North Lincolnshire Council

PLANNING ACT 2008 (AS AMENDED)

INFRASTRUCTURE PLANNING (EXAMINATION PROCEDURE) RULES 2010

Planning Inspectorate's Reference: EN010148

Subject: Application for an Order Granting Development Consent for the Tween Bridge Solar Farm

Applicant: RWE Renewables UK Solar and Storage Limited

DEADLINE 6 SUBMISSION

22 September 2026

Contents

Section	Page
1.0 Introduction	3
2.0 North Lincolnshire Council Comments on ExQ3	3
3.0 North Lincolnshire Council Comments on the ExAs commentary and questions on the latest draft DCO (REP5-002)	10
4.0 North Lincolnshire Council Comments on RIES	13
5.0 Other Comments, including Deadline 5 Submissions	13
Appendix 1 – NLC Suggested Protective Provisions as Local Highway Authority	
Appendix 2 – NLC Suggested Fees for the Discharge of Requirements	

1.0 Introduction

1.1 This document comprises the Deadline 6 submissions North Lincolnshire Council (NLC/the Council) further to the Examination Timetable. Comments are only provided where there is something to add, otherwise the Applicant's comments should be taken as 'noted'. NLC notes that discussions are ongoing between the Applicant and interested parties which may lead the need for additional representations from the Council. Where necessary, further submissions will be submitted as soon as possible.

1.2 The Council will seek to continue to work proactively with the Applicant's to resolve outstanding issues where possible. Any matters which cannot be agreed will be set out clearly in the Statement of Common Ground between NLC and the Applicant and in the Council's closing statement.

2.0 North Lincolnshire Council's Response to ExQ3

2.1 The Council's comments in respect of ExQ3 are set out in the following table:

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.
	NLC Response	Noted
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.
	NLC Response	NLC set out its position on the emerging North Lincolnshire Local Plan at paragraphs 6.7 & 6.8 of its LIR. This position has been updated in that the emerging Local Plan will now be prepared under The Town and Country Planning

		(Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2026 (the 2026 Regulations). The Council undertook consultation under Regulation 20 of the 2026 Regulations (the Scoping Consultation), and this consultation ended on 1 September 2026. In accordance with the Council's published timetable the statutory 30-month Local Plan timetable is due to comment on Monday 28th June 2027 with the consultation on proposed Local Plan content and evidence under Regulation 23. In this context, it is considered that the emerging Local Plan is not a relevant consideration in the determination of this DCO application.
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. [It is noted that this reference should be to field E5]. 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.
	NLC Response	• In respect of the removal of panels from fields E19 and E20, NLC notes the removal of panels in close proximity to Property 44 New Plains House and Plains House Farm and that the impact of the proposals on it would be reduced as set out in the revised ES Appendix 6.2 Residential Visual Amenity Assessment [Document Reference 6.3.6.2 Revision 2]. Please see NLCs response to Q3.8.1 below in respect of the RVAA and impacts on existing properties. • The relocation of the 132kV substation outside of flood zone 3b is noted and welcomed. It remains NLCs position that it objects to the location of infrastructure in FZ3b without robust justification and NLC has particular concerns about the impact of BESS areas within Flood Zone 3b due to associated fire and pollution risk and about the potential local flood risk impact of the proposed 300mm gravel base for BESS, inverters and spare containers within Flood Zone 3b. NLC does not consider that the Applicant has adequately demonstrated that there are clear operational reasons requiring elements of the development to be located within Flood Zone 3b. Whilst it is acknowledged that the wider site is constrained by flood risk, the applicant has not robustly demonstrated through the design or layout that the most vulnerable or highest risk infrastructure, such as BESS facilities, cannot all be

		located within areas of lower flood risk within the Order Limits, particularly having regard to the extent of overplanting proposed. • NLC welcomes the reconfiguration of solar panels within field E5 and considers that the impacts of the panels in field E5 on the setting of Dirtness Pumping Station is reduced. NLC considers that the proposals would still result in less than substantial harm to the building's setting, however this would be at the lower end of less than substantial as a result of the changes in the layout of the panels. NLC considers that this harm would be clearly outweighed by the public benefits of the scheme (subject to NLCs overall position on the weight to be afforded to the benefits of the proposal).
2.	**Biodiversity and ecology (Including Habitat Regulations Assessment)**	
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.
	NLC Response	NLC confirms that it does intend to be involved in the monitoring of new habitats in relation to BNG on land within its administrative boundary. NLC considers that the DCO should include a provision for BNG monitoring fees.

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
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].
	NLC Response	NLC notes the updated content of Requirement 8(2)(b) and is satisfied that this would give the necessary control alluded to in the OECMP.

