

Springwell Solar Farm

Written Summary of Oral Submissions at Compulsory Acquisition Hearing 1 (CAH1)

EN010149/APP/8.23
Revision 1
Deadline 3
August 2025
Springwell Energyfarm Ltd

Planning Act 2008
Infrastructure Planning (Examination
Procedure) Rules 2010



Table of Contents

1. Introduction.....	2
2. Written Summary of the Applicant's Oral Submissions at CAH1	3
3. Response to Action Points from CAH1	12
Appendix 1 - Summary of LIQ Response Status	14

1. Introduction

- 1.1.1. This note summarises the oral submissions made by Springwell Energyfarm Limited (the **Applicant**) at Compulsory Acquisition Hearing 1 (**CAH1**) held on 17 July 2025 in relation to the application for development consent (**Application**) for the Springwell Solar Farm (the **Proposed Development**).
- 1.1.2. Where the Examining Authority (the **ExA**) requested further information from the Applicant on specified matters, or the Applicant undertook to provide further information during the course of CAH1, that further information is either set out in this document or provided as part of the Applicant's Deadline 3 submissions.
- 1.1.3. This note does not purport to summarise the oral submissions of other parties, and summaries of submissions made by other parties are only included where necessary to give context to the Applicant's submissions, or where the Applicant agreed with the submission(s) made and so made no further submissions (this is noted within the document where relevant).
- 1.1.4. The structure of this note follows the order of the items listed in the detailed agenda published by the ExA on 4 July 2025 (the **Agenda**). Numbered agenda items referred to are references to the numbered items in the Agenda. The Applicant's substantive oral submissions commenced at Item 3 of the Agenda. Therefore, this note does not address Items 1 and 2 on the Agenda as these were procedural and administrative in nature.
- 1.1.5. The second part of this note comprises the Applicant's response to Action Points raised from CAH1.

2. Written Summary of the Applicant's Oral Submissions at CAH1

#	Agenda item	Written summary of Applicant's oral submissions
3	Updates on Negotiations and Powers Sought	<p>3.1. The Applicant will be asked to provide an update on negotiations since Deadline 2. Whether there has been any progress with unknown landowners will also be discussed.</p> <p>By way of introduction, Mr Richard Griffiths, Partner at Pinsent Masons LLP, for the Applicant, noted for the record that this was the first compulsory acquisition hearing. He explained that the Applicant had an option agreement for the main site with Blankney Estate (Option Agreement), and that the parties were progressing variations to that Option which should be completed before the end of the examination. Mr Griffiths confirmed that the Applicant was continuing its engagement with Mr and Mrs Leathleys (where an Option Agreement is substantially agreed and anticipated to be exchanged imminently) and Mr and Mrs Hayward (where the Applicant aims to secure agreed Heads of Terms before the end of examination). He also confirmed that the Applicant had received signed Crown consent from the Ministry of Defence on 17 July 2025.</p> <p>Mr Ben Wills, representative of Mr and Mrs Hayward, made oral submissions in respect of plot 11/1 identifying the Haywards' concerns about the CPO process in the context of five parties seeking to negotiate cable easements through the Haywards' farmland to connect into the proposed National Grid Navenby Substation. Mr Wills submitted that plot 11/1 is a significantly sized parcel extending 29.7 hectares (73 acres), and queried why the Applicant sought an option over the full extent of the parcel when the actual land needed for the cable route is smaller. Mr Wills noted that good discussions were being had with Gateley Hamer (the Applicant's land agents) in respect of proposed Heads of Terms, but that the Haywards sought a detailed plan to have full visibility over the exact area that is needed. Mr Wills also queried, in Mr Hayward's words, whether this was a situation of the 'cart coming before the horse' in terms of granting the Applicant compulsory acquisition rights in circumstances where consent for National Grid substation had not yet been granted.</p> <p>The ExA asked the Applicant for a response to Mr Wills, and to justify the amount of land sought for the cable corridors.</p> <p>Mr Griffiths responded that plot 11/1 was included in its entirety because – while the Applicant had seen layouts of the proposed substation's location - National Grid was yet to submit its planning application for the</p>

