



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 (ExQ2)

Issued on 2 September 2025

The following table sets out the Examining Authority's (ExA's) written questions and requests for information – 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 Q2 (indicating that it is from ExQ2) and then has an issue number and a question number. For example, the first question on air quality issues is identified as Q2.3.1. 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 and include 'Springwell Solar Farm' in the subject line of your email.

Responses are due by Deadline 4: Tuesday 23 September 2025



Abbreviations used:

ADBA	Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment	NGNS	National Grid Navenby Substation
ASI	Accompanied Site Inspection	NKDC	North Kesteven District Council
BNG	Biodiversity Net Gain	NPS	National Policy Statement
CCTV	Closed Circuit Television	NSIP	Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project
CEMP	Construction Environmental Management Plan	oCTMP	Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan
dDCO	Draft DCO	oLEMP	Outline Landscape Environmental Management Plan
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment	oOEMP	Outline Operational Environment Management Plan
EIA Regulations	Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017	oPRoWPPMP	Outline Public Rights of Way and Permissive Paths Management Plan
ES	Environmental Statement	oSMP	Outline Soil Management Plan
ESG	Environmental Steering Group	oWSI	Outline Written Scheme of Investigation
ExA	Examining Authority	PA2008	The Planning Act 2008
HE	Historic England	PM_{2.5}	Particulate Matter less than 2.5 micrometres in diameter
IP	Interested Party	PRoW	Public Right of Way
ISH	Issue Specific Hearing	PPs	Protective Provisions
LCC	Lincolnshire County Council	R	Requirement
LPA	Local Planning Authority	RR	Relevant Representation
MoD	Ministry of Defence	s106	Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990
NH	National Highways	SoCG	Statement of Common Ground
NE	Natural England		



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 ExQ2 2.1.1 – refers to question 1 in this table.



Index

1.	General, Cross-topic and Need.....	5
2.	Alternatives and Site Selection.....	5
3.	Air Quality	5
4.	Biodiversity	6
5.	Climate Change	8
6.	Compulsory Acquisition, Temporary Possession and Other Land or Rights Considerations	8
7.	Cultural Heritage	9
8.	Draft Development Consent Order (DCO).....	12
9.	Land, Soils and Groundwater	13
10.	Landscape and Visual Impact.....	14
11.	Noise and Vibration.....	16
12.	Population.....	16
13.	Traffic and Transport, inc Publics Right of Way	18
14.	Water	20
15.	Other Matters, inc Waste	20

