



Application by RWE Renewables UK Solar and Storage Limited for Tween Bridge Solar Farm Project

The Examining Authority's written questions and requests for information (ExQ3): Issued on 11 August 2026

Responses are due by deadline 6: 22 September 2026

The following table sets out the Examining Authority's (ExA's) written questions and requests for information – ExQ3.

Questions are set out using an issues-based framework derived from the initial assessment of principal issues provided as **annex B** to the Rule 6 Letter dated 16 March 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 3 (indicating that it is from ExQ3) and then has an issue number and a question number. For example, the first question is identified as Q3.1.1. When you are answering a question, please start your answer by quoting the unique reference number.

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 (ExQ3)' when asked.

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'.

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: [Examination Library](#). 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 ExQ3 3.1.1 – refers to question 1 in this table.

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.**



Abbreviations:

ALC	Agricultural Land Classification	LVMS	Landscape and visual mitigation strategy
BESS	Battery Energy Storage System	LWS	Local Wildlife Site
BMV	Best and Most Versatile	MWh	Megawatt Hours
BOAT	Byway open to all traffic	NDHA	Non-designated heritage assets
CA	Compulsory Acquisition	NE	Natural England
CDC	City of Doncaster Council	NGET	National Grid Electricity Transmission Plc
CFL	Critical Flood Level	NLC	North Lincolnshire Council
CLWS	Candidate Local Wildlife Site	NPA	Neighbourhood Planning Act
CNP	Critical National Priority	NPS	National Policy Statement
dDCO	Draft development consent order	NSIP	Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project
DESNZ	Department for Energy Security and Net Zero	OECMP	Outline ecological construction management plan
DfT	Department for Transport	OLEMP	Outline landscape ecological management plan
DL	Decision letter	PA2008	Planning Act 2008
EA	Environment Agency	PPG	National Planning Practice Guidance
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment	PRoW	Public right of way
EM	Explanatory Memorandum	PV	Photovoltaic
ES	Environmental Statement	RR	Relevant representation
ExA	Examining Authority	RVAA	Residential Visual Amenity Assessment
FRA	Flood Risk Assessment	SOAEL	Significant observed adverse effect level
km	Kilometre	SPA	Special Protection Area
kV	Kilovolt	SSSI	Site of Special Scientific Interest
LOAEL	Lowest observed adverse effect level	TP	Temporary Possession



Index

1. General and cross-topic questions	5
2. Biodiversity and ecology (Including Habitat Regulations Assessment).....	5
3. Climate change	7
4. Compulsory acquisition, temporary possession and other land or rights considerations.....	7
5. The draft Development Consent Order (DCO)	7
6. Cultural heritage	7
7. Flood Risk, hydrology, and water resources	7
8. Landscape and visual	8
9. Land use, soil and ground conditions	8
10. Network connection	8
11. Noise and vibration.....	8
12. Socio-economic	8
13. Transport and access.....	9
14. Other matters.....	9