#	Agenda item	Written summary of Applicant's oral submissions
		<p>substation. Therefore, National Grid does not yet hold that consent, which means that the Applicant is not yet able to confirm exactly where it can route the cable, and so requires flexibility over that plot until that time. Mr Griffiths confirmed that plot 11/1 is 'blue land' on the Land Plans [EN010149/APP/2.2.2] [AS-004] because the Applicant was only seeking rights for connection into the National Grid substation, not freehold acquisition of the plot. He noted that the rights would be constrained to a particular area once the location of the National Grid Navenby Substation was known, and observed that the level of flexibility (i.e. seeking rights over a broader area) was necessary and the usual approach. Mr Griffiths noted that he could not comment on National Grid's plans about whether or not they would acquire the Haywards' land by agreement or compulsory purchase and further noted that financial issues in relation to the commercial deal proposed are not a matter for this examination.</p> <p>Mr Griffiths introduced Ms Jessica Bere, Technical Director at Gateley Hamer, for the Applicant. Ms Bere explained that the current proposal was for a 10 m wide permanent easement somewhere within the option area within the wider plot 11/1 area.</p> <p>Mr Griffiths noted that section 5 of the Grid Connection Statement [EN010149/APP/7.6.2] [REP1-058] set out the responsibilities under the Connection Agreement between National Grid Electricity Transmission (NGET) and the Applicant, where NGET is responsible for the construction of the substation and the Applicant is responsible for the construction of the relevant generator bay. He confirmed that the Applicant's intention is to minimise the area of the easement required, but at this stage the Applicant was unable to confirm its precise location until it knows where the bay it needs to connect into will be located. Mr Griffiths reiterated that until NGET progresses its application for the substation with North Kesteven District Council, the location of the bay could not be confirmed and the flexibility across the whole plot was required in order to deliver the Proposed Development. Mr Griffiths confirmed that the Applicant was committed to continued dialogue with Mr Wills and his clients over the option that is currently being negotiated.</p> <p>Mr Griffiths subsequently noted in response to a comment from Interested Party, Mr Marc Williams of the Springwell Solar Action Group, how paragraph 4.11.8 of NPS EN-1 clearly anticipates that electricity generating stations may well come forward in advance of, and separate to, the substation connection, given they are promoted by separate applicants. Mr Griffiths stated that he appreciated the pressures the Haywards</p>

#	Agenda item	Written summary of Applicant's oral submissions
		<p>were under, and noted that the Applicant was actively trying through Gateley Hamer to reach agreement with them and provide them with information. He made the commitment that, as soon as the Applicant could progress matters further, it would.</p> <p><u>Changes to the BoR</u></p> <p>The ExA queried the reasons for the changes in the Book of Reference (BoR) [EN010149/APP/4.3.3] [REP2-004] submitted by the Applicant at Deadline 2, where the ExA referred to additional plots added into 'Category Two' and the removal of Barclays Bank. Ms Bere for the Applicant noted that she expected that the landowners had written to the Applicant to confirm that they no longer have rights in the land, presumably following updates of a land registry refresh and ongoing dialogue with landowners and interested parties. She noted she would confirm this following the hearing.</p> <p>Post-hearing note: The Applicant confirms that no additional plots have been added to the BoR since the application was submitted. The amendments to the BoR at Deadline 2 were for the following reasons:</p> <p>At submission, the BoR [EN010149/APP/4.3] [APP-017] contained two minor errors when referencing the compulsory acquisition powers sought over plots 12/10 and 12/11, where these were erroneously identified as permanent acquisition of new rights; however, on the Land Plans at submission these plots were shown as temporary use ('green land'). The Land Plans were correct and at Deadline 2, the description of powers sought in the Book of Reference [EN010149/APP/4.3.3] [REP2-004] for plots 12/10 and 12/11 were amended to align correctly with the Land Plans.</p> <p>Additional changes to the Book of Reference [EN010149/APP/4.3.3] [REP2-004] at Deadline 2 were the inclusion of the Applicant's (Springwell EnergyFarm Limited's) interests and the removal of Barclays Security Trustee Limited. Both amendments were triggered by updates to the HMLR Register against the relevant plots, showing the inclusion of the Applicant's interest via the Option Agreement over land, and the removal of Barclays Security Trustee Limited due to the mortgage being paid off.</p> <p><u>Updates in relation to unknown landowners</u></p>

