

Tween Bridge Solar Farm

8.3 Written Summary of Oral Submissions at the Preliminary Meeting

Planning Act 2008
Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms
and Procedure) Regulations 2009

Document Reference: 8.3

Deadline 1 May 2026

Revision 1

Written Summary of Oral Submissions at the Preliminary Meeting

Table of Contents:

1	Introduction.....	3
2	Agenda item 1 – Welcome, introductions and arrangements for the hearing.....	3
3	Agenda item 2 – The Examining Authority’s remarks about the examination process.....	4
4	Agenda item 3 – Initial assessment of principal issues.....	4
5	Agenda item 4 – Draft examination timetable.....	4
6	Agenda item 5 – Procedural Decisions	5
7	Agenda item 6 – Procedural decisions for the examination.....	6
8	Agenda item 7 – Any other matters.....	7
9	Agenda item 8 – closure of PM	8

1 Introduction

1.1. Introduction

- 1.2. This document summarises the oral submissions made on behalf of RWE Renewables UK Solar and Storage Limited (**the Applicant**) at the Preliminary Hearing (**PM**) on 14 April 2026 in relation to the Applicant's application for development consent for the Tween Bridge Solar Farm (**the Scheme**).
- 1.3. This document does not purport to summarise the oral submissions made by other parties at the PM and references to submissions made by other parties are only included to give context to the Applicant's submissions in response.
- 1.4. Reflective of the Applicant's confirmation that a detailed response would be provided at Deadline 1, this document also includes post-hearing responses to some matters raised at the PM. Where the comment is a post-hearing comment submitted by the Applicant, this is indicated.
- 1.5. This document uses the headings for each item in the agenda for the PM published in the Rule 6 Letter published by the Examining Authority (**ExA**) on 16 March 2026 [**PD-005**].

2 Agenda item 1 – Welcome, introductions and arrangements for the hearing

- 2.1. The Applicant was represented at the PM by Tom McNamara (**TM**), TLT LLP, Legal Director.
- 2.2. The following parties who intended to make submissions during the PM were introduced:
 - 2.2.1. ██████████ representing North Lincolnshire Council (**NLC**) and ██████████
██████████ representing City of Doncaster Council (**CDC**), together **the Councils**.
 - 2.2.2. ██████████ representing National Highways (**NH**);
 - 2.2.3. Ms Beverley Georgiou, a local resident; and
 - 2.2.4. Mr Howard Grady and Mrs Jane Grady.

3 Agenda item 2 – The Examining Authority’s remarks about the examination process

- 3.1. The Applicant did not make submissions on this agenda item.

4 Agenda item 3 – Initial assessment of principal issues

- 4.1. The Applicant did not make submissions on this agenda item.

5 Agenda item 4 – Draft examination timetable

- 5.1. In response to the ExA’s comments on the draft examination timetable set out in Annex D of the Rule 6 Letter [PD-005], TM confirmed that the Applicant had no comments on the examination timetable but had one related point to highlight.
- 5.2. TM explained that the Applicant was currently progressing a piece of work, the purpose of which was to stress test the conclusions of the Environmental Statement (ES) submitted with the Development Consent Order (DCO) application, having regard to the Scheme’s receipt of a ‘Gate 2 Phase 2’ grid connection offer from the National Energy System Operator in December 2025. This meant the scheme was currently anticipated to connect to the national grid transmission network between the years 2031-2035, which would therefore result in a delay to the timetable assumed in the ES, which was based on the Scheme connecting to the network from 2029.
- 5.3. TM confirmed that this submission would take the form of a sensitivity report (**the Sensitivity Test Report**), which the Applicant was proposing to submit at Deadline 2. TM set out that the Applicant considered this was an appropriate deadline. Firstly, because this was the date by which the Applicant reasonably considered the relevant analysis could be completed by the relevant technical specialists for submission. Second, because the submission would be made early in the examination timetable, affording sufficient time for the ExA and Interested Parties to consider the document and make further submissions in respect of it. Third, because there would be sufficient time beyond Deadline 2 for the ExA to accommodate any specific questions arising from the submission in the agendas for the hearings scheduled in late June 2026. Fourth,

because there would also be sufficient time for any questions arising from the ExA's consideration of the document to form the basis of written questions, where appropriate, as part of the ExA's second written questions due to be published in early July 2026.

- 5.4. In response to the ExA's query regarding the precise purpose of the Sensitivity Test Report, and whether amendments would need to be made to the ES as a result, TM explained that the purpose of the Sensitivity Test Report was to consider whether the ES conclusions as to the likely significant effects of the Scheme, remained robust as a result of the delay to the grid connection date. The work in progress to this point was indicating that the ES assessment conclusions remained robust and so formal updates to the ES were not considered to be necessary. TM clarified that the document was therefore proposed to be provided as a standalone submission, with any data relied upon set out within that submission but would nevertheless include appropriate cross-references to the ES and any other relevant documents and, where necessary, include explanation of how those documents should be read in light of the Sensitivity Test Report.
- 5.5. In response to [REDACTED] suggestion on behalf of NH that a future issue specific hearing be held related to transport matters, TM deferred to the ExA but did not see a specific reason why transport matters could not in principle at least be addressed via the written process, including written questions. TM also noted that the Protective Provisions for NH were progressing, and the Applicant expected there to be a significant narrowing of the issues as the examination progressed.