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
1. General and cross-topic questions		
Q3.1.1	The applicant, North Lincolnshire Council (NLC) and City of Doncaster Council (CDC)	Closing statements Please submit a closing statement at deadline 8. The closing statement should set out the final position with regard to each of the issues identified in the initial assessment of principle issues [PR-005] and any other issues where there is a disagreement as to the residual effects of the proposed development. Where the Councils dispute or disagree with any part of the applicant's assessment contained in the Environmental Statement (ES), they should set out an explanation as to why they disagree and confirm what they consider the effects to be (i.e. how do the Council's conclusions differ from the applicant's). Please ensure that closing statements are concise and identify the outstanding issues as opposed to providing a historical chronology of how the issues have evolved over the examination.
Q3.1.2	NLC, CDC	Emerging development plan policies Where not already provided, could NLC and CDC please provide the most up-to-date position of emerging development plan documents. Where not already addressed, please confirm the relevance of any policies contained in emerging documents.
Q3.1.3	All parties	Changes to layout The applicants Deadline 4 covering letter [REP4-001] noted a number of design amendments, which are summarised as follows: • Removal of solar panels from fields E19 and E20. • Spatial refinement of 132 kilovolt (kV) substation and 100 megawatt (MW) battery energy storage system (BESS) within Flood Zone 3b. • Reconfiguration of solar panels within field E15. All parties are invited to provide representations in relation to these amendments. The ExA accepted the amendments in its procedural decision dated 11 August 2026.
2. Biodiversity and ecology (Including Habitat Regulations Assessment)		
Q3.2.1	Applicant	Land within Thorne & Hatfield Moors Special Area of Conservation (SAC), Special Protection Area (SPA) and Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) (NE11B) The applicant's response to EXQ2 2.3.2 [REP4-062] is noted but could the applicant please provide the following information: 1: Update on the likelihood of an agreement being reached and the likely timescale for this? 2: Explanation for why a transfer to Natural England (NE) is being sought? Is this necessary? 3: Explanation for what mechanism would be used to transfer the land and how this would alter or have a bearing on the draft Development Consent Order (dDCO) [REP5-002]? 4: Fully signposted explanation of how the current dDCO [REP5-002] and relevant management plans would ensure that the land is managed in the event that an agreement is not reached with NE prior to the closure of the examination. The applicant is advised that this matter should be settled before the examination closes and a full explanation given as to the consequences for this application. For example, is this a matter which is ultimately going to be addressed outside of the DCO process? If it is, then does the applicant consider that it is even material to the consideration of this application?
Q3.2.2	Applicant, CDC and NLC	Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) The ExA notes CDC's response to EXQ2 Q2.2.5 [REP4-082]. Could CDC and the applicant please come to an agreement on draft wording for dDCO Requirement 8(3)(a). Reference should be made to specific percentages for different area-based habitat units. The applicant is advised to acknowledge the approach taken by the Secretary of State (SoS) and ExA in considering the Peartree solar farm made Order. In that case, the applicant's final dDCO omitted any commitment to percentage BNG in the wording of the Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) requirement. However, paragraph 3.4.54 of the recommendation report shows that the applicant provided additional wording, including area-based habitat unit BNG percentages, on a without prejudice basis. Ultimately that alternative wording was included in the made DCO. In addition, the applicant should also note the examples cited in CDC's response to EXQ2 Q2.2.5. If a different approach is proposed for Tween Bridge then the applicant will need to fully justify this. CDC and the applicant should also explain how CDC's involvement in monitoring would be secured and funded within the dDCO. NLC should also provide representations confirming whether it intends to be involved in the monitoring of new habitats in relation to BNG.
Q3.2.3	Applicant	Desk Study and Walkover Surveys