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.
	NLC Response	The land in question is currently registered at the Land Registry to National Highways Limited under Title No. SYK558485. The A18 was formerly a trunk road and the former County Council's documents were historically passed to the Secretary of State for Transport/Highways Agency. This particular parcel of land was, at the time, within the County of West Yorkshire but became included in North Lincolnshire after County Boundary changes. Upon detrunking, the land forming the highway should have passed back to the relevant councils, but that has not yet happened. In 2010 it is understood that the Highways Agency (as it then was), was going through the process of registering such land in order to make the transfer of the highway back to the council a more straightforward process but no further progress, after registration, appears to have been made.
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.
	NLC Response	Noted – please see NLC comments in the table at section 3 below.
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?
	NLC Response	Please see NLCs response on this matter at Q3.1.3 above. For the avoidance of doubt, NLC does not consider that the Applicant has adequately demonstrated that there are clear operational reasons requiring elements of the development to be located within Flood Zone 3b. It is NLCs view that this is a matter that weighs heavily against the proposals, but that it is ultimately a matter for the SoS as to the degree of weight to be attached to it in the overall planning balance.
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?
	NLC Response	NLC notes that the RVAA has been updated to include involved properties as requested. This highlights that five additional properties have been added to the RVAA which are involved properties but tenanted. Significant effects have been identified for 2 of the properties, with significant effects continuing to year 15 for property 58 Belton Grange. Although significant effects have been identified for property 58, these are assessed as moderate/major at year 1 and moderate at year 15. It is a surprise that a property surrounded on all sides by solar panels and with a view of a substation would not experience a major adverse effect and trigger a step 4 of the assessment process. Step 4 would have involved a detailed assessment of the property. Paragraph 1.2.9 of the RVAA details that fieldwork has not required visits to individual properties but a 'number of select properties were visited as part of the ongoing consultation process'. It should be clarified which properties were visited (supported by photographs) to demonstrate where sensitive locations have been considered in more detail and to demonstrate they do not trigger the stage 4 assessment. NLC notes additional text has been added in to the RVAA following a more detailed review of the proposed hedge planting by the Applicant. The acknowledgement of the maturing hedgerow planting in the text is welcomed and hedgerow planting is the most suitable form of mitigation for this situation. However, it is still considered that, on occasion, the proposed hedge planting has been recorded in the assessment as reducing the magnitude of change to a greater extent than is warranted. Examples would include properties 20, 21, 32, 36, 37 where we would have anticipated the effect to remain as major and significant (or higher), due to the enclosure of the properties on 3 or 4 sides by the development, rather than the magnitude and effect reducing due to hedge planting. The hedge planting is likely to obscure views of the proposed development but it is not anticipated this will reduce the magnitude of change, as views would still be substantially altered by the development. Supporting visuals to demonstrate any reduction in the magnitude and effect would have helped to demonstrate the change in view. Confirmation that these properties have been visited to understand the effects from the curtilage rather than public locations is required. It is considered that the effects have not been described in sufficient detail to understand if the conclusions reached are accurate for these locations and based on the information provided, we would assume the effects are still significant at

		year 15 for these locations.
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.
	NLC Response	NLC would wish to be involved in the preparation of the detailed landscape proposals and would wish to approve the detailed design at each phase of the development. The landscape and visual mitigation strategy currently prepared is very high level and NLC would wish to see more detail to understand how the landscape proposals to date have developed and how these will be evolved into the detailed design. Aspects such as soil testing will need to be carried out to ensure the proposed habitat can be sustained on the soil type present. Evidence of this would need to be provided to NLC. The landscape and visual mitigation strategy should be secured as part of the proposals. In addition to the design, this should also include for the maintenance and management of the proposals to ensure they fulfil the proposed mitigation. The management strategy should be for the lifetime of the proposals. The proposals will require monitoring frequently in the first 5 years of the development to ensure they have established as proposed and subsequently for the following years to monitor and confirm they are still providing the landscape and visual mitigation proposed for the lifetime of the development. Should any areas fail to thrive as anticipated, alternative proposals to provide appropriate mitigation should be submitted to NLC for approval. Any protection of retained trees and hedgerows should be secured as part of the LVMS. This is both during the phased construction and during any maintenance operations on site throughout the lifetime of the project.

14.	**Other matters**	
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.

