



## Application by Springwell Energy Farm Limited for an Order Granting Development Consent for the Springwell Solar Farm

### The Examining Authority's written questions and requests for information (ExQ1)

**Issued on 13 May 2025**

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 mainly set out using an issues-based framework derived from the Initial Assessment of Principal Issues provided as Annex C to the Rule 6 letter of 9 April 2025. 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 Q1 (indicating that it is from ExQ1) and then has an issue number and a question number. For example, the first question on air quality issues is identified as Q1.3.1. When you are answering a question, please start your answer by quoting the unique reference number.

If you are responding to a small number of questions, answers in a letter will suffice. If you are answering a larger number of questions, it will assist the ExA if you use a table based on this one to set out your responses. An editable version of this table in Microsoft Word is available on request from the case team: please contact [springwellsolarfarm@planninginspectorate.gov.uk](mailto:springwellsolarfarm@planninginspectorate.gov.uk) and include 'Springwell Solar Farm' in the subject line of your email.

**Responses are due by Deadline 1: Tuesday 3 June 2025**



## Abbreviations used:

<b>AIL</b>	Abnormal Indivisible Load	<b>LCA</b>	Landscape Character Area
<b>ALC</b>	Agricultural Land Classification	<b>LCC</b>	Lincolnshire County Council
<b>BESS</b>	Battery Energy Storage System	<b>LCT</b>	Landscape Character Type
<b>BMV</b>	Best and Most Versatile	<b>LIR</b>	Local Impact Report
<b>BNG</b>	Biodiversity Net Gain	<b>LPA</b>	Local Planning Authority
<b>BoR</b>	Book of Reference	<b>LVIA</b>	Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment
<b>CA</b>	Compulsory Acquisition	<b>MOD</b>	Ministry of Defence
<b>CCTV</b>	Closed Circuit Television	<b>NCA</b>	National Character Area
<b>DAD</b>	Design Approach Document	<b>NH</b>	National Highways
<b>dDCO</b>	Draft DCO	<b>NE</b>	Natural England
<b>EA</b>	Environment Agency	<b>NGET</b>	National Grid Electricity Transmission
<b>EIA</b>	Environmental Impact Assessment	<b>NKDC</b>	North Kesteven District Council
<b>EM</b>	Explanatory Memorandum	<b>NPA</b>	Neighbourhood Planning Act 2017
<b>ES</b>	Environmental Statement	<b>NPS</b>	National Policy Statement
<b>ExA</b>	Examining Authority	<b>NR</b>	Network Rail
<b>ha</b>	Hectare	<b>NSIP</b>	Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project
<b>HDD</b>	Horizontal Directional Drilling	<b>oBSMP</b>	Outline Battery Safety Management Plan
<b>HE</b>	Historic England	<b>oCEMP</b>	Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan
<b>IEMA</b>	Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment	<b>oCTMP</b>	Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan
<b>IP</b>	Interested Party	<b>oDEMP</b>	Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan
<b>ktCO<sub>2e</sub></b>	Kilotonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent	<b>oDS</b>	Outline Drainage Strategy



<b>oLEMP</b>	Outline Landscape Environmental Management Plan	<b>R</b>	Requirement
<b>oOEMP</b>	Outline Operational Environment Management Plan	<b>RR</b>	Relevant Representation
<b>oPRoWPPMP</b>	Outline Public Rights of Way and Permissive Paths Management Plan	<b>RVAA</b>	Residential Visual Amenity Assessment
<b>oSMP</b>	Outline Soil Management Plan	<b>SoR</b>	Statement of Reasons
<b>oWSI</b>	Outline Written Scheme of Investigation	<b>SoS</b>	Secretary of State for Energy Security and Net Zero
<b>PA2008</b>	The Planning Act 2008	<b>TA</b>	Transport Assessment
<b>PM<sub>2.5</sub></b>	Particulate Matter less than 2.5 micrometres in diameter	<b>UXO</b>	Unexploded Ordnance
<b>PRoW</b>	Public Right of Way	<b>WWII</b>	World War II

## The Examination Library

References in these questions set out in square brackets (eg [APP-010]) are to documents catalogued in the Examination Library. The Examination Library can be obtained from the following link:

[EN010149-000270-Springwell Solar Farm Examination Library.pdf](#)

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, eg ExQ1 1.1.1 – refers to question 1 in this table.



## Index

1.	General, Cross-topic and Need .....	5
2.	Alternatives and Site Selection .....	5
3.	Air Quality.....	6
4.	Biodiversity.....	8
5.	Climate Change.....	11
6.	Compulsory Acquisition, Temporary Possession and Other Land or Rights Considerations .....	13
7.	Cultural Heritage .....	16
8.	Draft Development Consent Order (DCO) .....	19
9.	Land, Soils and Groundwater .....	23
10.	Landscape and Visual Impact.....	27
11.	Noise and Vibration.....	34
12.	Population .....	36
13.	Traffic and Transport, inc Publics Right of Way.....	38
14.	Water .....	41
15.	Other Matters, inc Waste .....	44

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
1.	<b>General, Cross-topic and Need</b>	
Q1.1.1	National Grid	<p><b>Grid Connection</b></p> <p>The Proposed Development is reliant upon National Grid constructing a new substation at Navenby to enable a point of connection to be made to the National Electricity Transmission System [APP-0160]. However, the substation does not currently have planning permission.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide an update on the progress of the planning application for Navenby Substation and its delivery timescales.</li> <li>If consent cannot be gained for either Navenby Substation or the required new overhead powerlines is there a fall back or would the Proposed Development be undeliverable?</li> </ol>
2.	<b>Alternatives and Site Selection</b>	
Q1.2.1	Applicant	<p><b>Alternative Sites</b></p> <p>Many Interested Parties (IPs) [too many to list] questioned why the Proposed Development was proposed on agricultural fields rather than other types of sites, for example industrial rooftops or brownfield land. National Policy Statement (NPS) EN-3 paragraph 2.10.29 states that where possible, solar development should utilise suitable previously developed land, brownfield land, contaminated land and industrial land.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Explain why it is necessary to site the proposed development on agricultural land.</li> <li>The Applicant considered and discounted sites on the NKDC brownfield land register [APP-0136, Paragraph 3.3.18]. Was a similar exercise undertaken for the wider site selection process across Lincolnshire, Rutland and Cambridgeshire?</li> <li>Did any of the other potential sites identified in paragraph 3.2.9 of the Site Selection Report consist, either partly or wholly, of previously developed land, brownfield land, contaminated land or industrial land?</li> </ol>
Q1.2.2	Applicant	<b>Alternative Solar Panel Technologies</b>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		The ES [APP-044, Table 4.1] sets out the reasons for discounting tracker panels and east-west fixed panels. Do either of these different technologies require less land take than the proposed technology through increased efficiency or higher density of installation? If so, how was this factored into the decision to discount these technologies?
Q1.2.3	Applicant	<p><b>Panel Array Efficiency</b></p> <p>Paragraph 2.10.55 of NPS EN-3 states “The installed generating capacity of a solar farm will decline over time in correlation with the reduction in panel array efficiency. There is a range of sources of degradation that developers need to consider when deciding on a solar panel technology to be used. Applicants may account for this by overplanting solar panel arrays.”</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How has the reduction in panel array efficiency been considered in the decision of the solar technology to be used?</li> <li>Was overplanting a consideration in relation to alternative site layouts and technologies? If so, provide further details.</li> </ol>
<b>3. Air Quality</b>		
Q1.3.1	UK Health Security Agency	<p><b>Battery Energy Storage System Plume Assessment</b></p> <p>The Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) Plume Assessment [APP-0152] considers the possible impacts of the BESS Compound on the nearby receptors in an emergency situation; primarily the emergency responders and those in the surrounding area such as workers or local residents.</p> <p>The UK Health Security Agency [RR-429] has raised several concerns with regard to the contents and methodology used in the BESS Plume Assessment. It states <i>‘that a plume assessment is completed using methodology such as atmospheric dispersion modelling which allows comparison of predicted concentrations of pollutants (to include PM10 and PM2.5) at the receptor location with applicable health-based standards or guidelines values for air.</i></p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p><i>Where UK standards or guideline values are not available, those from the World Health Organization or other reputable international bodies (EU or OECD) should be used'.</i></p> <p>The Applicant set out at Issue Specific Hearing 1 [EV4-006 and EV4-007] that further information had been provided to the UK Health Security Agency. Confirm whether the additional information has fully address your concerns.</p>
Q1.3.2	Applicant	<p><b>Outline Battery Safety Management Plan</b></p> <p>The Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (oBSMP) [APP-0147] sets out that an Emergency Response Plan will be provided post-consent, in consultation with Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue Service and other relevant stakeholders.</p> <p>a. Justify why a draft of this cannot be provided now.</p> <p>b. Should the requirement for an Emergency Response Plan be set out in Requirement (R) 7 of the dDCO?</p>
Q1.3.3	North Kesteven District Council	<p><b>Outline Management Plans</b></p> <p>The Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) [APP-0140]; Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (oDEMP) [APP-0146] and the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP) [APP-0141] all contain measures that seek to mitigate/ minimise effects on air quality. Are you content with the measures set out in these and are they sufficient to adequately mitigate/ minimise air quality effects?</p>
Q1.3.4	Applicant	<p><b>Cumulative Effects</b></p> <p>The ES [APP-056] includes the consideration of air quality effects, alongside those from the proposed Navenby Substation. Further, the Air Quality Assessment [APP-081, Paragraph 9.1.2.] states: <i>'All permitted developments are expected to agree and follow site-specific CEMP and CTMP that will adequately control dust emissions, construction plant exhaust emissions</i></p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<i>and road traffic exhaust emissions from construction</i> '. This indicates that a detailed cumulative assessment that considers the total traffic movements for all relevant developments in the area has not been undertaken. Explain fully why a detailed cumulative assessment has not been undertaken and whether the projects cumulatively would exceed the screening criteria.
<b>4. Biodiversity</b>		
Q1.4.1	Applicant	<p><b>Extent of Biodiversity Net Gain Secured</b></p> <p>The dDCO [APP-012, Requirement 8] secures a minimum of 10% Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG), whereas the BNG Assessment [APP-095] demonstrates 31.66% BNG in respect of habitat units and 20.68% in respect of hedgerow units. NKDC [RR-305] note that the Examining Authority assigned 'great weight' (positive) in the overall planning balance in relation to EN010123 (Heckington Fen solar park) where a minimum of 65% BNG was committed to by Requirement.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Explain the reason for the difference between the % figure in R8 and the BNG assessment.</li> <li>Which of the above figures are relied upon in the assessment of beneficial effects in ES chapter 7 [APP-047] and the wider planning balance within the Planning Statement [AS-018]?</li> <li>What weight should the ExA afford to the delivery of a minimum of 10% BNG if that is all that is secured in R8?</li> <li>What is the highest % BNG that the Applicant is willing to commit to within R8 of the dDCO?</li> </ol>
Q1.4.2	Applicant	<p><b>Biodiversity Net Gain Trading Rules</b></p> <p>LCC [RR-233] raised concern that the trading rules set out in the Statutory BNG metric user guide are not currently being met in relation to the loss of native hedgerow with trees – associated with bank or ditch' habitat. The BNG Assessment [APP-095] explains that this could be overcome by creating some of the proposed new hedgerows on a bank or creating a ditch along an existing hedgerow. Will the Green Infrastructure Parameters and the BNG Assessment be updated to ensure that the proposals do meet the trading rules?</p>



ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Q1.4.3	Applicant	<p><b>Monitoring of Biodiversity Net Gain, Ecology and Landscape Mitigation</b></p> <p>NKDC [RR-305] state that it will seek to ensure that an appropriate fee is set for monitoring BNG, ecology and landscape mitigation works in respect of Springwell solar farm as the responsibility for this duty is likely to fall upon the Council. Will this be included in a s106 agreement. If not, how will such works be monitored?</p>
Q1.4.4	Applicant	<p><b>Green Infrastructure Parameters</b></p> <p>Should the Green Infrastructure Parameter Plans [APP-060, Figure 3.3A-F] and the Green Infrastructure BNG Parameters [APP-095, Figure 2, Appendix A] be included in Schedule 13 of the dDCO? If not, explain how the green infrastructure parameters would be secured?</p>
Q1.4.5	Applicant	<p><b>Monitoring of Bat Species</b></p> <p>The Applicant states in the ES [APP-047, Paragraph 7.11.1] that the effect of bats' use of solar farms is uncertain due to lack of research and therefore it is proposing to monitor bat species activity for the first 10 yrs post construction.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How are any actions determined necessary by the monitoring secured or controlled?</li> <li>Is there monitoring and learning from other solar developments in the wider area that can be undertaken to inform action sooner?</li> </ol>
Q1.4.6	Applicant	<p><b>Use of Large-Scale Solar Farms by Birds and Insects</b></p> <p>Numerous IPs [too many to list] have raised concerns regarding various species mistaking areas of solar panels for large expanses of water. For example, Metheringham Parish Council [RR-264] raised concern that the panels can kill insects and other small creatures as a result of the solar radiation and that migrating wading birds have been known to crash into the panels. An IP [RR-417] also raised concern that populations of bats, owls, red kites and other raptors would be deterred from using the land to hunt, that aquatic insects would lay their eggs on the panels rather than in the local watercourses.</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Provide a response to the specific concerns raised by IPs.</li> <li>b. What research and evidence is available on the use of large scale solar farms by the species that are present within the Order limits?</li> <li>c. Provide extracts of relevant evidence for consideration in the examination.</li> </ul>
Q1.4.7	Applicant	<p><b>Management of Grassland</b></p> <p>Butterfly Conservation Lincolnshire Branch [RR-047] have provided some detailed comments on the management of the different grassland types within the order limit.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Provide a response to the recommendations made by Butterfly Conservation Lincolnshire Branch.</li> <li>b. What guidance is available on the specification and management of grassland within solar farms?</li> </ul>
Q1.4.8	Applicant	<p><b>Culverting of Watercourses</b></p> <p>Under the heading of 'Biodiversity, ecological, geological conservation and water management' NPS EN-3 states in paragraph 2.10.87 that culverting existing watercourses/ drainage ditches should be avoided.</p> <p>The ES [APP-047] states that six sections of ditches which will need culverting for internal access road bridges or are in close proximity to proposed works. The Riparian Mammal and Aquatic Habitat Assessment Survey [APP-088] concluded that use of the surveyed ditches as temporary refuge and foraging habitat cannot be entirely discounted. In accordance with paragraph 2.10.88 of NPS EN-3, demonstrate that no reasonable alternatives exist to the culverting of these ditches?</p>
Q1.4.9	Application	<p><b>Protected Species Licences</b></p> <p>The ES states [APP-047, Paragraphs 7.8.11 and 7.9.24] that any loss of bat roosts would be mitigated and compensated under a European Protected Species licence from Natural</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>England (NE). NE [RR-291] state that it is unable to provide a position on the likelihood of a licence being granted without having reviewed a draft licence application.</p> <p>Is it proposed that a draft licence application will be made to NE within the timescales of the examination?</p>
Q1.4.10	Applicant	<p><b>Woodland Plots</b></p> <p>The Forestry Commission [RR-131] advise that it would ideally like to see woodland creation carried out in 5 hectare (ha) blocks or that connecting planting with existing woodlands, should create blocks of at least 5ha.</p> <p>a. Confirm the areas of the proposed individual woodland blocks.</p> <p>b. Can the Forestry Commission's advice be accommodated? If not, provide justification.</p>
Q1.4.11	Applicant	<p><b>Maintenance of Hedgerow</b></p> <p>Is there any conflict between the maintenance requirements of hedgerows for visual screening purposes and for ecological purposes? And how would this be managed?</p>
Q1.4.12	Applicant	<p><b>Birdstrike</b></p> <p>The Ministry of Defence (MOD) [RR-278] raised concern that the proposed attenuation pond shown in field Tb2 on the Illustrative Layout Plans [AS-006] has the potential to attract and support bird species hazardous to air traffic. It considers a requirement necessary to ensure that proposed waterbodies or wetland features would not introduce a birdstrike hazard to aircraft.</p> <p>c. Provide further information on the proposed attenuation pond and whether it has been designed and managed to support bird species.</p> <p>d. Provide comment on the MOD's proposed requirement.</p>
<b>5. Climate Change</b>		

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Q1.5.1	North Kesteven District Council Lincolnshire County Council	<b>Assessment Methodology</b> Are NKDC and LCC content with the methodology used in the climate change assessment in the ES [APP-048] and the assumptions used in ES Appendix 8.1: Raw Data and Emissions Factors [APP-096]?
Q1.5.2	Applicant North Kesteven District Council Lincolnshire County Council	<b>Baseline for Assessment Comparisons</b> In the decision letter for Gate Burton Energy Park (July 2024), the Secretary of State commented that it considered a Combined Cycle Gas Turbine power plant an inappropriate baseline for assessment comparisons. a. <b>Applicant</b> , provide further justification for this assumption in light of the SoS' view. b. What comparison should be used instead?
Q1.5.3	Applicant	<b>Projected Emissions</b> Explain where the figures in the ES [APP-048] Table 8.15 UK Carbon budgets, column 'Estimated project emissions (ktCO <sub>2</sub> e)' have been derived, as they do not seem to correlate with the other figures set out in Tables 8.11-8.14.
Q1.5.4	Applicant	<b>Suggested Benefits</b> The ES [APP-048] sets out that the Proposed Development would provide a saving of 9.6 million tonnes of carbon. a. How does this compare to global emissions, which the ES states is the study area? b. Against global emissions, can this be considered a significant beneficial effect?
Q1.5.5	Applicant	<b>Carbon Reduction Plan</b> The oCEMP [APP-0140, Table 5] sets out that all members of the supply chain will provide a carbon reduction plan, where feasible. a. Should the need for this be secured in its own right in the dDCO?

