Schedule 4 of the 1989 Act does not address this issue. Schedule 4 relates to other powers of licence holders and doesn't specifically refer back to section 64 which would make this unclear. The drafting referred to by the ExA features in a number of other DCO in relation to protective provisions whereby those statutory undertakers have electrical cables which are for example overhead and therefore this definition is appropriate.</p> <p>The Applicant's current drafting is similar to Heckington Fen, Gate Burton and East Yorkshire Solar Farm but as it is bespoke to the Proposed Development, the</p>

Helios Renewable Energy Project

The Applicant's Responses to ExQ3 and the ExA's Schedule of Changes to the dDCO

Ref No.	Provision	Proposed Change	ExA Reasoning	Applicant's Response
				Applicant does not propose to amend the definition.
DCO-PC07		"inverter" means electrical equipment required to convert direct current power to alternating current;	The ordinary meaning is considered to be sufficient for the purposes of this schedule of the dDCO	The Applicant proposes to keep the definition of inverter in the dDCO as per the response given above at DCO-PC02. This is also the same definition used in Schedule 1 of Heckington Fen the East Yorkshire Solar Farm DCO 2025.
DCO-PC08		"solar panel" means a solar photovoltaic panel or module designed to convert solar irradiance to electrical energy;	The ordinary meaning is considered to be sufficient for the purposes of this schedule of the dDCO	The Applicant proposes to keep the definition of solar panel in the dDCO as per the response given above at DCO-PC02. This is also the same definition used in Schedule 1 of the East Yorkshire Solar Farm DCO 2025
DCO-PC09		"substation" means a compound containing electrical equipment required to switch, transform, convert electricity and provide reactive power compensation with welfare facilities, means of access and other associated facilities	The ordinary meaning is considered to be sufficient for the purposes of this schedule of the dDCO	The Applicant proposes to retain the definition of substation in the dDCO. This is a bespoke definition describing the type of substation relevant to the proposed development and the Applicant does not consider that relying on a general meaning would be sufficiently clear.
DCO-PC10		"switchgear" means a combination of electrical disconnect switches, fuses or circuit breakers used to control, protect, and isolate electrical equipment;	The ordinary meaning is considered to be sufficient for the purposes of this schedule of the dDCO	The Applicant proposes to keep the definition of switchgear in the dDCO as per the response given above at DCO-PC02. This is also

Helios Renewable Energy Project

The Applicant's Responses to ExQ3 and the ExA's Schedule of Changes to the dDCO

Ref No.	Provision	Proposed Change	ExA Reasoning	Applicant's Response
				the same definition used in Schedule 1 of Heckington Fen and the East Yorkshire Solar Farm DCO 2025.
DCO-PC11		"trenchless installation techniques" means the installation of new electrical cabling and/or associated equipment by means of boring techniques including horizontal directional drilling, auger boring and micro tunnelling.	The ordinary meaning is considered to be sufficient for the purposes of this schedule of the dDCO	The Applicant proposes to retain the definition of trenchless installation techniques in the dDCO as drafted. This is a bespoke definition describing the type of technique to be used and the Applicant does not consider that relying on an ordinary meaning (the Applicant has been unable to locate a sufficient definition in a dictionary) would be sufficient for the purposes of the authorised development.
SCHEDULE 2 Article 43 REQUIREMENTS PART 1 REQUIREMENTS				
DCO-PC12	Construction environmental management plan (CEMP) 4 (2)	(a) site and construction working hours	This allows NYC's usual approach and any exceptions to be set out in the oCEMP and CEMP respectively. This appears to be consistent with the positions of the applicant [REP6-035] and the council [REP6-037].	This is agreed. The dDCO has been amended accordingly and submitted at Deadline 8.
DCO-PC13	Battery safety management plan 9 (3)	the Health and Safety Executive and	Recognising the HSE's submission to the Oaklands Farm Solar Park examination EN010122-000871-DCOs containing consultation with HSE on Battery Safety Management Plans.pdf	This is agreed. The dDCO has been amended accordingly and submitted at Deadline 8.