#	Agenda item	Written summary of Applicant's oral submissions
		<p>The ExA asked whether there were any updates on unknown landowners and ongoing work to identify those. Ms Bere submitted that the Applicant had not been made aware of any further unknown landowners through the Applicant's ongoing diligent enquiries. She stated that there are no unknown Category One landowners within the Book of Reference [EN010149/APP/4.3.3] [REP2-004], and that any unknown landowners were either Categories Two or Three. Ms Bere confirmed that the Applicant continued to make diligent enquiries to identify any unknown landowners listed in the Book of Reference [EN010149/APP/4.3.3] [REP2-004].</p>
4	The National Grid Substation Site	<p>4.1 The Applicant and National Grid will be asked questions on their current positions regarding the inclusion of the site within the Order limits and CA powers sought.</p> <p>The ExA confirmed it would put questions to NGET in writing. The Applicant was asked to provide an update on its overall progress with National Grid including Protective Provisions since the last deadline. This response is given below at Item 5.</p>
5	Protective Provisions	<p>5.1 The Applicant will be asked to provide an update on negotiations since Deadline 2.</p> <p>Ms Olivia Henshall, Senior Associate at Pinsent Masons LLP, for the Applicant, confirmed that the Applicant remains in negotiations with seven undertakers, as described in the Schedule of Negotiations and Powers Sought [EN010149/APP/4.4.3] [REP2-007] submitted at Deadline 2.</p> <p>She stated that with regards to Exolum Pipeline System Ltd and Anglian Water, negotiations are progressing and since Deadline 2, the Applicant has returned comments to these statutory undertakers on their bespoke protective provisions. The Applicant has received additional minor comments from Exolum Pipeline System since then, which are being considered. In respect of Network Rail, the Applicant has continued engagement with them since Deadline 2 and the parties are in negotiation in respect of bespoke protective provisions and accompanying agreement and other matters under discussion. With regards to National Grid Energy Distribution, NGET and Cadent Gas Limited, the parties are continuing with their engagement since Deadline 2 and had just heard back from NGET. Lastly, Ms Henshall noted while Openreach had not engaged with the Applicant since Deadline 2, protective provisions had been included within Schedule 15 Part 2 of the Draft DCO [EN010149/APP/3.1.2] [REP1-006] in order to manage any potential impacts on their apparatus.</p>

#	Agenda item	Written summary of Applicant's oral submissions
		Ms Henshall confirmed that, based on the current status of negotiations, the Applicant considered it should be able to reach agreement on the protective provisions with all of these parties by the end of examination and that it will update the ExA in due course.
6	Articles 24, 31 and 32 of the dDCO	<p>6.1 The Applicant will be asked further questions on these Articles and the powers sought by them.</p> <p>The ExA referred to Article 24 and noted the Applicant's response to First Written Question 1.6.7 (see Response to First Written Questions (ExQ1) [EN010149/APP/8.14] [REP1-071]), however, stated that the response did not address the ExA's question about providing evidence to show that persons with an interest in any land not included in either Schedules 9 or 11 were aware that undefined new rights may be sought over that land and were consulted on that basis. The ExA asked the Applicant to set out where in the Application documents this was made clear to them.</p> <p>Mr Griffiths, for the Applicant, confirmed that the Applicant had carried out statutory consultation under section 42 of the Planning Act 2008 for all persons with an interest in the land under section 42(1)(d), and noted consultation requirements did not oblige the Applicant to highlight what compulsory acquisition powers are sought on every single plot. Mr Griffiths stated that the consultation requirements are to write to the affected landowner letting them know that they are a person with an interest in the Order Limits and that powers are being sought over their land, and to invite them to comment.</p> <p>The ExA clarified that its question was ultimately in relation to how Article 24 was worded and queried whether it sought to give the Applicant permanent rights across all of the Order land rather than defined particular plots.</p> <p>Mr Griffiths, for the Applicant, stated that the Applicant was not seeking permanent rights across all of the Order land. He confirmed that Article 24 would only give the Applicant rights over the land listed in Schedule 9 of the Draft DCO [EN010149/APP/3.1.2] [REP1-006], and that the 'blue land' on the Land Plans [EN010149/APP/2.2.2] [AS-004] showed the land where those rights were sought. Mr Griffiths further explained that Article 24(1) is subject to paragraph (2) which states that the Applicant is only granted the rights set out in column 2 of Schedule 9 (the 'blue land'). He confirmed that for 'pink land,' rights are not</p>