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
1.	General, Cross-topic and Need	
Q2.1.1	Applicant	<p>Grid Connection</p> <p>The Examining Authority (ExA) understands that the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Scoping Report for the proposed National Grid Navenby Substation (NGNS) has now been published. Having regard to this additional information, provide further evidence that there are not any clear <u>environmental</u> reasons why permission would not be granted for the proposed NGNS, in line with Paragraph 4.11.6 of National Policy Statement (NPS) EN-1.</p>
Q2.1.2	Applicant Lincolnshire County Council North Kesteven District Council	<p>Cumulative Effects</p> <p>An action point from Issue Specific Hearing (ISH) 3 [EV6-008] [EV6-009] was for the Applicant to provide an update to the Interrelationships with other Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects and Major Development Schemes Report [REP1-068] at either Deadline (D) 3 or 4. Further, the Applicant has provided a revised Cumulative Effects Assessment [REP3-014] that takes into account the published EIA Scoping Report for the proposed NGNS.</p> <p>a. Applicant, please provide the updated interrelationships report.</p> <p>b. Local Authorities, do you accept the findings of the revised cumulative effects assessment? If not, please set out fully why you disagree.</p>
2.	Alternatives and Site Selection	
		No further questions at this stage.
3.	Air Quality	
Q2.3.1	Lincolnshire County Council North Kesteven District Council	<p>Revised Plume Assessment</p> <p>Following discussions at ISH3 [EV6-002] [EV6-003] the Applicant has undertaken an additional Plume Assessment [REP3-077] that incorporates atmospheric dispersion modelling and considers particulate matter. The UK Health Security Agency has set out [AS-028] that it has</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		overcome its concerns. Confirm whether you are content with the methodology and assumptions adopted, as well as the overall findings of the revised assessment.
4. Biodiversity		
Q2.4.1	Applicant	<p>Biodiversity Net Gain</p> <p>The updated draft Development Consent Order (dDCO) submitted at D3 [REP3-004] includes revised wording for requirement (R) 8(2) requiring higher minimum percentage biodiversity net gain (BNG) figures for habitat units (31.66%) and hedgerow units (20.68%) but not for watercourse units. However, these figures do not correlate with those in Table 15 of the BNG assessment [REP3-021], the net change for habitat units is 28.94% and 22.38% for hedgerow units. Furthermore, at ISH3 [EV6-006] [EV6-007], the Applicant also confirmed that a higher percentage would be included in R8 for watercourse units.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Confirm which percentage figures are correct for habitat and hedgerow units and provide an updated dDCO or BNG assessment as necessary. Provide an updated dDCO with the higher percentage BNG figure for watercourse units or provide justification for the minimum 10% net gain requirement.
Q2.4.2	Applicant Ministry of Defence	<p>Aerodrome Safeguarding - Birdstrike Hazard</p> <p>The Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) between the Applicant and Ministry of Defence (MoD) [REP3-067] states that this topic is deemed to be principally agreed, pending finalisation of the requirement wording. Each party is asked to confirm whether agreement on the requirement wording has been reached and if not to set out its preferred wording.</p>
Q2.4.3	Applicant Lincolnshire County Council North Kesteven District Council	<p>Ecological Steering Group</p> <p>The ExA note that terms of reference for the ecological steering group (ESG) have been included in the updated Outline Landscape and Environmental Management Plan (oLEMP) [REP3-037].</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>a. Applicant, confirm the funding mechanism for the ESG and, if relevant, submit a signed section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (s106) agreement into the examination.</p> <p>b. Lincolnshire County Council (LCC) and North Kesteven District Council (NKDC), are you content with the Applicant's proposed terms of reference for the ESG?</p>
Q2.4.4	Applicant	<p>Ecological Specialist</p> <p>In its D3 submission [REP3-079], LCC suggest that a specific reference is made at 2.2.1 of the Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan (oOEMP) [REP3-039] and 2.1.2 of the Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan [REP3-046] to an Ecological Specialist as a key role with responsibility for advising on and overseeing operational matters relating to ecology to ensure consistency with the approach set out in the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP). Confirm whether this role can be included or provide justification if it is not proposed to be included.</p>
Q2.4.5	Natural England	<p>Bat Licence Application</p> <p>The Applicant stated in response to ExQ1.4.9 [REP1-071] that it is considered low risk that a bat roost will be directly affected, especially any significant bat roosts (such as a large maternity roost) and it is therefore not proposing to draft a ghost bat licence application. Are Natural England (NE) satisfied with the Applicant's approach?</p>
Q2.4.6	Applicant	<p>Hedgerow Survey</p> <p>At D3 the important hedgerow survey [REP3-017] and oLEMP [REP3-037] were updated to clarify that the hedgerow survey is not in accordance with Hedgerow Regulations (1997) and therefore only identifies 'potentially' important hedgerows. Confirm that surveys proposed to be undertaken pre-construction will be in accordance with the Hedgerow Regulations (1997) and explain how this is secured within the dDCO.</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Q2.4.7	Applicant	<p>Scarce Arable Flora</p> <p>In Appendix 5 (arable weed management plan) of the oLEMP [REP3-037], the area of grassland managed to benefit arable weeds does not appear to coincide with target note 9 as shown on the arable survey location figures (Figure 2 of [APP-089]). Confirm whether the area of grassland managed to benefit arable weeds in field Bcd115 shown on the arable weed management plan should extend to the north-east corner of the field to include target note location 9.</p>
5. Climate Change		
Q2.5.1	North Kesteven District Council	<p>Ongoing Emissions and Generation Data</p> <p>NKDC maintains [REP3-080] that ongoing, publicly available emissions/ generation data is published annually to encourage transparency of the development. Has the requirement for this been secured in the DCO of any granted solar farm project?</p>
6. Compulsory Acquisition, Temporary Possession and Other Land or Rights Considerations		
Q2.6.1	Applicant	<p>Schedule of Negotiations</p> <p>Provide a revised Schedule of Negotiations [AS-026] to provide an update on the current status of all negotiations, including the variation to the option agreement with Blankney Estates Limited.</p>
Q2.6.2	Applicant	<p>Unknown Landowners</p> <p>There are still a number of plots identified in the Book of Reference [REP2-004] for which the owners are not known. Provide an update on efforts since Compulsory Acquisition Hearing 1 [EV8-002] [EV8-003] to establish these owners/ interests.</p>