6 Agenda item 5 – Procedural Decisions

- 6.1. Ms Georgiou made a number of submissions in respect of the pre-application and examination engagement processes.
- 6.2. TM noted and thanked Ms Georgiou for the submission. TM explained that the Applicant understood that the process underpinning the development of a project of this nature was complex, with varied and numerous touchpoints for public participation. Once the DCO examination commenced, the process was led by the Planning Inspectorate and the examination timetable, however the Applicant committed to speaking with Ms Georgiou following the close of the PM to discuss the process and opportunities for engagement going forwards.

- 6.3. TM made two further submissions in response to Ms Georgiou's submission:
- 6.3.1. all relevant Scheme information could be found on the Scheme's project page on PINS' website which was more generally a helpful place to find out more about the DCO examination process; and
- 6.3.2. in response to Mrs Georgiou's submission that the language used in site notices was difficult to interpret, TM explained that the reason for this was that many of the notices had to reflect statutory requirements as to form and content. However, TM noted that site notices were just one aspect of the publicity that the Applicant had undertaken to date and that the Applicant had also provided other more publicly accessible documents such as leaflets and newsletters.
- 6.4. Post-hearing note: the Applicant followed up directly with Ms Georgiou in person following the PM to discuss her submission and offer advice and assistance with finding information about the Scheme on the PINS project website page. The Applicant agreed to, and has subsequently actioned, emailing Ms Georgiou a direct link to the Landscape and Visual Mitigation Strategy [Document Reference 6.4.6.4 Revision 2]. The Applicant also offered to send a hard copy of the plan at size A3 in the post. The same email was sent to Mr and Mrs Grady who also attended the PM and following the close of the PM, asked the Applicant in person to direct them to the Landscape and Visual Mitigation Strategy.**

7 Agenda item 6 – Procedural decisions for the examination

- 7.1. The ExA drew attention to Annex F of the Rule 6 Letter, noting that draft versions of Statements of Common Ground (**SoCGs**) were to be submitted at Deadline 1 and final versions were to be required at Deadline 8. The ExA requested that where an SoCG was dealing with an assessment within the ES, that issues relating to the environmental baseline, the likely significant effects, mitigation measures and residual effects should be separately and clearly signposted by the relevant parties. TM confirmed that this request was noted and would be actioned.
- 7.2. TM also made the following submissions:

- 7.2.1. In relation to the SoCGs listed in Annex F of the Rule 6 Letter, TM confirmed that the Applicant was happy with the list provided but noted that the Applicant was also seeking to agree an SoCG with the Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust for submission at Deadline 1. TM set out that in respect of the SoCG with the fire and rescue services included in the list in Annex F, there was not on the Applicant's understanding an entity known as North Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue Service. The Applicant was proposing to enter into an SoCG with South Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Service (who were included on the list in Annex F). In respect of the Humberside Fire and Rescue Service (who were not included in the Annex F list), TM noted that Humberside Fire and Rescue Service had not submitted a relevant representation. Despite this, the Applicant had contacted them to propose an SoCG but had not received a response to date.
- 7.2.2. **Post-hearing note: the Humberside Fire and Rescue Service have confirmed that they do not want to progress a SoCG in respect of the Scheme. Evidence of this position is provided at Appendix B of the Statement of Commonality [Document Reference 9.1 Revision 1] submitted at Deadline 1.**
- 7.2.3. TM noted that the Applicant had provided a list of suggested locations to the ExA for its accompanied site inspection.
- 7.2.4. In respect of maintaining a status of application documents document throughout the examination, TM confirmed that as acknowledged in the Applicant's Response to s51 Advice Covering Letter [AS-021], the Applicant would maintain a document known as the **Application Document Schedule [Document Reference 8.1 Revision 2]** which would reflect document updates throughout the examination.
- 7.2.5. TM noted that its responses to Relevant Representations would be submitted at Deadline 1 [**Document Reference 8.2 Revision 1**].
- 7.2.6. In respect of the cancellation of the Preliminary Meeting originally scheduled for Tuesday 10 March, TM noted that the Applicant was grateful for the expeditious start to the examination facilitated subsequently.

8 Agenda item 7 – Any other matters

- 8.1. TM made a final submission in respect of procedural issues, confirming that the Applicant was at the early stages of considering a potential update to the Scheme

which resulted from consultation and engagement with stakeholders. TM noted two points in respect of this proposed update:

- 8.1.1. The update was at the early stages; the Applicant has only recently launched a period of engagement with stakeholders to understand whether it would be appropriate to proceed with the update.
- 8.1.2. Having given early consideration to PINS' guidance on changes to an application after it has been submitted for examination¹, the Applicant's initial view was that the update was not such that it would engage the formal change process set out in the guidance. However, TM noted that the Applicant accepted that this decision was a matter for the ExA. With regards to timetable, TM noted that if the update was progressed, the Applicant was targeting the end of this month for a written submission to the ExA setting out the nature and purpose of the update and would be seeking procedural advice from the ExA in relation to the update and how it should be examined as part of the ongoing examination. In response to the ExA's query whether the proposed update included a change to Order Limits, TM confirmed that this was not the Applicant's intention and that the proposed update did not include any change to land or works powers.
- 8.2. **Action: the Applicant to write to the ExA with details of the proposed updates to the Scheme by 30th April 2026.**
- 8.3. **Post-hearing note: the Applicant wrote to the ExA with details of the proposed updates to the Scheme on 30 April 2026.**

9 Agenda item 8 – closure of PM

- 9.1. The ExA closed the PM.