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:							
		In response to EXQ2 Q2.2.11 [REP4-080], NE states in part: “In terms of HRA implications, we broadly agree with the conclusions drawn, however, whilst it is clear which protected species surveys will be carried out, it is not clear how assessment of the pre-construction baseline will be gathered for impacts on Humber Estuary SPA/Ramsar birds. With later construction start dates, the wintering/passage bird surveys to inform the baseline become increasingly out of date. We would suggest, at a minimum, commitment to complete a desk study and walkover survey prior to construction to determine if habitat suitability has increased for SPA/Ramsar birds. We advise overall that any re-assessment of the ecological baseline conditions should be to determine if any additional ecological mitigation is required beyond that already specified in the outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) (and any other relevant environmental documents).” Could the applicant please confirm how the dDCO and/ or application documents will ensure that desk studies and walkover surveys are undertaken where necessary (i.e. where existing surveys become out-of-date)?							
Q3.2.4	Applicant, CDC and NLC	Outline ecological construction management plan Paragraph 11.2 of the applicant’s outline ecological construction management plan (OECMP) [RE5-030] states in part: “The Development Consent Order (DCO) will contain a requirement providing that the final Outline Ecological Construction Management Plan [Document Reference 7.5 Revision 4] shall be submitted to and approved by the relevant local planning authority.” However, it does not appear that schedule 2 of the latest version of the dDCO [REP5-002] includes a separate requirement for a final ecological construction management plan. Requirement 8(b) requires that the landscape and ecological management plan is substantially in accordance with the OECMP. Is this the requirement which effectively secures the measures set out in the OECMP? Please note, this appears to be NE’s conclusion at Table 1 (issue NE0) of its deadline 5 representation [REP5-066].							
Q3.2.5	Applicant	Non-breeding birds and construction NEs deadline 5 representation [REP5-066] (NE7) states in part: “Following email communications with the Applicant dated 29 July 2026 in which we enquired around the justification for the months of restriction considering the bird survey results, the Applicant has confirmed they will be amending these to October to February in all relevant documents at Deadline 5. Based on the proposed October to February restriction period, alongside the measures outlined in 7.2.67 – 7.2.76 of the HRA, we consider this point is now resolved.” Could the applicant explain how this is secured in the dDCO [REP5-002]? If it isn’t secured, please amend accordingly.							
Q3.2.6	Applicant	NE deadline 5 submission For each of the issues identified by NE in its deadline 5 submission [REP5-066] the applicant should identify which plan or document mitigation measures referred to by NE are secured in. The applicant should also explain how any such measures are secured in the DCO [REP5-002]. In undertaking this exercise, if the applicant identifies any instances where measures relied upon in NEs conclusions are not secured, documents should be updated accordingly. This should be set out in tabulated form with the following headings: <table><tr><td>Issue (i.e. NE1, NE2)</td><td>Effect</td><td>Mitigation (or addressed by)</td><td>Document and DCO reference</td></tr></table>				Issue (i.e. NE1, NE2)	Effect	Mitigation (or addressed by)	Document and DCO reference
Issue (i.e. NE1, NE2)	Effect	Mitigation (or addressed by)	Document and DCO reference						
Q3.2.7	Applicant	Air quality effects NEs deadline 5 response [REP5-066] (NE13) states in part: “Natural England has now changed its approach to responding to air quality impacts and we have attached our standard advice on NSIPs (Appendix 1). You should review any further information received in line with Natural England’s advice to assess the application. This standard advice is Natural England’s formal statutory advice. It provides decision makers with the information needed to fulfil their statutory duties when making decisions on NSIP applications with potential air pollution impacts. Any overall conclusion regarding impacts on statutory protected sites must take into account the standard advice for air pollution.” Please could the applicant consider the standing advice and set out the implications for the proposed development and consideration of this application? Please refer to relevant application documents where necessary.							
Q3.2.8	Applicant and NE	Great Crested Newts The applicant should address and provide an update on NEs deadline 5 submissions [REP5-066] in relation to Great Crested Newts (GCN). Could NE please advise what the implications of this are for the consideration of this application. In particular, NE advises that a precautionary approach should be taken - where GCN should be considered present in ponds. If this were the case, what are the implications? Please bear in mind that the examination is at a very advanced stage. As such, it is not clear whether the applicant would have sufficient time to undertake additional survey effort during the examination.							
Q3.2.9	Applicant	BNG Please could the applicant provide a full response to NEs deadline 5 submission [REP5-066] in respect to the applicant’s approach to ‘trading rules’?							