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		b. Should the oOEMP [APP-0140] and the oDEMP [APP-0146] also include the need for a carbon reduction plan?
Q1.5.6	Applicant	<b>Power Generation</b> Numerous IPs [including RR-319] raise concern that the projected amount of power generated from the Proposed Development will be lower than claimed due to the weather and low hours of sunshine in the Lincoln area. Further, other IPs [including RR-322] set out that there are other forms of renewable energy that have lower Total Life Cycles, which should be preferred. What is your reply to both of these suggestions?
Q1.5.7	Applicant	<b>Sourcing Solar PVs and Other Infrastructure</b> Numerous IPs [too many to list] are of the view that there are carbon footprint concerns about the sourcing and manufacturing of Solar PVs from China. What is the Applicant's reply?
<b>6. Compulsory Acquisition, Temporary Possession and Other Land or Rights Considerations</b>		
Q1.6.1	Applicant	<b>Schedule of Negotiations</b> Provide a revised Schedule of Negotiations [APP-018] to provide an update on the current status of all negotiations, including Crown Land.
Q1.6.2	Applicant	<b>Unknown Landowners</b> There are a number of plots identified in the Book of Reference (BoR) [AS-007] for which the owners are not known. Provide an update on efforts to establish these owners/ interests and details on what further steps will be undertaken to identify these owners prior to the exercise of Compulsory Acquisition (CA) powers.
Q1.6.3	Applicant Blankney Estates Limited	<b>Variation to Option Agreement</b>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		The Statement of Reasons (SoR) [APP-015] notes that the Applicant and Blankney Estates Limited are currently negotiating a variation to the signed option agreement, based on changes required to align with the submitted Application and Order limits. What is the current status of these discussions?
Q1.6.4	Network Rail	<b>Network Rail Unidentified Property Rights</b> Network Rail (NR) has set out [RR-296] that it is investigating if it has any unidentified property rights that could be affected by the Proposed Development. Provide an update on these investigations.
Q1.6.5	Applicant National Grid Electricity Transmission	<b>National Grid and the Order Limits</b> National Grid Electricity Transmission (NGET) has set out [RR-289] that the inclusion of the entirety of the field in which the proposed Navenby Substation would be located contradicts previous discussions NGET had with the Applicant in relation to the Project, where NGET's position is that only the cable route should be shown. NGET also note that it is important that no rights are granted over this area that would restrict the delivery of Navenby substation which is required by the Applicant for delivery of the Project. Provide an update on these discussions.
Q1.6.6	Applicant	<b>Cable Corridors</b> The Work Plans [APP-007] show large areas of land for cables (Work No. 6) within the Order Limits. The ES [APP-043] notes that multiple cables will be required across the Proposed Development and the width of these cable trenches will vary depending on the number of cables in each, up to 19 metres. The SoR [APP-015, Paragraph 4.4.3.] indicates that the location/ route of the cables is currently unknown and detailed surveys are required. However, the Vegetation Removal Parameter Plans [APP-60, Figure 3.11a to f] suggest that the locations of the cables (at least where it crosses field boundaries) are known.

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		Given that a maximum width of 19 metres is needed and the Vegetation Removal Plans suggest that the locations of the cables are known, justify how seeking CA powers over all of the land identified for Work No. 6 accords with the need for the SoS to be satisfied that the Applicant is seeking no more land than is reasonably required for the purposes of the Proposed Development.
Q1.6.7	Applicant	<p><b>Powers of Acquisition – Permanent Rights</b></p> <p>Article 24 of the dDCO [APP-012] is drafted to enable compulsory acquisition of new rights over <u>all</u> of the Order land, with a schedule which limits the compulsory acquisition power in defined plots to the defined rights listed in Schedule 9.</p> <p>Provide further justification for this approach and demonstrate that persons with an interest in the Order land, particularly for plots identified in the Land Plans [AS-004] and BoR [AS-007] for temporary possession were aware that undefined new rights were being sought over <u>all</u> of the Order land and were consulted on that basis.</p>
Q1.6.8	Applicant	<p><b>Powers of Acquisition – Temporary Possession</b></p> <p>Articles 31 and 32 of the dDCO [APP-012] give temporary possession powers of <u>any</u> of the Order land. Due to this, temporary possession powers are not limited to the land specified in Schedule 11.</p> <p>In addition, the Applicant is seeking to disapply the temporary possession regime under the Neighbourhood Planning Act 2017 (NPA) in Article 6(1)(h). The ExA note that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The notice period under Articles 31(3) and 32(3) of 28 days is substantially shorter than the 3 months required under the NPA.</li> <li>• Under the NPA, the notice would also have to state the period for which the acquiring authority is to take possession.</li> </ul>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The NPA 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.</li> </ul> <p>a. Provide further justification why temporary possession powers of any of the Order land is necessary and appropriate, and explain what steps have been taken to alert all persons with an interest in the Order land to this possibility.</p> <p>b. Other than any prior precedent, what is the justification for only requiring 28 days' notice in Articles 31(3) and 32(3)?</p> <p>c. Should these articles include the need to state a period of possession and the ability to serve a counter-notice?</p>
Q1.6.9	Applicant	<p><b>Funding</b></p> <p>The Funding Statement [APP-016] notes that the current cost estimate of the Proposed Development is approximately £650m-£750m and this estimate has been arrived at by including construction costs, preparation costs, supervision costs, land acquisition costs (including compensation payable in respect of any compulsory acquisition), equipment purchase, installation, commissioning and power export'. Confirm if decommissioning costs have also been considered.</p>
Q1.6.10	Applicant Cadent Gas Limited National Grid Electricity Distribution (East Midlands) National Grid Electricity Transmission Anglian Water	<p><b>Protective Provisions</b></p> <p>Cadent Gas Limited [RR-048], National Grid Electricity Distribution (East Midlands) [RR-288], NGET [RR-289] and Anglian Water [RR-026] have all set out that they will require protective provisions within the dDCO. Provide an update on negotiations with each party set out above.</p>
<b>7. Cultural Heritage</b>		



ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Q1.7.1	Applicant Historic England Lincolnshire County Council North Kesteven District Council	<p><b>Requirement 11 - Archaeology</b></p> <p>HE state in its RR [RR-159] that there needs to be a mechanism whereby the results of additional assessment stage trial trenching undertaken post-DCO have a material bearing upon the subsequent phase of the archaeological mitigation scheme. The Examining Authority (ExA) note in paragraph 4.1.7 of the Outline Written Scheme of Investigation (oWSI) [APP-0148] that Task specific WSIs would be prepared in consultation with the Local Planning Authority's (LPA) archaeological advisor prior to the carrying out of any archaeological trenching or investigation.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Applicant</b>, explain with reference to the wording of R11 and R5 how the LPA will be involved in determining the scope for any subsequent archaeological work and additional mitigation measures in the detailed design, as a result of the above archaeological trenching or investigation?</li> <li>Should R11(1) include that any approval by the relevant planning authority (LCC) be in consultation with HE and NKDC?</li> <li><b>LCC, NKDC and HE</b>, provide your comments on the proposed drafting of this requirement including any additional/ revised drafting as appropriate with accompanying justification.</li> </ol>
Q1.7.2	Applicant Lincolnshire County Council North Kesteven District Council	<p><b>Above Ground Heritage Assets</b></p> <p>NKDC [RR-305] and LCC [RR-233] raised concern that there is a lack of detailed analysis of built heritage assets. The Applicant submitted revised documents [AS-001, AS-012, AS-013, AS-014, AS-015, AS-018 and AS-019] in response to Section (s) 51 advice issued by the Planning Inspectorate [PD-002].</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>LCC and NKDC</b>, for those heritage assets that have been scoped into the assessment, do you agree with the results of the Applicant's assessment?</li> <li><b>LCC and NKDC</b>, can you provide a list within your Local Impact Report (LIR) of built heritage assets that have not been scoped into the assessment which you consider should be scoped in with accompanying justification?</li> <li><b>Applicant</b>, provide justification for the scoping out of the specific farmhouses referenced in the NKDC RR as follows:</li> </ol>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Thompsons Bottom Farmhouse and outbuildings (LBEN 1254329/1254407)</li> <li>Temple Farmhouse (LBEN 1254328 and 1261359)</li> <li>Home Farmhouse (LBEN 1061825)</li> <li>Farmyard to the north of The Firs (LBEN 1280661)</li> </ul>
Q1.7.3	Applicant	<p><b>Brauncewell Medieval Village</b></p> <p>ES Chapter 9 [AS-012] states that there is a slight adverse effect on the setting of Brauncewell medieval village scheduled monument (less than substantial harm) but a significant beneficial effect of a proposed permissive path which is said to offset the adverse effects (para 9.9.25). Does the Applicant consider that the overall effect is moderate beneficial or is the beneficial effect to be taken in balance against the adverse effect to result in a less significant benefit?</p>
Q1.7.4	Applicant Ministry of Defence	<p><b>World War II Aeroplane Crash Sites (non-designated heritage assets MLI25416 and MLI25417)</b></p> <p>ES chapter 9 [AS-012] states that piling will be avoided in the areas of the World War II (WWII) crash sites and that detailed design will seek to route cables outside of the crash site locations so that these sites will be preserved in situ.</p> <p>a. <b>Applicant</b>, if a licence to recover a crashed military aircraft in accordance with the Protection of Military Remains Act 1986 might be required, will a letter of no impediment be sought from the MOD prior to the end of the examination?</p> <p>b. <b>MOD</b>, do you have any comments on the suitability of the works proposed in the areas of the WWII crash sites?</p>
Q1.7.5	Applicant	<p><b>Cable Routes</b></p> <p>Paragraph 9.9.9 of the ES [AS-012] states that cabling will be above ground in areas of high archaeological density within the Ground Mounted Solar PV Generating Station (Work no.1). However, between Springwell Central and Springwell East and between Springwell Central and Springwell West it is proposed to bury the cables. As stated in para 9.9.13, burying the</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>cables could result in the loss of some of the archaeological features, the loss of physical evidence of their relationships and phasing and damage to other features.</p> <p>a. What reasonable alternatives were considered to the undergrounding of cables in the locations specified on the Works Plans?</p> <p>b. How will adverse impacts on the complex archaeology in the cable route be avoided and/ or minimised in the detail design and how will this be secured?</p>
<b>8. Draft Development Consent Order (DCO)</b>		
Q1.8.1	Applicant	<p><b>Part 1 Preliminary - Article 2(8)</b></p> <p>The Explanatory Memorandum (EM) [APP-013, Paragraph 4.2.4] states that: <i>'Paragraph (8) confirms references within the Order to materially new or materially different environmental effects (in the context of the Authorised Development or part of it not being authorised if it would result in such effects), are not intended to apply where the effects are different to those assessed in the ES by virtue of being an adverse effect that has been reduced or avoided, or a positive effect that has increased in significance. Without this clarification, the "materially new or materially different" provisions could have the inadvertent consequence of not encouraging a reduction in adverse effects or an increased benefit from a positive effect at detailed design'</i>. Confirm whether or not article 2(8) has precedent in any previously made DCOs.</p>
Q1.8.2	Applicant	<p><b>Part 2 Principal Powers – Article 6</b></p> <p>Article 6 of the dDCO [APP-012] would allow development not authorised by the DCO to be carried out within the Order limits pursuant to planning permission. The ExA consider that this would appear to obviate the need, in such circumstances, to apply to change the DCO (through s153 of the Planning Act 2008 (PA2008)). Provide further justification for this article.</p>
Q1.8.3	Applicant	<p><b>Part 2 Principal Powers – Article 6</b></p> <p>The Environment Agency (EA) [RR-130] has set out that it is satisfied that no activities will take place that would require the need for a flood risk activity permit and does therefore not consent</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		to the disapplication of the consent required in relation to the carrying out of a relevant flood risk activity under the Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016, as required by section 150 of the Planning Act 2008. This is also relevant for the legislation contained in part (d). Applicant, provide further justification for the need to disapply this legislation in light of the EA's comment.
Q1.8.4	Applicant	<b>Part 3 Streets - Article 10</b> Article 10 of the dDCO [APP-012] would authorise the alteration of <u>any</u> street within the Order limits. Provide further justification to demonstrate why this power is necessary and should not be limited to only identified streets.
Q1.8.5	Applicant	<b>Part 3 Streets - Article 13</b> Notwithstanding any other precedents, provide justification to demonstrate why this power is appropriate and proportionate having regard to the impacts on pedestrians and others of authorising temporary working sites in these streets.
Q1.8.6	Applicant	<b>Part 5 Powers of Acquisition – Article 27</b> Article 27(1) of the dDCO [APP-012] includes the words ‘paragraph 22(1)’ should this be amended to read ‘paragraph (1)’?
Q1.8.7	Applicant	<b>Part 6 Miscellaneous and General – Article 40</b> Article 40(1) states that <i>‘the undertaker may fell or lop any tree or shrub near any part of the authorised development...’</i> . However, the EM [APP-013, Paragraph 4.6.10] refers to ‘within or overhanging the Authorised Development’. The ExA consider that this could be misleading. Provide a revised EM to address this matter.
Q1.8.8	North Kesteven District Council	<b>Part 6 Miscellaneous and General – Articles 41 and 41</b>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		NKDC [RR-305] has set out that it has some concerns around the powers that would be afforded under Articles 40 and 41. Please explain fully what these concerns are.
Q1.8.9	Applicant	<b>Part 6 Miscellaneous and General – Article 49</b> Provide further justification for the inclusion of the words ‘to take’ in Article 49(1).
Q1.8.10	Applicant	<b>Schedule 2 Requirements</b> The EM [APP-013, Paragraph 5.2.3] states: ‘ <i>Many of the requirements require submission of details for approval by the relevant planning authority. In some instances, the relevant planning authority is under a duty to consult with a third party or parties in relation to the document submitted to them. This is a departure from the model provisions</i> ’. Confirm whether this approach has been accepted in any previously made DCOs.
Q1.8.11	Applicant	<b>Schedule 2 - Requirement 10</b> The title of R10 of the dDCO [APP-012] states that it relates to surface and foul water drainage. However, the ExA note that the content of R10 makes no reference to surface water. Explain why this is the case.
Q1.8.12	Applicant	<b>Schedule 2 - Requirement 11</b> The EM [APP-013, Paragraph 1.6.7] sets out that R11 relates to the approval and implementation of the written scheme of investigation for archaeological mitigation. However, the first paragraph of R11 does not include the word ‘archaeological’. Advise if it should.
Q1.8.13	Applicant	<b>Schedule 3 - Railway Matters</b> NR [RR-296] is concerned that Schedule 3 of the dDCO [APP-012] disapplies the Great Northern and Great Eastern Railway Companies Act 1879 and Great Northern Railway (Spalding to Lincoln) Act 1878. It notes that this legislation provides Network Rail with a series

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		of rights and responsibilities which allow it to carry out its statutory undertaking in respect of the regions covered by the legislation. NR also consider that Protective Provisions are required in the dDCO. Provide further justification why the disapplication of this legislation is required and why Protective Provisions are not required.
Q1.8.14	Applicant	<p><b>Schedule 16 - Discharge of Requirements</b></p> <p>NKDC [RR-305] has set out that there will be an increase in planning fees in April 2025 and requests that a proportionate increase is reflected in the fees set out in Schedule 16.</p> <p>NKDC also request an increase in the number of days available for considering further amendments as it considers the timescale set out in Schedule 16 does not allow sufficient time for consultation. Further, the EA [RR-130] are of the view that 6(a) (Further information and consultation) should be amended to allow required consultees 15 days of receipt of the application to notify the relevant planning authority in writing specifying any further information it considers necessary in order to comment on the application. The EA consider this is needed to provide adequate consultation timescales that align with those in the Development Management Procedure Order 2015, i.e. 21 days (equivalent to 15 business days).</p> <p>What is the Applicant's reply to these matters?</p>
Q1.8.15	Applicant	<p><b>Explanatory Note</b></p> <p>The dDCO [APP-012] states that '<i>A copy of the Order plans and the book of reference mentioned in the Order and certified in accordance with article 42 (certification of plans and documents, etc) of this Order may be inspected free of charge during working hours at North Kesteven District Council, District Council Offices, Kesteven Street, Sleaford, Lincolnshire, NG34 7EF and at Lincolnshire County Council, County Offices, Newland, Lincoln, LN1 1YL</i>'. Confirm that NKDC and LCC has agreed to this.</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Q1.8.16	Applicant	<b>Explanatory Memorandum</b> The EM [APP-013, Paragraph 1.6.12.] sets out that approval and implementation of a decommissioning environmental management plan also secures a dust management plan, an emergency preparedness and response plan, a site waste management plan and a health and safety plan. The oDEMP [APP-0146, Paragraph 1.1.11] identifies that it will also secure a 'Traffic Management Plan and Travel Plan'. Therefore, should the EM also refer to this plan?
Q1.8.17	Applicant	<b>Explanatory Memorandum</b> The provisions of s127 of the PA2008 referred to in the EM [APP-013, Paragraph 3.3.2 and 3.3.3], will only apply if a representation is made under s127(1)(b) which causes the SoS to be satisfied of either of the matters set out in s127(1)(c). The wording of these paragraphs of the EM does not make this clear. Provide a revised version of the EM to address this matter.
<b>9. Land, Soils and Groundwater</b>		
Q1.9.1	Applicant	<b>Use of Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land</b> The use of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) land has been raised as a concern by many IPs [too many to list]. NPS EN-3 (Paragraph 3.10.14) states that: ' <i>While land type should not be a predominating factor in determining the suitability of the site location applicants should, where possible, utilise previously developed land, brownfield land, contaminated land and industrial land. Where the proposed use of any agricultural land has been shown to be necessary, poorer quality land should be preferred to higher quality land (avoiding the use of "Best and Most Versatile" agricultural land where possible)</i> '. Explain fully how the Proposed Development and the selection of the site accord with these requirements.
Q1.9.2	Applicant North Kesteven District Council Lincolnshire County Council	<b>Agricultural Land Classification Surveys</b> The Applicant has undertaken Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) Surveys of the application site [APP-112 to APP-114]. NE [RR-291] has noted that the ES [APP-051, Table 11.12]

