

Sent by Email to:

springwellsolarfarm@planninginspectorate.gov.uk

Infrastructure Manager  
Planning Services  
Lincolnshire County Council  
County Offices  
Newland  
Lincoln LN1 1YL

Tel: [REDACTED]

E-Mail: [nsips@lincolnshire.gov.uk](mailto:nsips@lincolnshire.gov.uk)

Your Ref: EN010149

Interested Party Number: SWSF-SP005

Date: 7 October 2025

Dear Sir/Madam

**Application by Springwell Energy Farm Limited for an Order Granting Development Consent for the Springwell Energy Farm project.**

**Deadline 5 submissions for Lincolnshire County Council (LCC)**

This letter contains LCC's comments on further information and submissions received at Deadline 4.

### **Ecology**

LCC has reviewed the updated draft DCO (REP4-004) submitted by the Applicant, and notes the updates made to Requirement 8 (Landscape and Ecology Management Plan) (REP4-004) to ensure that figures relating to Biodiversity Net Gain align with figures presented in the Applicant's Biodiversity Net Gain Report (REP3-022).

LCC welcomes the inclusion of references to the proposed Ecological Steering Group in Table 4 and at 5.1.7 within the oCEMP (REP4-025) within Table 3 and at 5.2.3 within the oOEMP (REP4-032) and in Table 3 and at 5.2.4 within the oDEMP (REP4-035).

However, in relation to the oLEMP submitted at Deadline 4 (REP4-030), LCC provided comments on the previous version of the oLEMP at Deadline 4 which has not yet been addressed. LCC notes that there is a discrepancy in the BNG figures relating to hedgerows presented in Table 1 when compared to figures presented in the updated BNG strategy (REP3-022). In addition to this, LCC's response to EXQ2 Q2.4.3 raised a number of points in relation to the proposed Ecological Steering Group (ESG) to be addressed in the oLEMP. LCC has stated its current position in relation to this matter in the Statement of Common Ground to be submitted at deadline 5, subject to the final submitted version of the oLEMP, which includes a draft terms of reference for the ESG, being submitted in accordance with the version provided to the Council on 6 October 2025, which addresses our previous concerns.

LCC notes the updates made in Chapter 16 (Cumulative Effects) (REP4-013) and has no comments to make in relation to ecology and biodiversity.

### **Waste**

LCC remain concerned about section 2.10.1 of the oCEMP, particularly the assertion that ‘waste arising from construction is not anticipated to consist of substantial amounts of waste electrical or electronic equipment’ when the applicant’s forecasts show around 300 tonnes of ‘damaged PV modules’ during construction. LCC therefore question the validity of the statement that such waste would not be substantial.

LCC are pleased to see additional clarification of the information to be in the maintenance schedule within the oOEMP (section 2.10.7) as well as additional clarification of the information to be in the decommissioning activities updates (section 2.10.6 within the oDEMP).

In terms of arising forecasts, LCC now feel able to agree that the applicant’s methodology and tonnage forecasts match. However, the applicant’s assumptions (e.g. percentages) and the quantity of waste generated both raise potential issues. LCC would like to see the finalised forecasts and assumptions published for the Council’s consideration. LCC position on these matters is set out in the Statement of Common Ground due to be submitted at deadline 5.

### **dDCO**

LCC notes that Schedule 16 has been updated, with the insertion of Article 3(6). LCC is concerned that the stipulated two-day timeframe for submitting a request for additional information would be insufficient. While we understand that this part pertains to further requests following the submission of additional information in response to a previous request, it is important to note that such further submissions may contain substantial material requiring careful review and/or consultation. In such cases, a two-day turnaround would not allow adequate time for proper consideration.

LCC has had recent discussions with the applicant regarding this timeframe and has indicated to the applicant that 10 working days and the inclusion of ‘or such other period as is agreed in writing between the undertaker and the relevant planning authority’ would be acceptable to the Council. We therefore respectfully request that this be amended in the final DCO. Suggested wording is provided below:

Where further information is requested under this paragraph and provided by the undertaker, any notification reasonably given by the relevant planning authority that the information provided is inadequate and requesting additional information must be received by the undertaker within ~~two~~ **10** working days of the day on which the undertaker has provided the further information in response to the original request **(or such other period as is agreed in writing between the undertaker and the relevant planning authority)**, ~~and where~~ **and where** no such notification is received the relevant planning authority is deemed to have sufficient information to consider the application

and is not thereafter entitled to request further information without the prior agreement of the undertaker.

**Interrelationship report [REP4-045]**

LCC has reviewed the interrelationship report submitted at deadline 4 and has no further comments beyond those made in response to ExQ2 Question 2.1.2.

Yours faithfully,

[REDACTED]

For [REDACTED]  
Head of Planning