Helios Renewable Energy Project

The Applicant's Responses to ExQ3 and the ExA's Schedule of Changes to the dDCO

Ref No.	Provision	Proposed Change	ExA Reasoning	Applicant's Response
DCO-PC14	Landscape and ecological management plan (LEMP) 10 (2) (b)	a commitment to a minimum of 10% biodiversity net gain in habitat units and details of how this will be achieved details of habitat creation	With reference to NYC's response to ExQ2 [REP6-037] and the Heckington Fen Solar Park Order 17 February 2025.	<p>The Applicant accepts the ExA's request to amend Requirement 10(2)(b) of the dDCO to include a commitment to deliver a minimum of 10% biodiversity net gain. The Applicant has included the following wording in the dDCO submitted at Deadline 8 as follows:</p> <p><i>"(b) details of habitat creation including how a minimum of 10% biodiversity net gain in habitat units, calculated using The Statutory Biodiversity Metric published by the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs on 29 November 2023 (or such other biodiversity metric approved by the relevant planning authority in consultation with the relevant statutory nature conservation body), will be achieved during the operation of the authorised development;"</i></p>
DCO-PC15	Landscape and ecological management plan (LEMP) 10 (2)	and - ; and (f) detailed arrangements for the monitoring of ground nesting birds and bats.	With reference to NYC's response to ExQ2 [REP6-037]	To monitor the implementation of the management prescriptions and whether these have provided suitable ground nesting bird habitat, monitoring surveys will be undertaken by a suitably qualified

Helios Renewable Energy Project

The Applicant's Responses to ExQ3 and the ExA's Schedule of Changes to the dDCO

Ref No.	Provision	Proposed Change	ExA Reasoning	Applicant's Response
				<p>ecologist in years 5 and 10 following implementation of the scheme. This will comprise a single visit each monitoring year during the peak breeding season (April to June) with a walkover of the mitigation areas to record that suitable habitat has been established in line with Countryside Stewardship management practices as set out in AB4: Skylark Plots and IN140 Neutral Grassland for Lapwing. The management strategy will be reviewed following each monitoring visit, and any required actions will be notified to the landowner / farmer.</p> <p>The Applicant does not have to demonstrate use of the habitats by ground nesting bird habitats, just that suitable habitat has been established in line with Countryside Stewardship management practices as set out in AB4: Skylark Plots and IN140 Neutral Grassland for Lapwing.</p> <p>With regards to monitoring for bats, NYC's PADS are clear that the information is needed only for research purposes and does not relate to mitigation and therefore it</p>

Helios Renewable Energy Project

The Applicant's Responses to ExQ3 and the ExA's Schedule of Changes to the dDCO

Ref No.	Provision	Proposed Change	ExA Reasoning	Applicant's Response
				<p>is not appropriate to include this as a requirement on the DCO. The Applicant advises that further bat monitoring is not required as it was agreed with the NYC ecologist during a virtual meeting of 4th May 2023 (ES Appendix 8.10 [APP-152]) that <i>"it is disproportionate to conduct bat activity surveys on the Proposed Development is minimal and significant effects on bats are to be avoided through planting design and panel layout as part of the Proposed Development."</i></p> <p>Foraging and commuting bats were subsequently scoped out of the impact assessment based on the absence of any pathway that may result in an adverse effect from the Proposed Development. As such, no specific mitigation measures were proposed in relation to this species and no monitoring of this species is considered necessary, as secured in ES Chapter 8 Biodiversity [APP-028].</p> <p>The Applicant has updated Requirement 10(2) of the dDCO at Deadline8 as follows:</p> <p><i>and</i></p>