ExQ2: 2 September 2025**Responses due by Deadline 4: Tuesday 23 September 2025**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Q2.6.3	Applicant	<p>Cable Corridor to Proposed National Grid Navenby Substation</p> <p>The Applicant has stated [REP3-053] that it has had confirmation from National Grid on the final design of the proposed NGNS and the bay location for connection. On this basis, is there still a need for the extent of the cable corridors currently included in the Order limits, including the whole of Plots 11/1 and 11/3. If so, explain fully why this is still required.</p>
Q2.6.4	National Grid	<p>National Grid and the Order Limits</p> <p>Confirm your latest position in relation to your objection to the Order limits including the proposed NGNS and ongoing discussions with the Applicant.</p>
Q2.6.5	Applicant Anglian Water Cadent Gas Limited Exolum Pipeline System Ltd National Grid Electricity Transmission National Grid Electricity Distribution (East Midlands) Network Rail	<p>Protective Provisions</p> <p>The Applicant has provided a revised dDCO [REP3-004] that includes draft Protective Provisions (PPs).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> All parties, provide an update on negotiations. All parties except the Applicant, please confirm whether you consider the PPs in the dDCO [REP3-004] to be acceptable. If not, explain fully why not and provide alternative wording. Applicant, Cadent Gas Limited has raised concerns [REP3-085] about a lack of engagement. What is your reply to these concerns and confirm whether an agreement before the end of the examination is anticipated?
7.	Cultural Heritage	
Q2.7.1	Applicant	<p>Compliance with EIA Regulations</p> <p>As set out in its post hearing submission [REP3-079], LCC pointed out at ISH2 that the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (EIA</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>Regulations) 14(3)(a) and (b) require the Environmental Statement (ES) to be based on the Scoping Opinion and to include the information reasonably required for reaching a reasoned conclusion on the significant effects of the development on the environment. LCC are of the opinion that the ES does not accord with the EIA Regulations or NPS EN-1 insofar as it does not include an assessment of the significance of the Scopwick and Blankney Conservation areas, the contribution made by their setting to their significance and the potential impact of the Proposed Development. LCC were also of the opinion that the ES did not accord with EIA Regulations in relation to Scopwick Mill and Thompson's Bottom Farm on the basis that the ES did not assess and lacked sufficient information to allow the ExA to reach a reasoned conclusion on the potential impact of the Proposed Development on these assets.</p> <p>The Applicant is asked to respond to LCC's position from a legal perspective to demonstrate compliance with the EIA Regulations or to otherwise update the ES to include an assessment of these assets.</p>
Q2.7.2	Applicant	<p>Archaeological Desk Based Assessment – Scopwick Mill and Thompson's Bottom Farm</p> <p>Annex 14 of the updated Archaeological Desk-based Assessment (ADBA) [REP3-023] doesn't cover Scopwick Mill or Thompson's Bottom Farm. However, the ExA note that the SoCG with NKDC [REP3-059] provides a response to concerns in relation to these assets at ref 11-5a and 11-5e. Provide an update to Annex 14 of the archaeological desk-based assessment to include the consideration of Scopwick Mill and Thompson's Bottom Farm.</p>
Q2.7.3	Lincolnshire County Council Historic England	<p>Archaeological Desk Based Assessment and outline Written Scheme of Investigation</p> <p>The Applicant has produced an updated ADBA and an updated Outline Written Scheme of Investigation (oWSI). LCC and HE are asked to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Identify any outstanding concerns. Advise if it is acceptable for these matters to be resolved in detailed design stage; and

