



Application by BSSL Cambsbed 1 Limited for East Park Energy

The Examining Authority's written questions and requests for information (ExQ1): Issued on 5 May 2026

Responses are due by deadline 3: 26 May 2026

The following table sets out the Examining Authority's (ExA's) written questions and requests for information - ExQ1. If necessary, the examination timetable enables the ExA to issue a further round of written questions in due course. If this is done, the further round of questions will be referred to as ExQ2.

Questions are set out using an issues-based framework derived from the initial assessment of principal issues provided as **annex C** to the Rule 6 Letter dated 17 February 2026. Questions have been added to the framework of issues set out there as they have arisen from representations and to address the assessment of the application against relevant policies.

Column 2 of the table indicates which interested parties (IPs) and other persons each question is directed to. The ExA would be grateful if all persons named could answer all questions directed to them, providing a substantive response, or indicating that the question is not relevant to them for a reason. 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.

Each question has a unique reference number which starts with 1 (indicating that it is from ExQ1) and then has an issue number and a question number. For example, the first question on air quality and emissions issues is identified as Q1.2.1. When you are answering a question, please start your answer by quoting the unique reference number.

Use of artificial intelligence (AI) in casework evidence

If you use AI to create your submission, you should tell us that you have done this. You should specify which systems or tools you have used, the source of the information that the AI system has based its content on, and what information the AI has been used to create or alter. Further information can be found in the Planning Inspectorate's [guidance](#). By following this guidance, you will help the ExA to understand the origin and accuracy of the information submitted, thereby supporting fair and impartial decision-making. **If you do not declare the use of AI in any evidence submission where it has been used or remove evidence such as watermarks, we reserve the right to reject the submission.**

You should respond to the questions by using the **Have your say** function on the [project page of the National Infrastructure website](#) and selecting 'Responses to Examining Authority's First Written Questions (ExQ1)' when asked.



Planning Inspectorate

If you are responding to a small number of questions, you can submit your answers by choosing 'Make a comment' and entering your answers in the 'Your comments' box. If you are answering a larger number of questions you should download a copy of the Microsoft Word version of the document, enter your answers and save the document using an appropriate file name. You can then submit the completed document by selecting 'Upload files'.

Microsoft Word version: [https://nsip-documents.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/published-documents/EN010141-000712-Examining%20Authoritys%20Written%20Questions%2001%20\(ExQ1\)%20MS%20Word%20Version.docx](https://nsip-documents.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/published-documents/EN010141-000712-Examining%20Authoritys%20Written%20Questions%2001%20(ExQ1)%20MS%20Word%20Version.docx)



Abbreviations used:

PA2008	Planning Act 2008	ExA	Examining Authority
Art	article	HDC	Huntingdonshire District Council
BESS	Battery Energy Storage Systems	LIR	the Local Impact Report
BMV	Best and Most Versatile	LPA	local planning authority
BNG	Biodiversity Net Gain	MP	model provision (in the MPO, see below)
BoR	the Book of Reference	MPO	The Infrastructure Planning (Model Provisions) Order 2009
CA	compulsory acquisition	NE	Natural England
CCC	Cambridgeshire County Council	NFCC	National Fire Chiefs Council
CPO	compulsory purchase order	NPS	National Policy Statement
dDCO	the draft Development Consent Order	NSIP	Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project
EA	Environment Agency	OCEMP	Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan
EM	the Explanatory Memorandum	PRoW	Public Right of Way
ES	the Environmental Statement	UXO	unexplained ordnance

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: [EL web link](#)

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 ExQ1 1.1.1 – refers to question 1 in this table.