#	Agenda item	Written summary of Applicant's oral submissions
		<p>required because the Applicant is acquiring the freehold, and that 'green land' is for temporary possession powers where Article 24 then links into Article 31 which is for the temporary use of land.</p> <p>The ExA noted that they had the same question about consultation in relation to Articles 31 and 32, and would come back to the Applicant if needed.</p> <p>Mr Griffiths explained that Article 31 has a two-tier structure which would enable the Applicant to take temporary possession of the following land in connection with the construction of the Proposed Development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • under Article 31(1)(a)(i), land where only temporary use is sought, being land shaded green on the Land Plans [EN010149/APP/2.2.2] [AS-004] where those particular plots are listed in Schedule 11; and • under Article 31(1)(a)(ii), any other Order land, meaning land that is coloured pink or blue on the Land Plans [EN010149/APP/2.2.2] [AS-004], being land where the Applicant is ultimately seeking compulsory acquisition of all interests and rights in land (pink), or permanent acquisition of new rights (blue). <p>In accordance with Article 31(1)(a)(ii), he noted that the temporary use power can be exercised across the whole of the Order land precisely because the Applicant wanted to minimise acquisition of land. By way of example, Mr Griffiths referred to the cable corridor, where the Applicant would be able to enter the land and take temporary possession of it under Article 31, microsite the land to identify where the precise location of the easement would be and then once designed, the Applicant could seek to permanently acquire the narrower easement area, thereby minimising the permanent compulsory acquisition under Article 24.</p> <p>Post-hearing note: The subject of this discussion became Action Point 3, which the Applicant has responded to in the 'Response to Action Points from CAH1' table annexed to this Written Summary.</p> <p>The ExA referred to the Response to First Written Questions (ExQ1) [EN010149/APP/8.14] [REP1-071] 1.6.8(a) and how it referred to persons discussing voluntary agreements. The ExA asked what discussions were happening with other people with an interest in land – not necessarily the landowner – and whether they were aware of such rights being sought.</p>

#	Agenda item	Written summary of Applicant's oral submissions
		<p>Mr Griffiths sought to clarify First Written Question 1.6.8(a) was talking about the scope of temporary possession powers and the notification process should the Order be granted giving the Applicant temporary possession powers. The ExA stated it was seeking to understand whether the consultation requirements under the Regulations had been met.</p> <p>Ms Bere, as the land agent from Gateley Hamer for the Applicant, confirmed that all Category One, Two and Three parties were consulted under section 42 of the Planning Act 2008 as part of the statutory pre-application consultation requirements, and were all sent a land interest questionnaire along with plans showing the interest, and outlining their interest in the particular parcel of land. Ms Bere confirmed that every effort was made to make contact, and that contact details were provided for landowners to get in contact if they had queries.</p> <p>The ExA asked whether the Applicant could provide any of that material so that it could be clear what was provided. Ms Bere committed to compile a list of those parties who replied to the land interest questionnaire (though it was established that the actual results of those questionnaires was not required).</p> <p>Post-hearing note: A list of parties contained in the BoR and their Land Interest Questionnaire (LIQ) response status has been compiled and is appended to this Written Summary.</p> <p>Mr Griffiths noted that there was some confusion, because FWQ 1.6.8 (which relates to the post consent procedure for serving notice before exercising temporary possession powers) was not the correct reference based on what the ExA seemed to be asking, which was about pre-application consultation. Mr Griffiths subsequently confirmed that the Consultation Report [EN010149/APP/5.1] [APP-019] contained all of the necessary reporting on the Applicant's pre-application consultation obligations and that the Planning Inspectorate had accepted the adequacy of consultation when it accepted the application into examination.</p> <p>The ExA said that there were previous DCOs where temporary rights across the whole Order limits had been refused – and gave the example of the Manston Airport DCO application, where the Secretary of State was not satisfied that there was sufficient consultation in line with the compulsory acquisition regulations and was not satisfied that the parties were aware of the powers sought.</p>