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
3.	Climate change	
Q3.3.1	N/A	No further questions at this time
4.	Compulsory acquisition, temporary possession and other land or rights considerations	
Q3.4.1	NLC	NLC It is not clear why NLC has not responded to the applicant with regard to plot 10/12, as addressed at paragraph 4.58 of the applicant's written summary of oral submissions at the compulsory acquisition hearing [REP4-061]. A response should be provided by deadline 6. If agreement cannot be reached then NLC should set out the areas of disagreement and outline what the implications are when considering the relevant statutory tests contained in the Planning Act 2008.
Q3.4.2	Applicant	Q4.0.14 – Funding The Applicant's response to EXQ2 2.4.4 [REP4-062] is noted but the question was related to total development cost worst-case assumptions. Please could the applicant update its response accordingly?
Q3.4.3	Applicant	Private loss, public benefit and diligent enquiry The applicant's written summary of oral subs at CAH [REP4-061] indicates that the schedule of land owner negotiations has been updated on the basis that it included category 2 and 3 persons. However, the ExA requires the applicant to identify (where no contact has been made or no agreement reached) how private loss would be outweighed by public benefits in each category 1, 2 and 3 case. This can be done on the basis of the evidence before the applicant. Where a category 2 or 3 person has not made a representation or contacted the applicant, then the applicant should base its response on any available evidence of private loss. If necessary, the applicant can provide a blanket justification in certain circumstances (for example, X to X are lenders and their private loss extends to x, this is outweighed by x). Please also provide a statement of diligent enquiry for each party (in all categories) who has not responded. This should include documentary evidence of efforts to contact APs.
Q3.4.4	Applicant	Identification of plots In the Peartree Solar Farm recommendation report, pages 131 to 144 address objections to CA or site-specific issues. In each case, the ExA sets out all affected plots under the following categories: • "CA of land". • "CA of rights". • "TP of land". Could the applicant please provide a breakdown under these categories of relevant plots in all cases where agreements haven't been reached, where there are disagreements on protective provisions or other disagreements/ objections. The aim is to assist the ExA in clearly setting out affected plots in producing the recommendation report. Please also provide a broad description of the location of the plots. For example: "Land in the north of the order limits".
5.	The draft Development Consent Order (DCO)	
Q3.5.1	All parties	DCO Commentary Please note that the ExAs commentary on the dDCO [REP5-002] is provided under separate cover.
6.	Cultural heritage	
Q3.6.1	Applicant	Archaeology Please could the applicant respond to CDC's response to EXQ2 Q2.6.3 [REP4-082]. In particular, could the applicant please provide a response to CDCs request for further information in relation to the archaeological potential and mitigation options where components of the proposed development do not include flexibility, or only include limited flexibility (for example substations and battery energy storage systems (BESS))?
7.	Flood Risk, hydrology, and water resources	
Q3.7.1	Applicant, CDC, NLC and EA	Flood Plain Storage and Sequential/Exceptions Test It is noted that the applicant has revised the indicative layout of the proposed development such that a reduced part of one BESS unit would be located in Flood Zone 3b. However, could the applicant please respond to the following queries: 1) Please could the applicant clearly set out the effect of the proposed development on floodplain storage, taking into account the revisions to the indicative layout?