Index

1. General and cross-topic questions.....	5
2. Air quality and emissions	7
3. Biodiversity, ecology and natural environment (including Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA))	7
4. Cultural heritage	8
5. Draft Development Consent Order (dDCO) & Explanatory Memorandum.....	9
6. Landscape and visual impact assessment	10
7. Need.....	11
8. Noise and vibration	11
9. Socio-economic effects	11
10. Geology and soil.....	11
11. Traffic and Transport	12
12. Water environment and flood risk.....	12

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
1. General and cross-topic questions		
Q1.1.1	The applicant	<p>Outline Battery Safety Management Plan [APP-162] Paragraph 1.2.1 states that 'For the purposes of this document a concept design has been considered that uses a BESS system based upon lithium iron phosphate (LFP) lithium-ion battery technology.'</p> <p>What other battery technology could be considered and has an options analysis been undertaken to prove LFP is the most acceptable choice?</p>
Q1.1.2	The applicant	<p>Outline Battery Safety Management Plan [APP-162] What is the expected cyclical inspection/maintenance regime proposed to ensure the safety of the BESS?</p>
Q1.1.3	The applicant	<p>Outline Battery Safety Management Plan [APP-162] Paragraph 1.5.3 reports that revised NFCC guidance is expected in 2025. Please provide an update on whether the updated guidance has been published and if so, provide a commentary on any impacts on the proposed development.</p>
Q1.1.4	The applicant	<p>Outline Battery Safety Management Plan [APP-162] Paragraph 1.6.2 states that CFRS sent an official 'Cambridgeshire and Bedfordshire FRS Response to East Park Energy Consultation' to the applicant on 15 October 2024. Please provide a summary of the CFRS feedback or a copy of the email.</p>
Q1.1.5	The applicant	<p>Outline Battery Safety Management Plan [APP-162] Paragraph 2.2.2, 6th line references ESS, should this be BESS?</p>
Q1.1.6	The applicant	<p>BESS Can you advise what the design philosophy was for concentrating the BESS in one area, rather than have a dispersed approach across multiple fields for the BESS.</p>
Q1.1.7	The applicant	<p>BESS What cumulative effects are there when assessed against other BESS provision within the area.</p>
Q1.1.8	The applicant	<p>BESS Please indicate if there any proposed bunds to be designed into the scheme to prevent any firewater contaminating surrounding land in the event of a fire.</p>
Q1.1.9	The applicant	<p>BESS It is acknowledged that there is over 400m separation distances from the nearest residential property, notwithstanding this please indicate what other measures are to be implemented to reduce the risk of fire and explosion to residential properties.</p>
Q1.1.10	The applicant	<p>Designing Out Crime Has the scheme been subject to engagement with the Police and Designing Out Crime Officer. If so, what were the recommendations?</p>
Q1.1.11	The applicant	<p>Planning Statement [APP-031] Maintenance Regime Paragraph 4.8.2 references routine activities on site during the operational phase of the development. One of these activities is maintenance. Can the applicant supply an outline of how often the cyclical pre-planned maintenance activities will take place.</p>
Q1.1.12	The applicant	<p>Planning Statement [APP-031] Agri-Research Paragraphs 5.4.15 and 5.4.16 references the agri-solar research development proposal with Rothamsted Research. What levels of staffing will this generate, how often? And what provision, if any is made for parking and any other associated traffic management?</p> <p>In addition, Section 7.14 of the Planning statement on Ground Conditions does not reference the research facility, should this be referenced?</p>
Q1.1.13	The applicant	<p>Policy and Legislation Paragraph 6.2.1 of the Planning Statement [APP-031] references the 50MW threshold provided by the Planning Act 2008 for onshore generating stations. It is acknowledged that this was the threshold prescribed when the application was submitted. However, for completeness, it is also worth acknowledging in the Planning Statement that this threshold changed through the commencement of the Infrastructure Planning (Onshore Wind and Solar Generation) Order 2025.</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Q1.1.14	The applicant	Good Design Paragraph 7.2.14 of the Planning Statement [APP-031] states that good design will be secured by Requirements and control documents. However, has the scheme been subjected to a design review by an independent panel?
Q1.1.15	The applicant	Ground Conditions Paragraph 7.14.10 of the Planning statement [APP-031] references that a comprehensive site investigation programme has informed ES Volume 1 Chapter 12: Ground Conditions, which includes desk studies, data gathering, including information relating to UXO, and walk over surveys. Have any intrusive site investigation works been undertaken or are proposed before commencement of work?
Q1.1.16	The applicant	Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan [REP1-040] Paragraph 6.5.36 provides a sheep grazing density referenced at table 3. How have the densities been calculated, for instance is there a guidance document that underpins the densities provided?
Q1.1.17	The applicant	Human Health Have health authorities been consulted regarding the potential impacts of the scheme, and if so what comments, if any, have been made?
Q1.1.18	The applicant	Design Parameters For works No.2 and 3 where buildings are proposed, what measures will be implemented to ensure that the buildings will sit appropriately in their location having regard to local context and character. For Works No.10 involving the agrisolar research facility, are any buildings proposed, and if so, please respond on the aforementioned issues of local context and character.
Q1.1.19	The applicant	Outline Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan [APP-163] Paragraph 2.2.2 refers to the creation of Apprenticeships as part of the outputs of the proposed development. Can an estimate of number be provided?
Q1.1.20	The applicant	Grid Connection In response to National Grid's Relevant Representation [RR-903] it is stated in the Applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations submitted at D1 [REP1-055] that "The Applicant can confirm that the Scheme received a 'Gate 2' offer with a connection date of October 2028, with an October 2030 backstop.". Please supply evidence of the offer and agreement.
Q1.1.21	National Grid / The applicant	In National Grid's relevant representation [RR-903] , it is stated: "The scope of the expansion, rebuild or provision of a new substation of East Socon Substation is as yet unknown and will be determined by the outcome of NESO's Connection Reforms process. Please provide projected timelines by which this will be determined and the timetable for the expansion, rebuild, or the construction of a new substation . If this coincides with the construction of the proposed development, have the cumulative impacts of the works to East Socon site been considered?
Q1.1.22	The applicant	Use of PFAS (Per- and Polyfluoroalkyl Substances) Please confirm whether PFAS are used in the manufacturing materials (e.g. for the construction of the PV panels)? If they are, explain how the potential environmental impacts have been assessed and to clarify and signpost to any mitigation measures .
Q1.1.23	The applicant	Maximum Parameters The total footprint of the East Park Substation and BESS is not set out in the ES. Can the applicant confirm the maximum footprint of the proposed East Park Substation and BESS area that has been assessed in the ES or signpost to where this information can be found in the application documents.
Q1.1.24	The applicant	Construction Compounds - Parameters Can the applicant confirm the maximum parameters of the proposed construction compounds or signpost to where this information can be found in the application documents.
Q1.1.25	The applicant	Cumulative Effects ES Chapter 17 : Cumulative and In Combination Effects