	NLC Response	NLC does not agree with the approach to fees set out in Schedule 2 of the draft DCO. A copy of NLCs suggested fee schedule for the discharge of requirements is attached at Appendix 2. It is essential that NLC's costs of discharging requirements (and of dealing with other applications for consent) are covered. NLC is not seeking to profit from providing the services demanded by the Applicant's Order, indeed it would be unlawful for it to seek to do so. However, the Council is seeking to ensure that it does not end up in a position where, because of an unsatisfactory fee regime, it is doing work at a loss and is effectively subsidising the Applicant's project. Any other approach is unfair. It will be appreciated this is an application for a nationally significant infrastructure project under the Planning Act 2008, and the fee should reflect the work involved. It will also be remembered that, by paragraph 1 of Schedule 2, the discharging authority will have a statutory deadline to make its decision on any application and if no decision is made within that period, consent will be deemed to have been granted. The same applies in respect of consents sought under articles. Dealing with any application for consent under this Order will therefore be a matter of high priority for the discharging authority, diverting officer resource from other matters. The inclusion of the deeming provision and its effects on local authority resourcing is another reason why the full cost of doing this work should be covered by the Applicant. NLC's preferred position would be to secure the payment of its reasonable costs by way of post-consent planning performance agreement however it is understood that the Applicant does not support this approach through their discussions with CDC. NLC notes that the fees proposed are in line with recent solar DCO precedents; however, having considered the Secretary of State's Decision Letters and ExA's Recommendation Reports for each precedent, NLC has not identified an instance where the fees were subject to analysis or discussion. It is also not clear how the fees have been calculated. It is understood that the precedent projects are not yet at the stage of discharging requirements and so it has not been possible to test the robustness of the fee structure in any meaningful way. The suggested amendments set out at Appendix 2 are explained as follows- **Sub-paragraph (2)** NLC considers that the work arising from each of requirements 3 (phasing of the authorised development and date of final commissioning), 5 (approved details and amendments to them) 17 (operational noise), and 20 (public rights of way) is likely to be substantial and so these requirements ought to be mentioned in this sub-paragraph. **Deleted sub-paragraph (3)** This sub-paragraph is unreasonable. For example, if an application is rejected as invalid, the discharging authority will have done the work to reach that conclusion. Reaching this decision, based on the Applicant's inability to submit documents in a valid fashion, should not cost the discharging authority money. Similarly, it does not follow that it is the discharging authority's fault if it has not discharged the application within the statutory timeframe. Again, the provision of unsatisfactory documents by an applicant can compromise the ability of the authority to work in an expeditious way. The discharging authority should not be punished for this. Sub-paragraph (3) should be deleted.

		New sub-paragraph (3) NLC does not understand why the adjustment of the Consumer Price Index value should randomly stop at 5%. If the index increases more than 5%, why shouldn't the percentage? NLC has also clarified sub-paragraph (3) to provide that any adjustment is upwards only, which NLC assume was the Applicant's original intention. **New sub-paragraphs (4) and (5)** These provisions are new and reflect the fact that NLC can now charge fees for providing relevant services in relation to DCO applications under the Infrastructure Planning (Fees) Regulations 2010. New sub-paragraph (4) is a statement of the law. New sub-paragraph (5) would allow the discharging authority to charge additional fees when the numbers cited in sub-paragraph (2) are insufficient. For example, NLC considers that subsequent work in relation to certain requirements (including requirements 6, 8 and 19 and which would give rise to a fee of £588) are unlikely to be significantly less time consuming than the original work arising from each requirement. New sub-paragraph (5)(a) would allow NLC to charge for any additional work not captured by the payment of £588. Similarly, new sub-paragraph (5)(b) would allow the discharging authority to charge for work demanded by the Order and which is not set out in sub-paragraph (2). This would allow the discharging authority to charge a fee for discharging other consents (e.g. under an article), provided there is no other mechanism in the Order for so charging. The proviso is included to prevent double charging and is consistent with NLC's ambition of making this exercise a cost-neutral one.

3.0 North Lincolnshire Council's Comments on the ExAs commentary and questions on the latest draft DCO (REP5-002)

3.1 The Council's comments in respect of the ExAs commentary and questions on the latest draft DCO are set out in the table below-

3.	**Part 3 - Streets**	
DCO.3.2	CDC and NLC	**Article 12** Please could CDC and NLC confirm whether article 12 of the dDCO [REP5-002] is acceptable? If not, please provide alternative wording or modifications by deadline 6. The ExA notes that in the SoCG [REP5-047] between the applicant and CDC this matter is identified as 'agreed'.
	NLC Response	NLC agrees with the wording of Article 12 as agreed by CDC and has no further comments to make in this respect.