#	Agenda item	Written summary of Applicant's oral submissions
		<p>Following a brief adjournment, Mr Griffiths for the Applicant confirmed that in the final draft of the Manston Airport Development Consent Order (DCO), Article 29 (which granted temporary possession powers) was the offending article and this was subsequently amended by the Secretary of State when it made the final Order. Mr Griffiths stated that Article 29(9) in the final draft DCO (pre-Secretary of State amendments) did not apply here, because that article stated that the applicant was not precluded from acquiring new rights over the temporary possession land under Article 22 (compulsory acquisition of rights). In that case, the applicant could, as they were proposing, go on to later acquire permanent rights over land that was currently shown as being subject to temporary possession powers only under Article 29(1)(a)(i). Mr Griffiths made clear that the Applicant's draft Article 22 (compulsory acquisition of land) – which among other articles was subject to Article 24(2) and Article 31 – did not seek to do that, and that there was therefore a difference in the drafting between the Applicant's Draft DCO [EN010149/APP/3.1.2] [REP1-006], which includes article 31(10) specifically restricting this situation arising, and the final draft Manston Airport DCO. Therefore, this situation does not arise in relation to the Proposed Development.</p> <p>Mr Griffiths sought to assure the ExA that, as set out in the Consultation Report [EN010149/APP/5.1] [APP-019], paragraphs 5.4.7 – 5.4.13 sets out the Applicant's diligent enquiry, and identifies the section 41(d) consultees, and Consultation Report Appendices E-1 – F-1 [EN010149/APP/5.2] [APP-024] sets out all of the letters sent to those consultees. He confirmed that the Book of Reference [EN010149/APP/4.3.3] [REP2-004] was being continuously updated and noted that the only additional interests that had been included in the BoR since submission of the Application was in relation to the Applicant itself following registration of the Applicant's interest from the Option Agreement. Mr Griffiths described how section 7.2 of the Consultation Report [EN010149/APP/5.1] [APP-019] confirms that targeted consultation following statutory consultation was carried out due to minor design amendments and that new interests were identified and consulted on the proposed application. To conclude, Mr Griffiths noted that the Consultation Report [EN010149/APP/5.1] [APP-019] clearly identified the consultation process, the Book of Reference [REP2-004] was continuously updated during the examination and that the ExA's concern arising from the Manston Airport DCO application was not part of the Applicant's Draft DCO [EN010149/APP/3.1.2] [REP1-006].</p>

#	Agenda item	Written summary of Applicant's oral submissions
		<p><u>Leasing or acquiring the land?</u></p> <p>In response to Interested Party Mr Williams' question about why, if the Applicant was going to lease the land from the Blankney Estate for 40 years, there are discussions about acquiring freehold, Mr Griffiths explained that the Applicant has an Option for Lease agreement with the Blankney Estate. The lease would be for the construction, operation and decommissioning of the Proposed Development and at the expiry of that lease, the land would be handed back to the freehold owner in accordance with the terms of that lease. However, Mr Griffiths explained that the approach for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIPs) was that if a landowner should not comply with the option agreement, then the Applicant can fall back on rights to compulsorily acquire the land to ensure that the NSIP can be delivered. However, this would only occur if the landowner was in breach of the agreed contract. Mr Griffiths confirmed that this was a standard approach across NSIPs. He clarified that the stated intention between the parties is to agree the Option Agreement to then take a lease for 40 years and 6 months.</p>
7	Procedural Decisions, Review of Actions and Next Steps	<p>The ExA listed the actions from the hearing. The Applicant has provided a response to all actions allocated to it.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ben Wills to provide an update at each Deadline on his client's position regarding Plot 11/1. 2. Applicant to update on progress on Protective Provisions at Deadline 3. 3. Applicant to provide a summary of consultation that was undertaken with all parties who have an interest in land that is subject to powers under Articles 24, 31 and 32 of the Draft DCO [EN010149/APP/3.1.2] [REP1-006] at Deadline 3. a

3. Response to Action Points from CAH1

The table below sets out the list of action points that arose during CAH1 and the Applicant's response to them.