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		ES Chapter 17 [APP-053] identifies significant residual cumulative effects on landscape and visual, cultural heritage and archaeology and ecology and nature conservation receptors. However, the tables 18.1 and 18.2 in ES Chapter 18 [APP-054] states that no significant residual cumulative effects were predicted during construction or operation. Can the applicant provide further clarification and update the relevant documents if necessary.
2. Air quality and emissions		
Q1.2.1	Local Authorities	Compliance with Local Policies Paragraph 7.13.16 of the Planning Statement [APP-031] states that the proposed development is in compliance with local policies in respect of Air quality. Do the local authorities agree?
3. Biodiversity, ecology and natural environment (including Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA))		
Q1.3.1	The applicant	Retention of hedgerow and tree planting Landscaping works undertaken across the site are proposed to remain on decommissioning (Vol. 1, Ch. 2, 2.7.2) including substantial additional hedgerow planting (over 17km). Please provide further detail about how you have considered the changes to and effects on open views and the character of the landscape this additional planting may have.
Q1.3.2	HDC	BNG Monitoring Please outline any comments on the use of a Planning Performance Agreement to facilitate the resourcing of BNG monitoring in lieu of a S106 agreement.
Q1.3.3	The applicant	Mammal Gates Paragraph 7.6.15 of the Planning Statement [APP-031] summarises mitigation measures, which include mammal gates. Will these compromise in any way the security of the site?
Q1.3.4	The applicant	Planning Statement [APP-031] Paragraph 7.6.52 summarises that the extent and quality of priority habitats within the site will be enhanced, resulting in a moderate beneficial effect on a receptor of medium value that is significant. Which receptor is this?
Q1.3.5	The applicant	Planning Statement [APP-031] Paragraph 7.6.56 contains a bookmark error following the reference to the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981.
Q1.3.6	The applicant	Hazel Dormouse Paragraph 7.6.113 of the Planning Statement [APP-031] indicates that the Hazel Dormouse is likely to be absent from the site. Have any surveys been undertaken to support this and where can they be found?
Q1.3.7	Local authorities	Biodiversity Net Gain Report [APP-168] Paragraph 2.3.8 references that the Bedfordshire and Cambridgeshire's Local Nature Recovery Strategies were due to be published in December 2025. Have they been produced, and what implications, if any, have they for the proposed development?
Q1.3.8	Natural England	Biodiversity Net Gain Report [APP-168] Please confirm that you are content with the Biodiversity Net Gain report and the metric used
Q1.3.9	The applicant	Outline Landscape Environmental Management Plan [REP1-040] Paragraph 4.2.2 details membership of a steering group to be created. Are there any local specialist species related groups that should be considered for membership?
Q1.3.10	The applicant	Outline Landscape Environmental Management Plan [REP1-040] Paragraph 8.2.1 states that ecological monitoring will take place for at least 30 years. Can the applicant explain in what circumstances the monitoring would be extended in length?
Q1.3.11	The applicant	Outline Landscape Environmental Management Plan [REP1-040] Paragraph 2.6.23 refers to passerines and Corvidae. Is it possible to be more precise, as this refers to almost half of all bird species?