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>presents a breakdown of land use across the Order limits, but does not specifically categorise any construction compounds or access tracks.</p> <p>a. <b>Applicant</b>, confirm if construction compounds and access tracks have been taken into account in Table 11.12 and if so, where.</p> <p>b. Are <b>LCC</b> and <b>NKDC</b> content that the ALC surveys have been undertaken robustly?</p>
Q1.9.3	Applicant	<p><b>Permanent loss of Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land for Green Infrastructure</b></p> <p>NE [RR-291] and numerous other IPs [too many to list] have raised a number of concerns with regard to the permanent loss of BMV land to Green Infrastructure. Provide further justification for the use of BMV land for these areas, particularly what consideration has been given to the siting of the 'irreversible' Green Infrastructure away from BMV land and prioritising the siting of 'temporary' Green Infrastructure on BMV land.</p>
Q1.9.4	Applicant	<p><b>Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land and Fixed Solar Equipment</b></p> <p>NKDC [RR-305] has set out that the amount of land given over to fixed solar equipment (satellite collector compounds, BESS and Springwell substation and main collector compound) would be 21ha, which is described in the ES as a temporary loss of BMV land. NKDC go on to note that IEMA guidelines say that the permanent sealing of land above 20ha (including temporary development where there would be a reduction in soil quality) is a major adverse environmental impact and it notes that ExA's on other solar projects have taken the view that such a loss of land is a permanent impact as it is virtually impossible to mitigate. What is the Applicant's reply?</p>
Q1.9.5	Lincolnshire County Council North Kesteven District Council	<p><b>Cumulative Effects on Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land</b></p> <p>The Applicant has set out [APP-056, Paragraph 16.8.9.] that it estimates the total area of BMV land within Lincolnshire to be over 410,000ha. Therefore, the Proposed Development would alone occupy some 0.13% of the BMV land in Lincolnshire and with the development of all the solar farms identified in the cumulative assessment [APP-056, Table 16.1] alongside the</p>



ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		Proposed Development, approximately 2% of the county BMV land resource will be temporarily used. Do LCC and NKDC agree with the Applicant's figures?
Q1.9.6	Applicant Lincolnshire County Council North Kesteven District Council	<p><b>Soil Management and Mitigation</b></p> <p>The oCEMP, oOEMP, oDEMP and Outline Soil Management Plan (oSMP) contain a range of measures to manage and mitigate potential effects on soil. NE [RR-291] has raised several concerns with regard to the contents of the oSMP, with regard to soil handling and soil reinstatement.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Applicant</b>, provide further justification for the need to handle soils in the wetter winter period, and/ or provide further information to illustrate that every effort will be taken to avoid the need to handle soils in a plastic condition.</li> <li><b>Applicant</b>, should the oSMP include a clear commitment to restoring the original ALC grade of all restored agricultural land?</li> <li><b>Applicant</b>, clarify why removal of hardstanding is specifically limited to a 1 metre depth.</li> <li><b>Applicant</b>, explain why reference is made within the ES [APP-051, Paragraphs 11.7.22 and 11.8.24] to the importation of topsoil during restoration and why this could be necessary.</li> <li>Are <b>LCC</b> and <b>NKDC</b> content with the measures set out in all of the above management plans?</li> </ol>
Q1.9.7	Applicant Lincolnshire County Council Environment Agency	<p><b>Contamination</b></p> <p>The ES [APP-051, Paragraph 11.8.1.] sets out that an interpretive report is required relating to site investigation work that has already been completed prior to construction works commencing and will be issued to LCC. This will provide further information relating to potential pollutant linkages that were identified in the Preliminary Risk Assessment [APP-115 to APP-118]. In addition, the Preliminary Risk Assessment makes several recommendations, such as shallow intrusive works to determine ground and groundwater conditions, gas monitoring and boreholes.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is it appropriate to prepare the interpretive report post consent?</li> </ol>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		b. <b>Applicant</b> , how are the recommendations in the Preliminary Risk Assessment being addressed?
Q1.9.8	Applicant	<p><b>Unexpected Contamination</b></p> <p>The EA [RR-130, Paragraph 3.5] has requested that an additional requirement be added into the dDCO in relation to unexpected contamination and has put forward wording. The EA has also noted that it would need to be consulted on any remediation strategy to ensure it is carried out in a manner that protects controlled waters.</p> <p>a. Confirm if the wording is considered suitable.</p> <p>b. If not, provide alternative wording and explain why the suggested wording is not suitable.</p> <p>c. Provide a revised dDCO than includes the requirement.</p>
Q1.9.9	Applicant Environment Agency	<p><b>Effects of Firewater on Groundwater</b></p> <p>Numerous concerns [too many to list] have been raised about the potential for contaminants from a BESS accident to affect groundwater. Further, the EA [RR-130] consider the BESS emergency response plan should consider the potential effect of the release of firewater from the BESS compound on groundwater quality. The ExA note that the oOEMP and oBSMP contain some details in this regard.</p> <p>a. <b>Applicant</b>, what is your reply?</p> <p>b. <b>EA</b>, what further information is required?</p>
Q1.9.10	Applicant	<p><b>Effects of Solar PVs on Groundwater</b></p> <p>There have been numerous concerns raised [too many to list] that chemicals contained within the Solar PVs could leak causing contamination and therefore affect groundwater quality. How will the Applicant ensure that this would not occur?</p>
Q1.9.11	Applicant	<b>Unexploded Ordnance</b>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	Lincolnshire County Council North Kesteven District Council	The ES [APP-051, Table 11.3] sets out that the risk of Unexploded Ordnance (UXO) will be managed by the implementation of a UXO Risk Management Plan for intrusive works. a. Is it appropriate to prepare the risk management plan post consent? b. Is the requirement for a risk management plan suitably secured in the dDCO?
<b>10. Landscape and Visual Impact</b>		
Q1.10.1	Applicant	<b>References</b> Provide copies, for inclusion into the Examination Library of: a. Ref. 10-22: National Character Area Profile 47 – Southern Lincolnshire Edge (2014) Natural England. b. Ref. 10-23: North Kesteven Landscape Character Assessment (2007) David Tyldesley and Associates for North Kesteven District Council. c. Ref. 10-24: The Historic Character of the County of Lincolnshire – English Heritage Project No 4661 - The Historic Landscape Character Zones (2011) John Lord and Alastair Macintosh, Lincolnshire County Council.
Q1.10.2	Lincolnshire County Council North Kesteven District Council	<b>Residents and Visitors of Surrounding Villages</b> Are LCC and NKDC satisfied with the Applicant's justification set out in Table 10.2 and Section 10.5 of ES Chapter 10 [APP-050] for not undertaking a full assessment of visual impacts for: a. Residents and visitors to the villages of Scopwick, Kirkby Green, Blankney and Ashby de la Launde; and b. Residents of the barracks at RAF Digby.
Q1.10.3	Applicant Lincolnshire County Council North Kesteven District Council	<b>Wider Landscape Character</b> Numerous IPs [including RR-306] raise concern regarding the extent of solar development within the wider Lincolnshire area and the impact this would have on the character of the landscape. However, the ES [APP-050] assessed that significant effects in construction,

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>operation and decommissioning would be limited to tightly defined tracts of Landscape Character Area (LCA) 7 and LCA11.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Applicant</b>, explain why the wider landscape character at the regional or county scale would not be adversely affected by the Proposed Development alone.</li> <li>When considered cumulatively with other solar developments (both above and below the threshold for NSIP development), does the extent of solar development affect the key characteristics of the Central Plateau Landscape Character Type (LCT) or National Character Area (NCA) 47 - Southern Lincolnshire Edge?</li> <li><b>Applicant</b>, in a similar format to Figure 16.8 [APP-072], provide a plan that shows the Order limits and other solar developments in relation to the boundary of LCA7, LCA11, the Central Plateau LCT and NCA47?</li> </ol>
Q1.10.4	Lincolnshire County Council North Kesteven District Council	<p><b>Character of Surrounding Villages</b></p> <p>Do LCC and NKDC agree with the Applicant's position in ES chapter 10 [APP-050] that the changes to the Landscape Character Area (LCA) 7 and LCA11 surrounding Blankney, Scopwick, Kirkby Green, Ashby de la Launde and RAF Digby will not affect the character of these villages? If not, provide an explanation of how the character of these villages would be affected.</p>
Q1.10.5	Applicant	<p><b>Vegetation in Photomontages</b></p> <p>The year 10 photomontage for Viewpoint 12 (Spires and Steeples Trail) [APP-130] appears to show the proposed hedgerow in leaf to the right-hand side of the track whereas the existing hedgerow on the left-hand side is without leaves.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is it correct that the proposed species of hedgerow would be in leaf in early March?</li> <li>Are there other times of the year that the proposed hedge species would offer less dense screening and if so, could additional photomontage views be provided?</li> <li>Further information is requested on how the proposed screening planting would relate to the existing hedgerows across the Proposed Development site in terms of density and the</li> </ol>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		level of visual screening it would offer in the winter months. Is it intended that users of the PRowWs would experience filtered views of the Panels or a dense screen of vegetation?
Q1.10.6	Applicant	<b>Viewpoint 36 Photomontage</b> Do the photomontages for viewpoint 36 [APP-133] show the worst potential case placement of structures within the relevant Work No. parameters?
Q1.10.7	Applicant	<b>CCTV Posts</b> The Design Commitment D5 [APP-0138] states that CCTV will be located typically every 50-60 metres. It is noted that CCTV posts are shown on the photomontages for viewpoint 29c [APP-132] but not on viewpoint 28b [APP-132] or viewpoint 17a [APP-131]. a. Should there be CCTV posts shown in these photomontages? b. Provide more details about how the final locations and spacing of CCTV posts will be determined.
Q1.10.8	Applicant	<b>Viewing Angle</b> Does the assessment of visual effects on viewpoints account for the angle at which you would be viewing the panels (eg. face on from the south, side on from the east and west or the underside of the panels from the north)?
Q1.10.9	Applicant	<b>Visual Effects on Public Rights of Way Users</b> NPS EN-3 (footnote 89 to paragraph 2.10.43) states that screening along public right-of-way networks to minimise the outlook into the Solar Park may impact on the ability of users to appreciate the surrounding landscapes. Several IP's [including RR-306] raised concern that the open nature of Landscape Character Area (LCA) 7 would be eroded by enclosure arising from screening planting and that the open agricultural character elements of LCA11 would change to an inherently enclosed character with long range vistas compromised in order to screen the Proposed Development.