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		c. Advise whether you consider that the oWSI provides satisfaction that these matters will be addressed post-consent.
Q2.7.4	Applicant	<p>Scopwick Mill</p> <p>Inspection point 10 of the Accompanied Site Inspection (ASI) [EV9-001] walked the route of the proposed permissive footpath through fields Bk06, Bk04 and Rw01. The ExA noted that there was intervisibility at a number of points along this route with the upper floor windows of Scopwick Mill. Explain how this intervisibility with the Proposed Development has been accounted for within the assessment of the impact on setting of the heritage asset.</p>
Q2.7.5	Applicant Lincolnshire County Council North Kesteven District Council Historic England	<p>Temple Bruer - Heritage Impact Review</p> <p>At D3 an Interested Party (IP) [REP3-083] submitted an independent report on the impact of the Proposed Development on the Temple Bruer Preceptory Church Tower Grade I Listed Building and Scheduled Monument.</p> <p>a. Applicant, provide a detailed response to the findings and conclusions of the report including the following points that are raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The extent to which the former Knights Templar Estate boundary forms the setting of the heritage assets and contributes to the significance of these assets. • The impact on kinetic views of the Preceptory along Warren Lane and how intervisibility between the Preceptory and the Proposed Development in this location has been considered. <p>b. LCC, NKDC and HE, the ExA note that in the relevant SoCGs with the Applicant, it is agreed that these assets can be scoped out of the ES. Does the independent report submitted at D3 highlight any issues that would change the position of the Councils and/or Historic England (HE)?</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Q2.7.6	Lincolnshire County Council	Collective value of Non-Designated Heritage Assets Annex 14 of the updated ADBA [REP3-023] includes the Applicant's assessment of the impact of the Proposed Development on the collective value of non-designated farmsteads. LCC are asked to comment on the Applicant's conclusion of slight impact (not significant) and explain its position if it disagrees with the Applicant.
8. Draft Development Consent Order (DCO)		
Q2.8.1	Applicant	Article 6 The Applicant has made an alteration to Article 6 (5) in the dDCO [REP3-006] to make clear that it does not include development authorised by Schedule 1 of the Order. However, the ExA remain of the view that the Applicant has not sufficiently demonstrated the need for it to apply to non-NSIP development that has not been consented by the DCO. Provide further justification for this part of the article.
Q2.8.2	Lincolnshire County Council North Kesteven District Council	Articles 40 and 41 Following discussions at ISH4 [EV7-006] [EV7-007] and a subsequent meeting between the parties, the Applicant has made changes to the oLEMP [REP3-037] and the oOEMP [REP3-039], including the addition of a maintenance schedule. Confirm whether these alterations address your remaining concerns.
Q2.8.3	Applicant Network Rail	Disapplication of Railway Related Legislation At ISH4 [EV7-006] [EV7-007], the Applicant set out that discussions were ongoing in terms of the disapplication of railway related legislation. Provide an update on these discussions.