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Q1.3.12	Natural England	Natural England's Relevant Representation [AS-023] Bat Flight paths In your RR dated the 14 January 2026, you encourage the applicant to use a more precautionary buffer zone and extend this from 6m to 10 m and ensure the buffers are along prominent bat flight paths. NE also seeks further discussion on potential bat mitigation. Please outline what further discussions have been had on this issue and can you provide your response to the applicant's response [REP1-055] to your advice on bat flight paths and is the applicant's approach sufficient?
Q1.3.13	Natural England Cambridgeshire County Council Huntingdon District Council	Baseline ecological survey coverage Are NE, CCC and HDC satisfied with the coverage of the ecological surveys undertaken to inform the baseline conditions of the ecology and nature conservation assessment within the ES [APP-043]?
Q1.3.14	The applicant	Priority Habitats Section 3.2 of ES Appendix 7-1: Ecological Baseline Report [REP1-024] identifies the presence of Priority Habitats on site. Please provide estimates of the volumes of each habitat type.
Q1.3.15	The applicant	Priority Habitats Please provide a Habitats of Principal Importance Plan.
Q1.3.16	The applicant	Short Term Minor Adverse Effects At paragraph 7.12.2 of ES Chapter 7: Ecology and Nature Conservation [APP-043] it concludes that 'During the construction phase the Scheme would result in short term and temporary minor adverse effects on ground nesting birds, the wider breeding bird assemblage, amphibians (including great crested newt) and otter.' For clarity, can the applicant confirm whether the short term and temporary minor adverse effects are reversible?
4. Cultural heritage		
Q1.4.1	The applicant	Planning Statement [APP-031] In paragraph 7.5.54 it is stated that Historic England would raise no objection to the dDCO subject to their agreement to the final Archaeological Mitigation Strategy. However, this is inconsistent with statements made elsewhere in the application submission.
Q1.4.2	The applicant	Buried Archaeology Paragraph 8.3.24 of the Planning Statement [APP-031] states that there is potential construction phase impacts on buried archaeology in the AAC as a result of tree and hedgerow planting. Please provide a plan illustrating the areas affected.
Q1.4.3	The applicant	Harm Paragraph 8.3.31 of the Planning Statement [APP-031] summarises and concludes that there will be less than substantial heritage harm. However, this appears to disregard the moderate adverse (significant) harm outlined in paragraph 8.3.31.
Q1.4.4	The applicant	Outline Archaeological Mitigation Strategy [REP1-048] Paragraph 5.2.1 indicates that sub-area B29 has not been accessible to survey prior to submission of the draft DCO. Can the applicant why it was inaccessible and also what plans they have to survey it prior to development commencing?
Q1.4.5	The applicant	Outline Archaeological Mitigation Strategy [REP1-048] Paragraph 7.3.28 references a 'FRAC out Contingency Plan'. Could the applicant please provide further details of what this may contain?
Q1.4.6	The applicant	Outline Heritage Enhancement Strategy [REP1-050] Paragraph 4.1.2 sets out key aims and objectives of the Strategy. Should this also reflect the need to have regard to statutory duties in relation to the historic environment?
Q1.4.7	The applicant	Outline Heritage Enhancement Strategy [REP1-050] Paragraph 4.2.5 sets out the applicant's intention to host workshops for greater understanding of the historic environment. there are a number of examples of community led character appraisals and management strategies having been prepared by the local communities. Is this something that could be provided and supported, if the community wish to undertake this exercise?
Q1.4.8	Local authorities	Conservation Area Character Appraisals or Management Strategies