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		How has the impact on the ability of users to appreciate the surrounding landscapes been taken into consideration in arriving at the conclusions in ES chapter 10 [APP-050]?
Q1.10.10	Applicant	<p><b>Project Principles</b></p> <p>Requirement (R) 5 of the dDCO [APP-012] requires the detailed design proposals to be developed in accordance with the Design Commitments [APP-0138]. The Design Commitments are based on the Project Principles as set out in section 6 of the Design Approach Document [APP-0137] but do not cover all the project principles.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should R5 require the detailed design to be developed in accordance with both the Design Commitments and the Project Principles? If not, explain how the Project Principles would be applied to the detailed design proposals.</li> <li>Should the Project Principles be included in Schedule 13 (documents and plans to be certified) of the dDCO?</li> </ol>
Q1.10.11	Applicant	<p><b>Good Design</b></p> <p>The Design Approach Document (DAD) [APP-0137] sets out the need for good design and includes Design Principles that would be used to inform the detailed design process for different components of the Proposed Development.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide further explanation of how the Springwell Substation (Work No. 2), Satellite Collector Compounds (Work No. 3) and the BESS (Work No. 4) would be capable of being laid out and designed (including through use of colour and materials) in order to promote the best possible aesthetic and visual appearance and to minimise landscape and visual effects.</li> <li>The Design Commitments [APP-0138] document includes various options for the colour and materials of above ground structures. Provide a summary of how the final appearance of above ground structures in Work Nos. 2 to 4 would be determined in order to minimise their landscape and visual effects?</li> <li>What bearing would the proposed colour and any reflectivity of the solar panels and panel mounting structures have on their landscape and visual impact?</li> </ol>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Q1.10.12	Applicant	<p><b>Advanced Planting</b></p> <p>Paragraph 5.3.8 of the Outline Landscape Environmental Management Plan (oLEMP) [APP-0142] states that the Applicant is committed to implementing proposed vegetation and advanced planting prior to the installation of solar panels including planting adjacent to the A15 to mitigate glint and glare effects of Solar PV development in Winter 2024-25.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The ExA observed what appeared to be advanced planting in field C6 on Unaccompanied Site Inspection 1 [EV1-001]. Provide details of locations where early planting has already been implemented.</li> <li>Have any other locations been identified for advance planting of screening vegetation and why?</li> <li>How would any further proposed advance planting be secured by the dDCO [APP-012]?</li> <li>Other than the areas where construction access is required, what would prevent all the proposed screening vegetation being planted prior to the installation of solar panels and could this mitigate any adverse visual effects in the construction phase and year 1 of the operational phase?</li> <li>If further advanced planting is planned post-DCO but prior to the installation of solar panels, would the Community Liaison Group and/ or Local Authorities be involved in determining the location and extent and how would this be secured through the control documents?</li> </ol>
Q1.10.13	Applicant	<p><b>Height Parameters</b></p> <p>Fields By03, By10, By28, Lf04, Lf11 include land which is in flood zone 2 and 3. Figure 3.2b [APP-060] shows that all panels in these fields are subject to a maximum height parameter of 3.5m above ground level.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do all panels within these fields By03, By10, By28, Lf04, Lf11 need to be installed to the maximum height parameter of 3.5m or only those panels that fall within the actual flood zone areas?</li> <li>Should the height parameter plans Figures 3.2(A-F) be included within Schedule 13 of the dDCO? If not, provide justification.</li> </ol>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Q1.10.14	Applicant	<p><b>Security Fencing</b></p> <p>Is the Applicant confident that the proposed post and wire fencing and other security measures will be sufficient for security? Or is there a risk that more robust security might be needed in the future which could have a worse visual impact?</p>
Q1.10.15	Applicant	<p><b>Co-ordination of Visual Mitigation with the National Grid Substation Proposals</b></p> <p>LCC [RR-233] and NKDC [RR-305] consider there are potential opportunities for the Applicant and the National Grid Substation proposals to coordinate mitigation planting in the area around the National Grid Substation. The local authorities give the example of extending of carriageway hedgerow planting further north along the western edge of the A15 (along field parcels Bcd024, Bcd027, Bcd031).</p> <p>Has the Applicant explored either the example given by the local authorities or any other opportunities to provide mitigation planting within the Order limits that would provide screening of the National Grid Substation? If not, provide justification.</p>
Q1.10.16	Applicant	<p><b>Not Significant Effects</b></p> <p>Paragraph 3.34 of the Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (3rd Edition) states that it should be made clear that effects not considered to be significant will not be completely disregarded. Explain how this has been taken into consideration, including in relation to the assessment of cumulative and combined effects, population effects and the wider 'planning balance' within the Planning Statement [AS-018].</p>
Q1.10.17	Applicant	<p><b>Landscape Fabric</b></p> <p>The ES [APP-050] states there would be moderate beneficial effects to landscape fabric (woodland, trees and hedgerows) in the yr 10 of operation and decommissioning phases. Can this be considered a benefit of the project in relation to landscape effects if the additional</p>



ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		planting is there to provide mitigation screening for a large-scale solar development which itself has an adverse effect on the landscape?
Q1.10.18	Applicant	<b>Density of Planting</b> The oLEMP [APP-0142] states that new hedgerow planting throughout the Order Limits is proposed, both to bolster existing hedgerows but also to create new hedgerows. Further detail is requested on how it would be determined whether a section of hedgerow will need to be infilled, will it just be where there is a complete break in hedgerows as shown on the Green Infrastructure Plans [APP-060, Figure 3.3A-F] or will existing sparse/ thin hedgerows also be enhanced to provide a higher level of screening?
Q1.10.19	North Kesteven District Council	<b>Enhancement Opportunities</b> Paragraphs 10.6.6 and 10.6.7 of the ES [APP-050] identify that the North Kesteven Landscape Character Assessment encourages "Replacement hedgerow planting where these have been lost or degraded" for both LCA 7 and LCA 11." Is the extent of hedgerow planting proposed by the applicant in line with the enhancement opportunities identified in the North Kesteven Landscape Character Assessment?
Q1.10.20	Applicant	<b>Control Documents</b> The Mallard Pass DCO (R7(2)(a)) states that each LEMP must include details of: <i>"the location, number, species, size and planting density of any proposed planting including details of any proposed tree, hedgerow and shrub planting and the proposed times of such planting;"</i> a. Should the Springwell dDCO include a similar wording in R8? b. If not, explain if and how the species, size and planting density of proposed screening planting would be secured in the dDCO.
Q1.10.21	Applicant	<b>Planting Performance Criteria</b>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		Further information is requested on the performance criteria for the successful establishment of planting for visual screening. The ExA note that Table A3.1 in the oLEMP [APP-0142] refers to maintaining a 3.5m height but can you explain how the density of planting would be monitored and managed to ensure that visual screening is achieved? (for example, a 3.5m tall hedgerow which is very sparse might provide very little screening)
<b>11. Noise and Vibration</b>		
Q1.11.1	North Kesteven District Council	<b>Methodology</b> Are NKDC content with the methodology used in the noise and vibration assessment in the ES [APP-052] and the assumptions [APP-052, Paragraphs 12.4.16 to 12.4.37] used for: construction plant items and activities; construction and decommissioning traffic; and operational plant noise?
Q1.11.2	Applicant	<b>Construction Noise</b> The oCEMP [APP-0140] states that applicable noise thresholds will be defined in each of the CEMPs and that compliance with these noise limits will ensure adverse effects are unlikely. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should noise limits be defined in the oCEMP and/ or dDCO?</li> <li>If not, how can the ExA be sure that noise limits for construction works would be adequately secured and that adverse effects would be unlikely?</li> </ol>
Q1.11.3	Applicant	<b>Operational Noise</b> The current drafting of R15 refers to 'the operational noise rating levels as set out in the environmental statement'. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For clarity and precision, should such 'noise rating levels' be specified in R15?</li> <li>Explain the links and any overlap between R15 and R5 (Detailed design approval) and R13 (Operational environmental management plan).</li> </ol>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Q1.11.4	Applicant	<p><b>Public Rights of Way</b></p> <p>Due to the transient and temporary nature of users along Public Rights of Way (PRoW) through the Proposed Development, and the proposed distance between PRoW and equipment, noise impacts along these areas have not been assessed. However, an IP [RR-031] raised concern that the users of this network of ProW include regular users who should not be classed as temporary and whilst the users are “transient” in that they are passing along the ProW, their whole experience of the use and enjoyment of the ProW would be destroyed by noise and disturbance.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is there guidance available as to the noise level that would constitute a significant effect for recreational users of PRoW?</li> <li>Provide a description of the character of the noise and the maximum noise level experienced by recreational users of PRoW.</li> </ol>
Q1.11.5	Applicant	<p><b>Distinctive Tonal, Impulsive or Low Frequency Noise</b></p> <p>Paragraph 5.12.6 of NPS EN-1 requires that the Applicant’s assessment includes the identification of any distinctive tonal, impulsive or low frequency characteristics of noise.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide a summary, in the clearest possible terms, of how these characteristics have been identified. This may include examples of equivalent sounds sources to provide a guide to all IPs.</li> <li>Given the design flexibility sought for particular elements of the proposal, what likelihood is there that such characteristics might change once the final design has been determined?</li> </ol>
Q1.11.6	Applicant	<p><b>Horizontal Directional Drilling</b></p> <p>Paragraph 2.8.3 of the oCEMP [APP-0140] states that activities such as trenchless/ Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD) could be required outside of the assumed day-time construction hours (i.e. evening, Sundays, Bank Holidays or at night), which will be agreed upon with the relevant planning authority prior to these works.</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Are there any other construction activities that might be required to be undertaken outside of the assumed day time construction hours?</li> <li>b. In what circumstances and with what justification would HDD be expected to occur outside assumed day time construction hours?</li> <li>c. What would be the expected frequency and duration of such HDD works and over what period might they be expected to continue in any specific location?</li> <li>d. Provide justification as to whether a worst-case scenario for HDD at night has been assessed in the ES.</li> </ul>
Q1.11.7	Applicant	<p><b>Decommissioning</b></p> <p>ES chapter 12 [APP-052] states that the likely noise impacts from decommissioning activities are considered to be similar to the noise impacts predicted from construction activities. Are there any noise impacts in the decommissioning phase (for example from the breaking apart of concrete) that could be greater than the impacts in construction?</p>
<b>12. Population</b>		
Q1.12.1	Applicant North Kesteven District Council	<p><b>Skills and Education Package</b></p> <p>NKDC [RR-305] state that it is seeking a skills and education package.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. <b>NKDC</b>, do you consider this to be necessary for mitigation of impacts or is it considered enhancement?</li> <li>b. <b>NKDC</b>, do you consider that this should be in addition to the measures set out in the outline Employment, Skills and Supply Chain Plan [APP-0153] and R16 of the dDCO [APP-012]?</li> <li>c. Has there been any discussion regarding a possible s106 agreement? If so, provide an update.</li> </ul>
Q1.12.2	Applicant	<b>Supply Chain Effects</b>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		In Paragraphs 13.7.12 and 13.7.52 of ES chapter 13 [APP-053] it is assumed that the supply chain effects are retained at Construction Labour Market Area and Lincolnshire scales respectively. Is there an existing supply chain at these scales that can support the construction and operation phases?
Q1.12.3	North Kesteven District Council Lincolnshire County Council	<p><b>Stepping Out Network and Effects on Tourism</b></p> <p>ES Chapter 13 [APP-053] acknowledges that significant visual effects from PRow and the Stepping Out Network may adversely impact the number of visitors to the area in the operational phase. However, the Applicant's position [APP-053, Paragraph 13.7.26] is that as other routes of the network may continue to be used, the residual impacts associated with loss of visitors such as the potential loss of business will not likely be impacted.</p> <p>a. Do you agree with the Applicant's conclusion of no significant effect on tourism related to the stepping out walks considering there are moderate/ major adverse visual effects for footpath users identified in ES chapter 10 [APP-050]?</p> <p>b. Is any evidence available that quantifies how regularly the PRow and the Stepping Out Network within and adjacent to the Order limits are used?</p>
Q1.12.4	Applicant	<p><b>Health and Quality of Life</b></p> <p>LCC [RR-233] raised concern that the Applicant has not undertaken a health impact assessment. Submissions have also been made by local residents [too many to list] on the potential effects on health and well-being. Paragraph 5.12.6 of NPS EN-1 requires that, where noise impacts are likely to arise from the proposed development, the applicant's assessment includes an assessment of any likely impact on health and well-being where appropriate. Further, paragraph 5.12.17 of NPS EN-1 states that proposals, where possible, should contribute to improvements to health and quality of life through the effective management and control of noise.</p> <p>a. Provide further justification for not undertaking a health impact assessment.</p> <p>b. Explain further how the application has taken the impact of noise on health and well-being into consideration?</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>c. Summarise how the proposed development contributes to improvements to health and quality of the life, cross referencing where necessary to existing documents.</p> <p>d. If it has not been possible for the proposed development to achieve improvements to health and quality of life, then explain why not.</p>
Q1.12.5	Applicant	<p><b>Permissive Paths</b></p> <p>The Proposed Development would provide an additional 8.58km [APP-0145] of permissive paths. What will happen to the permissive paths after decommissioning?</p>
Q1.12.6	Applicant	<p><b>Ethical Procurement</b></p> <p>Numerous RRs [too many to list] have raised concerns regarding ethical procurement of solar panels. Paragraph 2.5.5 of the outline Employment, Skills and Supply Chain Plan [APP-0153] states that solar developments can carry an increased risk of modern slavery due to the complexities in the supply chain relating primarily to solar panels. Paragraph 2.5.4 states that a rigorous approach would be taken to ensure those in the supply chain and contractors abide by the Applicant's values.</p> <p>a. Provide more detail on the measures that would be applied to the Applicant's own operations, and those of the supply chains, to evaluate the risks of modern slavery including an explanation of how these measures would be secured.</p> <p>b. Provide more detail on the compliance screening and certification process for suppliers of solar panels.</p>
<b>13.</b>	<b>Traffic and Transport, inc Public Rights of Way</b>	
Q1.13.1	National Highways	<p><b>Strategic Road Network</b></p> <p>National Highways (NH) [RR-290] has set out that the Applicant should provide further information, regarding the methodology for calculating the number of peak hour workers on the Strategic Road Network (A1/ A46) to allow it to complete its independent checks. The Applicant stated at Issue Specific Hearing 1 [EV4-008 and EV4-009] that further discussions</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		have since taken place. Provide and update on your current position with regards to potential effects on the strategic road network. If additional evidence is still needed, please set out fully what is required.
Q1.13.2	Applicant	<p><b>Assessment Methodology - Traffic Survey Data</b></p> <p>The Transport Assessment [APP-123, Paragraph 5.4.4] states: '<i>Whilst only 2024 survey data has been used as a baseline for the junction modelling in Section 9, ATC survey data collected in 2023 and DfT count point data collected in 2022 has been used to obtain data for the assessments undertaken in ES Volume 1, Chapter 6: Air Quality and ES Volume 1, Chapter 12: Noise and Vibration</i>'. Provide further explanation why using different survey data has been selected for the different assessments and is such an approach justified and robust?</p>
Q1.13.3	Applicant Lincolnshire County Council	<p><b>A15/ B1202 Junction Improvement</b></p> <p>The Transport Assessment (TA) [APP-123] identifies capacity issues at this junction, but notes that LCC are proposing their own improvement works due to existing issues. LCC has set out [RR-233] that it considers the Proposed Development should make a financial contribution to the improvements works. In addition, in the absence of the delivery of the improvement works, the Applicant has proposed a commuter bus alternative [APP-054, Paragraph 14.9.6].</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide an update on the delivery of the potential junction improvement works, including anticipated timescales.</li> <li><b>Applicant</b>, what is your response to the request from LCC to contribute towards the cost of the improvement works?</li> <li><b>LCC</b>, are you content that in the absence of any improvement works, the proposed commuter bus is a realistic alternative?</li> </ol>
Q1.13.4	Applicant Lincolnshire County Council	<p><b>North Hykeham Relief Road</b></p> <p>The TA [APP-123, Paragraph 10.1.29] identifies that the North Hykeham Relief Road scheme is expected to be completed in 2028. On this basis, the Applicant considers that it is likely that</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>the baseline levels of traffic predicted for 2028 will not materialise, thus the operation of the A15/ B1202 Junction should improve, and the overall impacts of development traffic lessened.</p> <p>a. Provide an update on the delivery of the proposed relief road.</p> <p>b. <b>LCC</b>, do you agree with the Applicant's view?</p>
Q1.13.5	<p>Applicant</p> <p>National Highways</p> <p>National Rail</p> <p>Lincolnshire County Council</p>	<p><b>Abnormal Indivisible Loads Route</b></p> <p>The oCTMP [APP-0141, Appendix 3] sets out the route that Abnormal Indivisible Loads (AILs) would follow to the application site. NR [RR-296] wishes to ensure that AIL movements under or near the Bridges are undertaken safely at all times and has set out that its engineers will be considering the details in the oCTMP.</p> <p>a. <b>NH</b> and <b>LCC</b>, is the proposed route considered to be acceptable?</p> <p>b. <b>NR</b>, provide an update on your consideration of the oCTMP.</p> <p>c. <b>Applicant</b>, set out how any AIL movements will safeguard any bridges along the route.</p>
Q1.13.6	<p>Applicant</p> <p>Lincolnshire County Council</p>	<p><b>Outline Travel Plan</b></p> <p>The measures proposed by the Applicant to promote sustainable modes of transport are set out in the oCTMP [APP-0141, Appendix 1]. Does the Outline Travel Plan go far enough and should it include mode share targets?</p>
Q1.13.7	<p>Applicant</p> <p>Lincolnshire County Council</p>	<p><b>Construction Traffic Routes</b></p> <p>Concern about construction traffic travelling through local villages has been raised by numerous interested parties [too many to list]. The routes proposed to be used by construction traffic are identified in the ES [APP-070, Figure 14.4] and in the oCTMP [APP-0141]. To ensure that effects do not arise that have not been assessed in the ES, should these routes be secured in a requirement within the dDCO?</p>
Q1.13.8	Applicant	<b>Construction Traffic Movements</b>



ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
	Lincolnshire County Council	The ES [APP-054, Table 14.23] identifies anticipated construction traffic movements on each assessed link. To ensure that effects do not arise that have not been assessed in the ES, should these figures be secured in a requirement within the dDCO?
Q1.13.9	Applicant Lincolnshire County Council	<p><b>Public Rights of Way Improvements</b></p> <p>LCC [RR-233] wish to see: a new PRow linking ROWS/5/1 to the highway on the western end; an enhancement to fix the gap between the legal line of Ashby De La Launde PF11 to the highway; the continuation of Cuckoo Lane; and that the surfacing for the proposed upgrade to the existing PRow between Scopwick and Blankney to bridleway status to be defined to ensure that it is accessible all year round.</p> <p>a. <b>Applicant</b>, what is your response to these requests?</p> <p>b. <b>LCC</b>, provide further evidence to justify the need for such improvements and why they are necessary to make the development acceptable.</p>
Q1.13.10	Applicant Lincolnshire County Council	<p><b>Outline Public Rights of Way and Permissive Paths Management Plan</b></p> <p>The Outline Public Rights of Way and Permissive Paths Management Plan (oPRoWPPMP) [APP-0145] contains the Applicant's approach to managing the PRows and Permissive Paths to ensure they are safe and accessible. Network Rail [RR-296] has set out that the oPRoWPPMP proposes changes to a public right of way that includes a railway crossing (the Scopwick Yard Level Crossing which connects Scop/8/2 and M/tin/7/1) and that it does not appear that the impacts on the railway or on continuing use of the public rights of way using the level crossing in this location have been considered. It notes that the oPRoWPPMP sets out various alternative routes for Scop/8/2 but these do not facilitate access across the railway to connect with the existing path on the other side and would therefore render the level crossing obsolete while any diversions are in place.</p> <p>a. <b>LCC</b>, are you content with the details set out in the oPRoWPPMP?</p> <p>b. <b>Applicant</b>, how will access to the level crossing be maintained?</p>
<b>14. Water</b>		

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Q1.14.1	Applicant	<p><b>Existing Drainage Infrastructure</b></p> <p>Anglian Water has noted [RR-026] that there are numerous buried mains pipes and sewers located within/ adjacent to the public highway and green verges and in locations west and north of Scopwick and south-west of Ashby there are buried main water supply pipes which cross the open countryside. How have these been taken into account in the Illustrative Layout Plans and Sections [APP-009] to avoid any potential impacts?</p>
Q1.14.2	Applicant	<p><b>Flood Risk at Scopwick</b></p> <p>Numerous IPs [including RR-369 and RR-190] have raised concerns about:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. the use of piling and the potential to damage fragile clay drainage pipes across the site;</li> <li>2. the artesian effect around Scopwick and piling could push the ground water up into the upper stratum, causing flood risk to the village of Scopwick;</li> <li>3. being able to manage the anticipated volume of water and use of swales and vegetation absorption to counter the flows of rainfall; and</li> <li>4. lack of external supervision of construction works and ongoing maintenance.</li> </ol> <p>Applicant, respond to each of these concerns.</p>
Q1.14.3	Applicant	<p><b>Outline Drainage Strategy</b></p> <p>The Outline Drainage Strategy (oDS) [AS-016, Appendix A] sets out that no infiltration testing has been undertaken at the Proposed Development to date, though anecdotal information (soilscape and runoff rates) suggests a measure of infiltration may be viable.</p> <p>The oDS sets out that due to the rural nature of the Proposed Development, discharge of surface water to the public sewer network is not being sought as part of the Proposed Development. The EA are concerned [RR-130] that there is the potential for impacts on surface water from the disposal of foul water from the proposed facilities at the BESS. The EA note that the proposed development site boundary of Springwell West is located approximately</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>290 metres from a public foul sewer (Main Street, Ashby de la Launde) and are of the view that the Applicant needs to demonstrate that connection to the public foul sewer is not feasible (in terms of cost and/ or practicality).</p> <p>Both Anglian Water and the EA [RR-026] [RR-130] have requested that it is included as a specific consultee to the discharge of Requirement 10 (Schedule 2) (Surface and foul water drainage) of the dDCO [APP-012] to enable it to make comments on the final drainage strategy.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Given that infiltration is at the top of the drainage hierarchy should more work and on-site investigation be undertaken to establish this now?</li> <li>Provide more evidence to demonstrate that connection to a public foul sewer is not feasible.</li> <li>Should the EA and Anglian Water be added as discharge consultees to Requirement 10 of the dDCO?</li> </ol>
Q1.14.4	Applicant	<p><b>Water Supply</b></p> <p>The ES [APP-055, Paragraph 15.12.1] notes that there is uncertainty regarding the confirmation of whether the welfare facilities will be water mains fed or whether a bowser can supply the potable water. When will this be confirmed and has the potential for a mains water connection been allowed for in the Order limits?</p>
Q1.14.5	Applicant	<p><b>Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan and Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan</b></p> <p>The outline plans [APP-0140] [APP-0143] set out an Emergency Preparedness and Response Plan will be developed in consultation with the EA, in relation to responding to flood warnings. The EA note [RR-130] that it does not normally comment on or approve the adequacy of flood emergency response procedures accompanying development proposals and consultation with the EA is therefore unlikely to be required. Provide amended outline plans to address this matter.</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
<b>15.</b>	<b>Other Matters, inc Waste</b>	
Q1.15.1	Applicant	<p><b>Anticipated Construction and Operational Waste Quantities</b></p> <p>The EIA regulations state that the description of the development should include an estimate, by type and quantity, of types of waste produced during the construction and operation phases (Schedule 4 Paragraph 1(d)). Anticipated quantities of waste have not been provided in ES Chapter 3 [APP-043], the oCEMP [APP-0140] or the oOEMP [APP-0143] for the construction and operation phases.</p> <p>In line with the EIA regulations and the requirements of NPS EN-1 confirm the anticipated volumes of waste from the Proposed Development, and the impact of waste generation from the Proposed Development on the capacity of waste management facilities.</p>
Q1.15.2	Applicant	<p><b>Below Ground Cables at Decommissioning</b></p> <p>At the end of the operational phase, it is proposed that all the below ground cables will be left in place. NPS EN-3 states that generally, it is expected that the panel arrays and mounting structures will be decommissioned, and underground cabling dug out to ensure that prior use of the site can continue.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Explain the reasoning for leaving the below ground cables in place.</li> <li>Are there any adverse effects or potential hinderance to use of the land associated with the cables being left in place?</li> </ol>
Q1.15.3	Applicant	<p><b>Microlight Aircraft Site</b></p> <p>An IP [RR-337] has raised concern about the potential effects of the Proposed Development on a registered microlight aircraft site and noted that the Civil Aviation Authority have expressed their concerns to the Applicant. Has the application assessed such potential effects?</p>

**ExQ1: 13 May 2025**

**Responses due by Deadline 1: Tuesday 3 June 2025**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
Q1.15.4	Applicant	<p><b>Fuel Pipeline</b></p> <p>At Open Floor Hearing 1 [EV3-002 and EV3-003] an IP set out that there is no evidence of any discussions with the British Pipe Line Agency about the fuel pipeline that runs in proximity to the Order limits at Springwell West. Confirm if any discussions have taken place with the British Pipe Line Agency and whether the Proposed Development could have any effects on the pipeline, including from construction traffic.</p>