ExQ2: 2 September 2025**Responses due by Deadline 4: Tuesday 23 September 2025**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Q2.8.4	Applicant Ministry of Defence	Requirement for Electrical Noise The Applicant has set out [REP3-067] [REP3-075] that discussions relating to electrical noise are still ongoing with the MoD. Provide an update on these discussions and when it is anticipated an agreement will be reached.
Q2.8.4	Lincolnshire County Council North Kesteven District Council	Requirement 3 The Applicant has proposed a number of changes to R3 of the dDCO [REP3-005]. Do you consider such changes to be acceptable?
9. Land, Soils and Groundwater		
Q2.9.1	Applicant	Temporary or Permanent Effects NKDC has identified [REP3-080] a number of other Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project (NSIP) solar farms where land that has been judged to be sealed under hardstanding (as a result of access tracks, Battery Energy Storage System, substation and other fixed equipment) has been taken as a permanent loss of agricultural land. a. What is the Applicant's reply? b. Provide a similar list of decisions where such effects have been considered temporary.
Q2.9.2	Natural England	Soil Handling The draft SoCG [REP3-063] with NE shows that there is still some disagreement over soil handling. The Applicant has amended the Outline Soil Management Plan (oSMP) [REP3-042] and added NE as a consultee in R18 of the dDCO [REP3-004]. Confirm whether this has addressed your concerns.

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
10.	Landscape and Visual Impact	
Q2.10.1	Applicant	<p>Cumulative Landscape and Visual Impact</p> <p>The Applicant's assessment of landscape and visual impact is limited to the directly affected character areas. However, the Local Authorities have made a number of submissions during the examination that the cumulative landscape and visual effects should be considered at a county-wide scale.</p> <p>In its D3 submission [REP3-079], LCC set out its promoted approach to the assessment of cumulative impact on the county-wide landscape character and visual receptors, by extracting common landscape attributes of the area from the multiple character area assessments that cover the region to determine the baseline for assessment.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Can the Applicant provide an assessment of county-wide landscape and visual impacts using the methodology suggested by LCC? If the Applicant doesn't consider this necessary or appropriate, provide justification. Provide a response to LCC's position that cumulative change of the landscape character through an extensive land use change, would directly affect the perceived openness, and rural tranquillity at a county-wide scale. Provide a response to LCC's judgement that sequential visual effects across two or more schemes could be experienced by visual receptors travelling through the wider landscape on both Public Rights of Way (PRoW) and road corridors.
Q2.10.2	Applicant Lincolnshire County Council	<p>Statement of Common Ground with Lincolnshire County Council</p> <p>It was understood by the ExA at ISH2 [EV5-002] [EV5-003] that there is currently disagreement between the Applicant and LCC on the Landscape character effects both in the wider area generally and within the area of Springwell east in year 10 of operation but this does not appear to be reflected in the SoCG. Provide an updated SoCG that accurately reflects the current position.</p>

ExQ2: 2 September 2025**Responses due by Deadline 4: Tuesday 23 September 2025**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Q2.10.3	Applicant	CCTV Posts Given that Closed Circuit Television (CCTV) posts are shown to be visible from various viewpoints, should CCTV posts be included in the list under R5(1) for a similar reason that lighting and signs are included?
Q2.10.4	Applicant	Temporary Hoarding for Glint and Glare Mitigation It is not clear where the approval of the temporary hoarding covered by the dDCO [REP3-005]. R9(6) refers to temporary fencing needing to be removed on completion of construction and R9(7) refers to permanent fencing being installed prior to commissioning. Neither of which would appear to cover the required timescale for the glint and glare hoarding, therefore is a further subparagraph required? In addition, should R9 generally refer to 'details' rather than 'written details' so that the relevant planning authority will have sight of drawn details in the approval process?
Q2.10.5	Applicant	Residential Visual Amenity Assessment - Scopwick Mill Inspection point 10 of the ASI [EV9-001] walked the route of the proposed permissive footpath through fields Bk06, Bk04 and Rw01. The ExA noted that there was clear intervisibility at a number of points along this route with the upper floor windows of Scopwick Mill. Should this property therefore be assessed in the Residential Visual Amenity Assessment? If not, provide justification.
Q2.10.6	Lincolnshire County Council North Kesteven District Council	Design Commitments The ExA note that following discussion with the Local Authorities, the Applicant has updated the Design Commitments [REP3-030] to include revised wording for commitments D17 and D20 as well as additional commitments D25 and D26. Are you content with the updates made?