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		Please provide any character appraisal or management strategies that relate to the conservation areas within the vicinity of the proposed development.
Q1.4.9	The applicant	<p>Heritage Assets</p> <p>Could the heritage assets considered be itemised by volume for the different types of assets considered for both within the site and those considered to be impacted by views from outside of the site.</p>
5. Draft Development Consent Order (dDCO) & Explanatory Memorandum		
Q1.5.1	The applicant	<p>Article 8 Disapplication or Amendment of legislation or Statutory Provisions</p> <p>The guidance in section 25 of Advice Note 15 should be followed and, if not already provided, additional information sought such as</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the purpose of the legislation/statutory provision the persons/body having the power being disappplied an explanation as to the effect of disapplication and whether any protective provisions or requirements are required to prevent any adverse impact arising as a result of disapplying the legislative controls (by reference to section 120 of and Schedule 5 to the Planning Act 2008) how each disappplied provision constitutes a matter for which provision may be made in the DCO. <p>Where the consent falls within a schedule to the Infrastructure Planning (Interested Parties and Miscellaneous Prescribed Provisions) Regulations 2015 evidence will be required that the regulator has consented to removing the need for the consent in accordance with s.150 Planning Act 2008.</p>
Q1.5.2	Local authorities	<p>Article 8 Disapplication and modification of legislative provisions</p> <p>Article 8(4) seeks to disapply the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010. Do any of the Local authorities have a CIL charging schedule in place, and would the proposed development be caught by the charging schedule?</p>
Q1.5.3	The applicant	<p>Article 11 Public Rights of Way</p> <p>The Secretary of State prefers to refer to temporary closure rather than temporary stopping up of public rights of way. This will also require consequential amendments to other provisions.</p>
Q1.5.4	Local Highway Authority	<p>Article 14(2) Access to Works</p> <p>Does the local Highway Authority consider 28 days to be a sufficient timeframe in which to make a decision?</p>
Q1.5.5	The applicant	<p>Requirement 16(2) Heritage Enhancement</p> <p>This element of the Requirement should include provision for the on-site physical outputs of the Heritage Enhancement Strategy to be maintained during the life of the scheme following implementation.</p>
Q1.5.6	The applicant	<p>Article 25 Special Category</p> <p>If it is argued that special parliamentary procedure should not apply (before authorising compulsory acquisition of land or rights in land being special category land) full details should be provided to support the application of the relevant subsections in Section 130, 131 or 132, for example (in relation to common, open space or fuel or field garden allotment):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> where it is argued that land will be no less advantageous when burdened with the order right, identifying specifically the persons in whom it is vested and other persons, if any, entitled to rights of common or other rights, and clarifying the extent of public use of the land where it is argued that any suitable open space land to be given in exchange is available only at prohibitive cost, identifying specifically those costs.
Q1.5.7	The applicant	<p>Articles 30 and 31 Temporary Possession</p> <p>Given the parliamentary approval to the temporary possession regime under the Neighbourhood Planning Act 2017 ('NPA 2017'), which were subject to consultation and debate before being enacted, should any provisions relating to notices/counter notices which do not reflect the NPA 2017 proposed regime (not yet in force) be modified to more closely reflect the incoming statutory regime where possible? As examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The notice period that will be required under the NPA 2017 Act is 3 months, substantially longer than the 14 day required under article 30 (3) . Other than prior precedent, what is the justification for only requiring 14 days] notice in this case? Under the NPA 2017, the notice would also have to state the period for which the acquiring authority is to take possession. Should such a requirement be included in this case?