7.	Schedule 2 - Requirements	
DCO.7.2	NLC, CDC and the applicant	**Requirement 8(3)(a)** 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 SoS and ExA in considering the Peartree solar farm made Order. In that case, the applicant's final dDCO omitted any commitment to % BNG in the wording of the 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. If the applicant refuses to amend the DCO as above, then it should please provide the alternative wording (setting out area-based habitat unit percentages) to allow the SoS the option of including wording with accurate percentages. 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.
	NLC Response	NLC confirms that it does intend to be involved in the monitoring of new habitats in relation to BNG on land within its administrative boundary. NLC notes the approach taken by the SoS in the Peartree Hill DCO - it looks forward to receiving the Applicant's proposed wording/approach and will comment further once this has been received.
DCO.7.4	Applicant, EA and NLC	**Requirement 14 [REP3-006]** In its written summary of oral submissions at ISH2 [REP3-082] the EA has suggested an additional requirement in relation to land contamination. Could the EA please clearly set out why such a requirement is necessary. In particular, please explain what site-specific circumstances (i.e. evidence of potential contamination) necessitate this additional requirement? Could NLC please provide its preferred wording for a requirement as referred to in its comments on the applicant's response to EXQ2 Q2.9.3 [REP5-057]?
	NLC Response	NLCs suggested wording for the suggested additional requirement to deal with contaminated land is as follows. This has been shared with the Environment Agency who have advised they are content with the wording below. **Contaminated land** (1) No phase of the authorised development shall commence until a contamination investigation and assessment report for that phase, together with a written remediation strategy if applicable to deal with any contamination discovered which is likely to cause significant harm to persons or pollution of controlled waters or the environment, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the relevant local planning authority, following consultation with the Environment Agency on matters related to its function.

		(2) Any remediation required must be carried out in accordance with the remediation strategy approved pursuant to sub-paragraph (1) prior to the commencement of development other than that required to carry out the approved remediation scheme. The relevant local planning authority must be given two weeks written notice of the developer's intention to commence the remediation scheme works. (3) No development further to that required to carry out the approved remediation scheme shall take place until a verification report that demonstrates the effectiveness of the remediation carried out pursuant to sub-paragraphs (1) and (2) above has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority, following consultation with the Environment Agency on matters related to its function. (4) In the event that contamination is found at any time when carrying out the approved development that was not previously identified, it must be reported in writing immediately to the relevant local planning authority. An investigation and risk assessment must then be undertaken in accordance with sub-paragraph (1), and where remediation is necessary a remediation scheme must be prepared in accordance with sub-paragraph (2). No further development shall take place in that phase of development until the approved remediation works have been carried out and a verification report has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority, following consultation with the Environment Agency on matters related to its function. (5) For the purposes of sub-paragraph (1), "commence" includes any permitted preliminary works comprising remedial work in respect of any contamination. (6) For the purposes of this Requirement, "phase" means any one of Land Parcels A-E as defined on the Environmental Statement Volume 4, Figure 1.2 Land Parcel Plan (Document ref: 6.4.1.2).

9.	Schedule 14 – Protective Provisions	
DCO.9.1	All Statutory Undertakers, CDC, NLC and the applicant	**General** The ExA notes that negotiation is ongoing on Protective Provisions (PPs) and on that basis is not proposing to set out preferred wording at this present time. All parties (including Statutory Undertakers) who are negotiating protective provisions should set out their preferred wording, identifying areas of disagreement on the applicant's proposed wording where agreement has not been reached. This should be provided by deadline 6 and updated at deadline 8.
	NLC Response	NLC has provided its preferred wording for the protective provision for the Council as local highway authority at Appendix 1 to this Submission. NLC will continue to work with the Applicant and CDC to reach agreement in advance of deadline 8.
DCO.9.2	CDC, NLC and the applicant	**Part 10** Could NLC and CDC please provide representations on the protective provisions at part 10 of schedule 14 to the dDCO [REP5-003]? The applicant is advised that protective provisions should be drafted to apply to 'the highway authorities' as opposed to just CDC. This will ensure consistency of approach across administrative boundaries. For that reason, NLC should review the

		protective provisions in conjunction with the applicant and CDC. The ExA also suggests that these protective provisions should serve to provide necessary functions from Article 18 (now deleted) of the originally submitted dDCO [AS-002].
	NLC Response	NLC has provided its preferred wording for the protective provision for the Council as local highway authority at Appendix 1 to this Submission. NLC notes the discussions that have taken place between the Applicant and CDC in this respect and agrees with CDCs position in respect of the wording of the protective provision. NLC has provided separate wording for ease given the permitting scheme in particular is different to that of CDC, however NLC is happy to work with the other parties to provide wording to apply to both local highway authorities if required.

4.0 NLC Comments on RIES

4.1 NLC has no specific comments to make on RIES. It is noted that the EIA and HRA processes are distinct from each other, however NLC refers to its comments in respect of the adequacy of the Applicant's Environmental Statement having regard to the definition of the project (see section 4 of NLCs LIR - NORTH LINCOLNSHIRE COUNCIL LIR).

5.0 Other comments, including on Deadline 5 Submissions

5.1 NLC has no further comments in respect of deadline 5 submissions, or any other matters, to those set out above.