Action Point	Applicant's Response
Action Point 1: Mr Wills to provide an update on his client's (the Haywards) position at each deadline regarding Plot 11/1.	N/A for Applicant
Action Point 2: The Applicant is to provide an update on progress of Protective Provisions at each deadline.	The Applicant has recorded the current position in the updated Schedule of Negotiations and Powers Sought [EN010149/APP/4.4.4] submitted at Deadline 3.
Action Point 3: The Applicant is to provide a summary of consultation that was undertaken with all parties who have an interest in the land that is subject to powers under Articles 24, 31 and 32 of the dDCO.	<p>Section 42(1)(d) of the Planning Act 2008 (PA 2008) requires the Applicant to consult each person who is within one or more categories set out in section 44 of the PA 2008. Land Referencers were appointed by the Applicant to complete the process of diligent inquiry prior to, throughout, and following the Application to identify relevant persons with an interest in land. The diligent inquiry process included the following methods described in the Statement of Reasons [EN010149/APP/4.1] [APP-015]:</p> <p>To ensure any new interests were identified, refreshes of the HMLR Registers were conducted every six months, or at a significant milestone in the application and examination process.</p> <p>HMLR Register information was further verified using Land Interest Questionnaires (LIQs). These were issued to all identified land interests, both within the Order Limits and those identified outside the Order Limits as potential Category 3 interests. The LIQs notified impacted parties of the Proposed Development and identified the land which may be impacted by it. Recipients of the LIQ were asked to</p>

Action Point	Applicant's Response
	<p>confirm that the information extracted from the HMLR Register was correct and provide additional information not publicly available where relevant (e.g., tenancy agreements and informal rights of access). The Applicant's contact information was provided should impacted parties have had any queries regarding how their land was to be impacted by the scheme.</p> <p>All parties identified were also notified of the statutory consultations held in 2024, where they were invited to comment on the proposals for the scheme. Further information can be found in the Consultation Report [EN010149/APP/5.1] [APP-019] and its appendices.</p> <p>All Category 1 landowners have been consulted with and engagement has been ongoing for a number of years as highlighted in the Schedule of Negotiations and Powers Sought [EN010149/APP/4.4.3] [REP2-007], where the Applicant held multiple meetings to explain the DCO process and the powers that are being sought over land. To avoid using the compulsory purchase powers sought in the draft DCO [EN010149/APP/3.1.2] [REP1-006], the Applicant has sought to secure voluntary agreements with these landowners.</p> <p>All Category 2 parties have been consulted with and engagement has been ongoing for a number of years, many of which relate to securing protective provisions, during which the use of compulsory acquisition powers that are being sought are discussed with the relevant interests. Updates as to the progress of these agreements are recorded in the Schedule of Negotiations and Powers Sought [EN010149/APP/4.4.3] [REP2-007].</p>