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Powers of temporary possession are sometimes said to be justified because they are in the interests of landowners, whose land would not then need to be acquired permanently. The NPA 2017 Act provisions include the ability to serve a counter-notice objecting to the proposed temporary possession so that the landowner would have the option to choose whether temporary possession or permanent acquisition was desirable. Should this article make some such provision – whether or not in the form in the NPA 2017?
Q1.5.8	The applicant	<p>Article 32 and 33 Statutory Undertakers and Apparatus</p> <p>Where a representation is made by a statutory undertaker (or some other person) that engages section 127(1) of the Planning Act 2008 and has not been withdrawn, the Secretary of State will be unable to authorise compulsory acquisition powers relating to that statutory undertaker land unless satisfied of specified matters set out in section 127. If the representation is not withdrawn by the end of the examination, the ExA will need to reach a conclusion whether or not to recommend that the relevant statutory test has been met in accordance with s.127.</p> <p>The Secretary of State will be unable to authorise removal or repositioning of apparatus (or extinguishment of a right for it) unless satisfied that the extinguishment or removal is necessary for the purpose of carrying out the development to which the order relates in accordance with section 138 of the Planning Act 2008. Justification will be needed to show that extinguishment or removal is necessary.</p>
Q1.5.9	The applicant	<p>Article 34 (4) Temporary Use of Land for Carrying out the Authorised Development</p> <p>Suggest amendment to :</p> <p>The undertaker may not, without the agreement of the owners of the land, remain in possession under this article after the end of the period of one year beginning with the date of completion of the part of the authorised development which temporary possession of the land was taken unless the undertaker has, by the end of that period, served a notice of entry under section 11 (powers of entry) of the 1965 Act or made a declaration under section 4 (execution of declaration) of the 1981 Act in relation to that land.</p> <p>This would be in line with recent DCO's issued by the Secretary of State such as Stone Street Solar (EN010135).</p>
Q1.5.10	The applicant	<p>Article 41(5) and Hedgerow plans</p> <p>Hedgerow plans show the proposed removal of several hedgerows which border a publicly maintainable highway. Per Part 7, Article 41(5) of DCO, has prior consent of the relevant Highway Authority been obtained?</p>
Q1.5.11	The applicant	<p>Article 44 Unreasonably withholding consent</p> <p>Article 44 Requirements, appeal etc refers to not unreasonably withhold consent. This will require consequential amendments to other provisions in line with the Secretary of States decision on Stone Street Solar (EN01010135).</p>
Q1.5.12	The applicant	<p>Article 47 Crown Rights</p> <p>Consent under section 135 (1) and (2) also will need be obtained from the Crown authority.</p>
6. Landscape and visual impact assessment		
Q1.6.1	The applicant	<p>LVIA Methodology</p> <p>Provide evidence of the effort made to agree the study area for LVIA with relevant consultees, as advised in Table 5.3 of the ES Chapter 5: Landscape and Visual [APP-041].</p>
Q1.6.2	The applicant	<p>Planning Statement [APP-031]</p> <p>Paragraph 7.4.39 states that following the establishment of planting adjacent to PRoW, that long term significant visual effects would remain. Can the applicant elaborate as to whether the options for reducing these effects have been exhausted?</p>
Q1.6.3	The applicant	<p>Chapter 5 Landscape and Visual [APP-041]</p> <p>Paragraph 5.2.2 indicates that there is no legislation specific to the assessment of landscape and visual effects. Can the applicant comment on the relevance of Section 245 of the Levelling Up and Regeneration Act 2023.</p>