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Q2.10.7	Lincolnshire County Council North Kesteven District Council	Inter-Project Cumulative effects with National Grid Navenby Substation The ExA note that in ES Chapter 16 [REP3-014] the Applicant states that <i>“at a meeting between the Applicant’s landscape consultant, LCC and NKDC on 08 July 2025, it was agreed that additional hedgerow planting alongside the A15 north of Gorse Hill Lane (as initially suggested by both LPAs) was unlikely to result in a material difference to the overall significance of effect on views from the A15. It was agreed by all parties that this additional planting was not essential.”</i> Do LCC and NKDC now consider this matter agreed?
11.	Noise and Vibration	
Q2.11.1	Applicant	Noise Impact on Users of PRow The Applicant is asked to provide a detailed response to the concerns raised in an IP’s D3 submission [REP3-083] in relation to noise impacts on users of PRow in construction and operation with particular reference to how the World Health Organisation guidance should be applied, i.e. whether the environment of <i>‘outdoors, in parkland and conservation areas’</i> in the guidance more closely aligns with the PRow than a garden or balcony setting.
12.	Population	
Q2.12.1	Applicant	Skills and Education Package In relation to a skills and education package, the ExA note in the SoCG between the Applicant and NKDC [REP3-059] that there is ongoing engagement on the potential for an agreement, subject to the Applicant being satisfied that such a package would meet the tests for planning obligations. Provide the draft s106 agreement into the examination.

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Q2.12.2	North Kesteven District Council	<p>Loss of Agricultural Jobs and Operations</p> <p>NKDC are asked to provide comment on the Applicant's response to paragraph 20.17 of its Local Impact Report, as set out in the Applicant's D2 submission [REP2-023] (Table 2-10). In particular, the ExA would like to understand NKDC's position on:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Whether sufficient information has been provided by the Applicant in relation to quantifying the loss of agricultural jobs associated with land-use change. Whether the Council agree with the Applicant's assessment in the ES that change in employment and agricultural land would result in a slight adverse (not significant) effect on the agricultural economy.
Q2.12.3	Applicant North Kesteven District Council	<p>Effects on Tourism</p> <p>Action Point 14 from ISH3 was <i>'Applicant and NKDC to hold further discussions in relation to the data used to assess tourism effects and monitoring measures that could be put in place to understand the impact on tourism related to the use of PRoW and stepping out network.'</i></p> <p>The ExA understand that a meeting was due to take place between the Applicant and NKDC on 13 August 2025. Both Parties are asked to provide an update on discussions and set out their position in relation to the following matters:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> What data should be used to assess possible tourism effects related to the use of PRoW and stepping out network? What measures can be put in place to monitor and mitigate the impact of the Proposed Development on tourism related to the use of PRoW and stepping out network in construction and operation?