Helios Renewable Energy Project

The Applicant's Responses to ExQ3 and the ExA's Schedule of Changes to the dDCO

Ref No.	Provision	Proposed Change	ExA Reasoning	Applicant's Response
				<i>(f) detailed arrangements for the monitoring of habitats for ground nesting birds in years 5 and 10 of the operation of the authorised development."</i>
DCO-PC16	Construction hours 13	Construction hours 13. — (1) Subject to sub-paragraphs (2) and (3), no construction works are to take place except between the hours of — (a) 08:00 to 18:00 Monday to Friday; and (b) 08:00 to 13:00 on Saturdays, with no activity on Sundays or bank holidays. (2) The following works are permitted outside the hours referred to in sub-paragraph (1) — (a) emergency works; (b) trenchless construction techniques which cannot be interrupted; and (c) works which do not cause noise that is audible at the boundary of the Order limits. (3) Nothing in sub-paragraph (1) precludes — (a) the receipt of oversize deliveries to site and the undertaking of non-intrusive activities; (b) start-up and shut-down activities up to an hour either side of the core working hours and undertaken in compliance with the CEMP; and (c) works on a traffic sensitive street where so directed by the relevant highway authority. (4) Any emergency works carried out under sub-paragraph (2)(a) must be notified to the local planning authority within 72 hours of their commencement. (5) In this requirement — "emergency" means a situation where, if the relevant action is not taken, there will be adverse health, safety, security or environmental	See responses on this topic from the applicant [REP6-035] and the council [REP6-037] and DCO-PC12	On the basis that the site and construction working hours limb is added to Requirement 4(2) and the oCEMP [Deadline 8 Submission] has been updated the Applicant agrees to the removal of this requirement and has updated the dDCO submitted at Deadline 8 accordingly.

Helios Renewable Energy Project

The Applicant's Responses to ExQ3 and the ExA's Schedule of Changes to the dDCO

Ref No.	Provision	Proposed Change	ExA Reasoning	Applicant's Response
		consequences that in the reasonable opinion of the undertaker would outweigh the adverse effects to the public (whether individuals, classes or generally as the case may be) of taking that action; and "trenchless construction techniques which cannot be interrupted" means drilling, tunnelling, boring or similar construction methods used to create an underground route for electrical cables without trenching from the surface, and includes any necessary ancillary activities to that drilling, tunnelling or boring; but does not include operations to prepare for drilling, tunnelling and boring, and specifically does not include works of excavation of pits, or works to remediate the site of pits used for drilling, tunnelling and boring.		
DCO-PC17	New requirement	Operational Noise The rating level (LAr) of noise from the operation of the authorised development shall not exceed: 40 dB LAr for any fifteen-minute period between 23:00 and 07:00; and 50 dB LAeq for any one-hour period between 07:00 and 23:00, determined one metre free-field external to any window or door of any existing permanent residential premises using the definitions and methods described in 'Methods for rating industrial and commercial sound' British Standards Institution BS4142 2014+A1:2019.	Securing mitigation through the design and procurement process to meet policy NPS-EN1 5.12.17 and 5.12.18. Based on The North Lincolnshire Green Energy Park Order 2025 4 April 2025 North Lincolnshire Green Energy Park Order 2025 (For Signature) signed.pdf adjusted for context.	It is the Applicant's understanding that this requirement has been drafted based on Tables 11.17 and 11.18 of ES Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration [APP-031]. Table 11.17 sets out that the maximum daytime background sound level at noise sensitive receptors is 50 dB and Table 11.18 confirms that the maximum night-time background sound level is 37 dB. The assessment finds that the noise generated from the operational phase of the Proposed Development is significantly below the proposed thresholds of 50 dB and 40 dB. The Applicant is

Helios Renewable Energy Project**The Applicant's Responses to ExQ3 and the ExA's Schedule of Changes to the dDCO**

Ref No.	Provision	Proposed Change	ExA Reasoning	Applicant's Response
				therefore content with the proposed new requirement and has included it in the dDCO submitted at Deadline 8.