Q1.6.4	Local authorities	<p>Chapter 5 Landscape and Visual [APP-041]</p> <p>Paragraph 5.3.6 indicates that the local authorities have not commissioned an external qualified resource to comment on the LVIA. Has this now been commissioned jointly by the local authorities?</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
7. Need		
Q1.7.1	The applicant	Planning Statement [APP-031] Given the estimated timeline of the proposed development from application and decision stage, how long will it take to commission contractors to commence works to ensure that targets are delivered by 2030?
Q1.7.2	The applicant	Planning Statement [APP-031] Paragraph 2.6.10 suggests that the proposed development could theoretically supply almost half all electricity that BCC and HDC collectively consume but source from non-renewable generation. Could the applicant provide some calculations and further evidence to support the claim made?
Q1.7.3	The applicant	Planning Statement [APP-031] Paragraph 3.3.3 states that there are no extant planning permissions affected by the Scheme. Appendix A provides details of a planning permission granted for Site A (Ref: 23/02048/M73) for a solar farm development. Could the applicant elaborate further on the details of this permission and how the proposed scheme differs from that previously approved by BBC.
Q1.7.4	The applicant	Planning Statement [APP-031] Paragraph 3.4.3 states 'As a starting assumption a 400 MW solar farm could be expected to require between 800 to 1,600 acres of land to deliver, which approximately equates to between 325 and 650 hectares.' The narrative does not go on to justify why the size of the proposed development is 773 hectares. Could the applicant expand upon this?
8. Noise and vibration		
Q1.8.1	The applicant	ES Chapter 10: Noise and Vibration [APP-046] In Table 10.6, response to consultee Planning Inspectorate ID 3.6.1 refers to Appendix 10-3 Construction Plant Data which includes a section on sample test data from vibration measurements from HGVs and other vehicles on local roads and access roads in the UK. It is stated that results show no significant vibration levels are likely and no exceedance of nuisance thresholds or cosmetic damage criteria and therefore no significance effect. Please explain how the referenced table suggests that and why national sample test data would accurately reflect this specific scheme.
Q1.8.2	The applicant	Noise reflection As part of their noise assessment, has the applicant taken noise reflection from the solar panels into consideration, including both noises generated by the proposed development itself and also existing noise sources which the panels could potentially amplify at certain receptors? Please provide further clarification.
Q1.8.3	The applicant	ES Chapter 10 Noise and Vibration [APP-046] Paragraph 10.8.28 states that under normal road conditions (i.e. maintained roads) there is no likely perceptible vibration at property facades. With regard to the specific roads surrounding this scheme which will incur HGV movement, has any assessment of their baseline condition been conducted to ensure they are considered 'normal'?
9. Socio-economic effects		
Q1.9.1	The applicant	Equality Duty Please provide a note on the proposed development's potential impacts for the Public Sector Equality Duty.
Q1.9.2	The applicant	ES Chapter 14 Socio-Economics, Land Use, and Tourism [APP-050] Paragraph 14.2.3 refers to the 2004 version of the NPS for Renewable Energy Infrastructure (EN-3), please update with the latest version of the NPS EN-3.
10. Geology and soil		
Q1.10.1	The applicant	ALC Classification Tables 13.10 and 13.11 of ES Chapter 13 Land and Soils APP-049] provide an analysis of the proportion of ALC of the site compared to individual local authorities. Please provide additional tables highlighting similar comparison to the region and nationally.
Q1.10.2	The applicant	Natural England's Relevant Representation [AS-023] Agricultural Land Classification In their RR dated the 14 January 2026, NE state that "survey intensity should be increased as necessary to accurately define BMV boundaries and to characterise the full range of soil types and limitations present. Can the applicant confirm that this will be agreed with NE through the Statement of Common Ground.