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
13.	Traffic and Transport, including	Public Rights of Way
Q2.13.1	National Highways	<p>Abnormal Load Movements</p> <p>The draft SoCG [REP1-084] between National Highways (NH) and the Applicant noted that NH has been invited to provide further comment on the suitability of their network from Immingham to the A15 junction. Whilst the latest SoCG [REP3-071] notes this action is agreed, it does not confirm that NH is content with the route from Immingham to the A15 junction. Please confirm if the route is acceptable.</p>
Q2.13.2	Applicant	<p>Link 14</p> <p>The ExA visited this link during its second Unaccompanied Site Inspection [EV1-002]. An IP has raised concern [RR-137] that the ES [APP-054] underestimates the potential effects of the Proposed Development on this link. Further, it is suggested [REP3-102] that Heavy Goods Vehicle traffic should not use routes through Scopwick whilst children are travelling to and from school and pedestrian crossing facilities should also be provided. Provide a detailed response to each of the concerns raised in both representations.</p>
Q2.13.3	Applicant Lincolnshire County Council	<p>Cumulative Traffic Assessment</p> <p>The Applicant [REP3-075, Appendix 3] has undertaken a cumulative traffic note to include the proposed NGNS and other relevant developments. The assessment states: '<i>The cumulative assessment is focussed on those developments where a significant impact could occur on the A15 corridor, this being the most sensitive location within the study area and the corridor featuring junctions with limited peak hour operational spare capacity</i>'. Given this, the ExA is concerned that potential cumulative effects on other links in the study area has not been assessed.</p> <p>a. Applicant, provide a further assessment that considers the whole traffic and transport study area.</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		b. LCC , are the assumptions used for traffic generation and flows for each relevant development, the ruling out of the Leoda project and the overall findings of the assessment accepted?
Q2.13.4	Applicant	<p>Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan</p> <p>Action Point 2 from ISH4 [EV7-008] required the Applicant to provide a revised Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP) to include figures showing the Local Goods Vehicles routeing and to add that shift patterns will be agreed with the Local Authorities to avoid workers using the A15/B1202 junction during embargo periods. Neither of these amendments appear to have been made [REP3-035]. Provide a revised oCTMP that includes these agreed changes.</p>
Q2.13.5	Lincolnshire County Council	<p>Public Rights of Way</p> <p>The Outline Public Rights of Way and Permissive Paths Management Plan (oPROWPPMP) [REP3-044] has been updated to address the outstanding concerns of LCC. Further, the Applicant has noted [REP3-075] that the creation of new PRoWs should include the dedication of such new paths and agrees a deed of dedication would ordinarily be required. However, under the powers in the dDCO [REP1-006], the Applicant does not consider any further amendments are required in this respect, as Article 11 of the dDCO [REP3-004] does the same job and no additional provision in this respect is necessary.</p> <p>a. Have the amendments to the oPROWPPMP fully addressed your concerns? b. Is the Applicant's view with regard to the dedication of new paths accepted?</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
Q2.13.6	Network Rail	Peterborough to Lincoln Railway Line The latest SoCG [REP3-069] sets out that Network Rail remain concerned about potential impacts on the safe operation of the railway during construction and operation and there is dialogue with the Applicant on this matter. Please provide an update on your position.
14. Water		
		No further questions at this stage. However, it should be noted that there are relevant matters to Flood Risk in the ExA's proposed changes to the dDCO.
15. Other Matters, including Waste		
Q2.15.1	Applicant	Decommissioning Further to discussions at ISH3 [EV6-008] [EV6-009], the ExA consider that there is currently insufficient information to demonstrate that decommissioning will be suitably funded, particularly as decommissioning costs have not been included in the Funding Statement [REP1-010] that supports the application (notwithstanding its purpose in relation to Compulsory Acquisition matters). Provide a new funding statement or additional information that clearly demonstrates that decommissioning can be suitably funded by the Applicant.
Q2.15.2	North Kesteven District Council	Working Hours The SoCG [REP3-059] notes that NKDC wish to see a change to the proposed working hours to 7am to 6pm Monday through to Friday and 8am to 1pm on Saturdays. Provide further justification for this request and set out if there is any precedence for such hours in made DCOs for solar farm projects.
Q2.15.3	Applicant	Microlight Aircraft Site IPs [REP1-159] [REP3-107] [REP3-115] have referred the 'Renewable energy developments: solar photovoltaic developments CAST Aerodrome Safeguarding Guidance Note, July 2023'.

ExQ2: 2 September 2025

Responses due by Deadline 4: Tuesday 23 September 2025

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<ul style="list-style-type: none">a. Does the Applicant agree that this document is a relevant consideration?b. If so, set out how the Proposed Development accords with this guidance in all respects, and not just in terms of glint and glare.