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		2) Please could the applicant update the sequential and exceptions tests to take account of the revised layout and representations from NLC at deadline 3 [REP3-079] (including references to proposed overplanting). Please could the CDC, NLC and the EA provide representations on the revised layout and the extent to which any previous objections or concerns have been addressed?
8. Landscape and visual		
Q3.8.1	CDC and NLC	Residential Visual Amenity Assessment (RVAA) The applicant has updated the RVAA [REP4-028] to include an assessment of involved properties. Could CDC and NLC provide any representations on this, if considered necessary?
Q3.8.2	Applicant, CDC and NLC	Landscape and Visual Mitigation Strategy (LVMS) [REP4-042] The LVMS is not cross referenced properly in the outline landscape ecological management plan (OLEMP) [REP4-055]. Please refer to the latest version submitted at deadline 4 [REP4-042] and amend references accordingly. How is the LVMS secured? It is noted that it is listed as a plan to be certified in the dDCO. It is also noted that dDCO requirement 6 requires that each phase must include a programme for landscaping works. It is acknowledged that this must be in accordance with the LVMS. However, a 'programme' is not the same as a plan. The ExA is concerned that there is no DCO mechanism to make changes to the LVMS or means by which to set out detailed landscape proposals for each phase of the development. Please could the applicant address this? The ExA advises that the LVMS should be appended to the OLEMP. This is the approach normally taken in respect of solar DCO proposals and would address the lack of flexibility and future scope for further detail set out above. The applicant would need to amend the dDCO wording to account for this. NLC and CDC should provide representations on this matter.
9. Land use, soil and ground conditions		
Q3.9.1	N/A	No further questions at this time.
10. Network connection		
Q3.10.1	Applicant	NLC references to case law Could the applicant provide a legal opinion on the submissions made by NLC in response to EXQ2 Q2.10.1 and Q2.10.2 [REP4-081]?
Q3.10.2	Applicant	Point of connection The applicant's response to EXQ2 2.10.3 [REP4-062] is noted. However, if the gate 2 offer has not yet been made then what implications does this have for the asserted legally binding obligation on NGET to provide a point of connection? This is particularly important, because part of the premise of the applicant's case - in response to previous questions concerning the prospect of a connection being secured - relies on this asserted legal obligation. Please provide a clear summary of the overall legal obligations and how they interrelate to ensure that a grid connection will be secured. Please support this with evidence and append it to the applicant's response to EXQ3.
11. Noise and vibration		
Q3.11.1	Applicant	Nighttime working The applicant's response to EXQ2 question 3.11.3 [REP4-062] highlights that ES Chapter 13 [REP4-018] has been updated to take into account worst-case scenario assumptions in relation to nighttime horizontal directional drilling (HDD). However, ES paragraph 13.5.34 does not clearly set out what the pre-mitigation likely significant effects would be. Neither does it explain what the residual effects would be post-mitigation. It is noted that ES table 13-25 has not been amended and that construction effects prior to mitigation are minor (not significant) with residual effects also unchanged at 'negligible/minor adverse'. However, is this accurate when taking into account that ES paragraph 13.4.34 states in part: "At dwellings in the vicinity of drill location 19 as identified on drawing reference ES Figure 2.4 Indicative HDD Crossing Plan [APP-137], the initial calculation indicates the SOAEL criterion could be exceeded, with a predicted level of LAeq 58dB." The applicant should explain which dwellings would be affected and what the effects would be prior to mitigation and post mitigation. Table 13-25 should be updated to reflect these conclusions. If it is the case that the applicant considers the limited duration of HDD to be a mitigating factor, then this should be explained and factored into the assessment. The OCEMP should also include specific HDD construction noise (and ecological) mitigation measures. Please could the applicant respond accordingly?
12. Socio-economic		

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
N/A	N/A	No further questions at this time.
13. Transport and access		
Q3.13.1	Applicant	Abnormal Indivisible Loads (AIL) CDCs response to EXQ2 Q2.13.1 [REP4-082] sets out various recommendations with regard to the approach to AIL. Could the applicant please explain how these are secured in the dDCO [REP5-002]. If not secured, could the applicant please amend the dDCO or otherwise explain why these measures do not need to be incorporated.
14. Other matters		
Q3.14.1	EA and Applicant	Piling Method Statement The applicant's response to EXQ2 Q2.14.1 [REP4-062] suggests that a piling method statement and piling risk assessment are the same thing. However, this is not the case, the piling risk assessment sets out theoretical risks associated with piling but a method statement is a more technical and precise document which forms the basis for piling operations in practice. The applicant should address this and explain how the dDCO secures a piling method statement. If it is the applicant's contention that these matters should all be addressed in the CEMP [REP4-046] then the CEMP should be amended to address the concerns raised by the EA. The EA should provide suggested wording for the relevant requirement.
Q3.14.2	NLC and CDC	Fees Could NLC and CDC please confirm exactly what fees they would be seeking in respect of the discharge of requirements in Schedule 2 of the dDCO [REP5-002]? NLC's [REP5-057] and CDC's [REP5-058] deadline 5 representations in respect of fees are noted. However, please provide the exact position (amount) of NLC and CDC including a justification.