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
11. Traffic and Transport		
Q1.11.1	The applicant	Planning Statement [APP-031] Paragraph 4.7.14 provides details of construction workers. How have average and peak totals been calculated?
Q1.11.2	The applicant	Planning Statement [APP-031] Paragraph 4.7.17 provides details of construction hours of work workers. It is noted that this references no construction work on Sundays or Bank Holidays. This should also reference Public Holidays.
Q1.11.3	The applicant and Local Highway Authorities	Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [REP1-034] Section 4.5 provides details of Sustainable Travel options for construction workers. It is noted that construction workers 'will be encouraged' to use or consider sustainable travel measures. I also note references to sustainable transport options being 'promoted' or 'provided' in Table 16.3 of ES Chapter 16: Other Environmental Topics [APP-052] Given this assumption has been used to inform traffic generation figures, can the applicant consider a regime where construction workers were compelled to use sustainable travel options, such as the drop off/ pick up option outlined in paragraphs 4.5.5 and 4.5.6. How could this be controlled and enforced through a Requirement to ensure traffic volumes do not increase and put pressure on the strategic road network? Can the Local Highway Authorities comment on the sustainable travel options for the transport of construction workers to the site and could other initiatives be considered?
Q1.11.4	The applicant	HGVs Paragraph 7.11.17 of the Planning Statement [APP-031] discusses the reducing the impact of HGVs travelling to and from the site will be managed to minimise the number of HGVs arriving during the highway peak hours. How will this be enforced and what happens if drivers choose to ignore the measures put in place?
Q1.11.5	The applicant	NH in their RR [RR-904] request that the applicant provides additional explanation concerning the expected impact on the A1 Junction with the B645 during the peak hours to confirm if further assessment (modelling) is required. It is also noted that significant impact occurs just outside the peak hours which could see a shift in the peak hours. The level of impact would ordinarily warrant further analysis of junction performance due to the significant volume of trips presented. Can the applicant update on the progress of providing the additional information and analysis?
Q1.11.6	The applicant	NH in their RR [RR-904] also request that further detail concerning the monitoring regime for construction activities and related vehicular movements are provided in the OCEMP [APP-155], consistent with other consented DCOs. Can the applicant update on the progress of providing the additional information.
Q1.11.7	The applicant	Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan [REP1-042] Paragraph 3.2.2 sets out examples of groups that are to form a community liaison group in relation to alterations to the PRow network. Are there any local PRow groups that should be included in this list?
12. Water environment and flood risk		
Q1.12.1	The applicant	Flood Risk Chapter 8 of the ES: Hydrology and Flood Risk [REP1-009] states flood risk has been assessed in accordance with legislation and policy but does not mention consideration of data sourced from the new National Flood Risk Assessment (NaFRA) published by the Environment Agency. Please confirm if this guidance is considered relevant in this Scheme. If not, please provide a justification as to why.
Q1.12.2	The applicant	Suspended Solids Table 8.12 (Chapter 8 of the ES Hydrology and Flood Risk [REP1-009]) which contains the Construction Phase Impact Assessment shows the intended management of surface water runoff but provides little to no mitigation details for limiting the discharge of suspended solids. Please expand in that regard.
Q1.12.3	The applicant	Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) [APP-098] Paragraph 3.6.3 of the FRA refers to the available borehole records and the geology of the site, with bedrock permeability being poorly draining with a low permeability range. This is mentioned in the context of the risk of groundwater flooding being low across the site, does this geology contribute to any other source of flooding?
Q1.12.4	The applicant	Outline Surface Water Management Plan [REP1-046]

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		Table 6 in paragraph 6.5.12 refers to 'cute' grass'. I assume this is cut grass? In relation to the arisings will they be left on site to contribute to any biodiversity improvements or will they be disposed of to ensure better drainage?
Q1.12.5	The applicant	<p>Sustainable Water Supply</p> <p>The Environment Agency in their Relevant Representation [RR-367] state that they are not confident that a suitable and sustainable water supply for the construction phase of the development has not been identified. Could the applicant provide an update on this and also how this may impact firefighting in the event of an outbreak of fire on site?</p>
Q1.12.6	Cambridgeshire Fire and Rescue Service	<p>Water Supply for Fire Fighting</p> <p>Given the concerns raised by the Environment Agency in the aforementioned representation , can the Fire Service comment on the suitability of the water supply for firefighting purposes.</p>