Appendix 1

Summary of LIQ Response Status



Party ID	Party	Responded to LIQ [Y/N]	LIQ Response Date	Statutory Consultation Letter issued [Y/N]	Targeted consultation Letter issued [Y/N]	s56 Letter issued [Y/N]
6138	Blankney Estates Limited	Y	16/07/2024	Y	Y	Y
6140	The Secretary of State for Defence	Y	22/05/2025	Y	Y	Y
6141	Peter Stuart Helm	Y	22/08/2023	Y	N	Y
6148	Joseph Green	N	N/A	Y	N/A	Y
6151	Alison Horan	Y	07/12/2023	Y	N/A	Y
6152	Lincoln Diocesan Trust and Board of Finance Limited	Y	05/10/2023	Y	N/A	Y
6154	Jeremy Wetherall	Y	17/08/2023	Y	N	Y
6157	Hesper Mary Timms	Y	17/07/2023	Y	N/A	Y
6159	Ralph Edmund Timms	Y	17/07/2023	Y	N/A	Y
6163	John Frank Money	Y	14/08/2023	Y	N/A	Y
6164	Philip James Baumber	Y	17/07/2023	Y	N/A	Y
6167	Hugh Simon Nevile	Y	21/07/2023	Y	Y	Y
6170	Ruth Patricia Hodge	Y	31/08/2023	Y	N/A	Y
6171	Russell Adrian Hodge	Y	31/08/2023	Y	N/A	Y
6172	Jennifer Anne Wilkinson	Y	29/05/2024	Y	Y	Y
6176	Pamela Leathley	Y	15/09/2023	Y	N/A	Y
6177	Lincolnshire County Council	N	N/A	Y	Y	Y
6179	Carol Diane Weston	Y	29/11/2023	Y	N/A	Y
6181	David Alexander Donald Weston	Y	29/11/2023	Y	N/A	Y
6182	Richard Alan Durance	Y	06/09/2023	Y	N/A	Y
6184	Alison Durance	Y	02/09/2023	Y	N/A	Y
6187	Margaret Embleton	Y	09/01/2024	Y	N/A	Y
6188	Douglas Alan Embleton	Y	09/01/2024	Y	N/A	Y
6197	Scopwick and Kirkby Green Parish Council	Refused	24/11/2023	Y	N/A	Y
6202	Ian Leathley	Y	14/08/2023	Y	N/A	Y
6506	Exolum Pipeline System Ltd	N	N/A	Y	N/A	Y
6536	National Grid Electricity Distribution plc	N	N/A	Y	Y	Y
6537	National Grid Electricity Transmission plc	N	N/A	Y	Y	Y
6538	Cadent Gas Limited	Y	24/07/2023	Y	Y	Y
6745	JG Construction (Lincoln) Limited	N	N/A	Y	N/A	Y
6756	Neil John Squires	Refused	29/11/2023	Y	N/A	Y
6757	Andrew Stewart Reynolds	N	N/A	Y	N/A	Y
6758	Gina Louise Reynolds	N	N/A	Y	N/A	Y
6762	Susan Ann Wing	Y	02/08/2023	N	Y	Y
6796	Handelsbanken plc	N	N/A	Y	N/A	Y
6804	HSBC UK Bank plc	N	N/A	Y	N/A	Y
6816	National Gas Transmission plc	Y	27/07/2023	Y	N/A	Y
6878	Anglian Water Services Limited	Y	17/07/2024	Y	Y	Y
6890	Stuart John Rhodes	Y	11/08/2023	N	Y	Y
6891	Krystyna Theresa Rhodes	Refused	14/06/2024	N	Y	Y
6894	John Neville	N	N/A	Y	N/A	Y
6895	Kimberley Alice Neville	N	N/A	Y	N/A	Y
6898	Christopher Charles Kasap	Y	28/08/2023	N	Y	Y
7084	Richard William Parker	Y	22/12/2023	Y	N/A	Y
7085	John Paul Michael Parker	N	N/A	Y	N/A	Y
7149	Aedifica UK Limited	N	N/A	Y	N/A	Y
7154	Barclays Security Trustee Limited	N	N/A	Y	N/A	Y
7187	The Owner/Occupier	Refused	20/06/2024	TBC	TBC	TBC
7229	Munks Agricultural Contractors Limited	N	N/A	Y	N/A	Y
7258	Richard John Hayward	Y	05/01/2024	Y	Y	Y
7259	Charles Peter Hayward	Y	05/01/2024	Y	Y	Y
7285	Michael Dowse	Refused	12/07/20224	N	Y	Y
7286	Countrywide Tax & Trust Corporation Ltd	N	N/A	N	Y	Y
7321	James Fitzroy Dean	Y	24/07/2024	N	Y	Y
7322	Julia Mary Mackenzie Scott	Y	28/06/2024	N	Y	Y
7323	Charles Henry Curzon Coaker	Y	28/06/2024	N	Y	Y
7324	George William Tindley	Y	28/06/2024	N	Y	Y
7343	Paul Eric Scholey	Y	23/02/2024	Y	N/A	Y
7344	Jane Margaret Scholey	Y	23/02/2024	Y	N/A	Y
7345	Jennifer Mary Blades	Y	21/02/2024	Y	N/A	Y
7370	Georgina Willow Hayward	Y	05/01/2024	Y	N/A	Y
7415	Ruth Margaret Parker	N	N/A	Y	N/A	Y
7417	Jill Lindsey Parker	N	N/A	Y	N/A	Y
7418	C.F.Banks Limited	N	N/A	Y	N/A	Y
7421	E & RW Parker Trust	Y	22/12/2023	Y	N/A	Y
7422	A.Moor & Sons Limited	Y	22/12/2023	Y	N/A	Y
7424	Openreach Limited	N	N/A	Y	Y	Y
7539	The Occupier	N	N/A	TBC	TBC	TBC
7564	St Hybald's Church Parochial Church Council	Y	07/04/2024	N	Y	Y
7571	Derek James Marshall	Y	20/06/2024	N	Y	Y
7572	Alma Therese Marshall	Y	20/06/2024	N	Y	Y
7570	Eric Michael Wilkinson	Y	25/08/2023	Y	N/A	N/A



springwellsolarfarm.co.uk