



## Application by Beacon Fen Energy Park Limited for an Order Granting Development Consent for the Beacon Fen Energy Park Project

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

Issued on 01 October 2025

The following table sets out the Examining Authority's (ExA's) first set of written questions and requests for information - ExQ1.

Questions are 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 12 August 2025. The questions have arisen from the ExA's consideration of the application documents and representations. The answers to them will help the ExA to consider the application against relevant legislation and policy.

Column 2 of the table indicates who each question is directed to. Please could each party answer all questions directed to them, providing a substantive response, or indicating why the question is not relevant to them. This does not prevent an answer to any question being provided by any party if it is relevant to their interests.

Each question has a unique reference number which starts with an alphabetical code and then has an issue number and a question number. For example, the first question on the draft Development Consent Order (dDCO) is identified as DCO.1.1. **When you are answering a question, please start your answer by quoting the question reference number.**

The meanings of abbreviations are set out in the List of Abbreviations below.

You should respond to the questions by using the **Have your say** function on the [project page](#) of the National Infrastructure website and selecting 'Responses to Examining Authority's First Written Questions (ExQ1)' when asked.

Download a copy of this Microsoft Word version of the ExA's written questions, enter your answers and save the document using an appropriate file name. You can then submit the completed document by choosing 'Make a comment' and selecting 'Upload files'.

**Responses are due by Deadline 2 on Tuesday 21 October 2025.**



## Abbreviations used:

<b>APs</b>	Affected Persons	<b>MW</b>	Megawatts
<b>Art</b>	Article	<b>NE</b>	Natural England
<b>ALA 1981</b>	Acquisition of Land Act 1981	<b>NH</b>	National Highways
<b>BMV</b>	Best and Most Versatile	<b>NKDC</b>	North Kesteven District Council
<b>BoR</b>	Book of Reference	<b>NPS</b>	National Policy Statement
<b>BNG</b>	Biodiversity Net Gain	<b>NSIP</b>	Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project
<b>CA</b>	Compulsory Acquisition	<b>OCEMP</b>	Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan
<b>CPO</b>	Compulsory purchase Order	<b>PA2008</b>	The Planning Act 2008
<b>dDCO</b>	Draft DCO	<b>PRoW</b>	Public Right of Way
<b>EA</b>	Environment Agency	<b>PV</b>	Photovoltaic
<b>EM</b>	Explanatory Memorandum	<b>R</b>	Requirement
<b>ES</b>	Environmental Statement	<b>RR</b>	Relevant Representation
<b>ExA</b>	Examining Authority	<b>SAC</b>	Special Area of Conservation
<b>Fig.</b>	Figure	<b>SPA</b>	Special Protection Area
<b>HLAs</b>	Host Local Authorities	<b>SI</b>	Statutory Instrument
<b>IPs</b>	Interested Parties	<b>SoS</b>	Secretary of State
<b>LIR</b>	Local Impact Report	<b>SUs</b>	Statutory Undertakers
<b>LNR</b>	Local Nature Reserve	<b>TP</b>	Temporary Possession
<b>LPA</b>	Local Planning Authority	<b>WMS</b>	Written Ministerial Statement
<b>MP Order</b>	The Infrastructure Planning (Model Provisions) Order 2009		



## **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:

[Examination Library](#)

It will be updated as the examination progresses.



## Index

1. General and cross-topic matters .....	5
2. Need, site selection and alternatives .....	9
3. Compulsory Acquisition, Temporary Possession, Land Rights and related matters.....	15
4. Development Consent Order and other consents.....	17
5. Biodiversity and ecology.....	19
6. Historic environment.....	22
7. Landscape and visual.....	24
8. Land Use .....	27
9. Socio-economics.....	28
10. Traffic and transport .....	29
11. Water environment and flood risk .....	29
12. Cumulative effects .....	29

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
<b>1. General and cross-topic matters</b>		
GCT.1.1	Host local authorities (HLAs)	<p><b>Planning Policy</b></p> <p>If not in your Local Impact Reports (LIR), all local authorities are asked to provide full copies of any development plan policies referred to in any of your submissions and confirm the status of the relevant plan. Should you refer to any additional development plan policies at any time in your future submissions to the Examining Authority (ExA), if they have not already been provided, please also submit copies of these into the examination.</p> <p>The ExA also asks to be kept up-to-date on changes to the status of any development plan which a local authority has previously relied upon during examination.</p>
GCT.1.2	HLAs	<p><b>Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Scoping</b></p> <p>Appendix 1.1. Scoping Report [APP-071] includes the applicant's assessment of the relevant local policy context. Are the HLAs content with the applicant's policy analysis?</p>
GCT.1.3	HLAs Statutory Consultees	Table 15.1 of appendix 1.1. Scoping Report [APP-071] includes the summary of what has been scoped in and scoped out of the EIA? Are the HLAs and statutory consultees content with the applicant's approach?
GCT.1.4	HLAs	<p><b>Neighbourhood Plans</b></p> <p>Can you confirm whether there are any relevant made or emerging neighbourhood plans that the ExA should be aware of? If there are, can you:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Provide details, confirm their status and – if they are emerging – the expected timescales for their completion.</li> <li>2. Provide a copy of the made plan or a copy of the latest draft.</li> <li>3. Indicate what weight you consider the ExA should give to these documents.</li> </ol>
GCT.1.5	HLAs Statutory Consultees	<p><b>Updates on development</b></p> <p>Please provide an update on any submitted planning applications or consents granted since the application was submitted that could either affect the proposed development or be affected by the proposed development and whether these would affect the conclusions reached in the Environmental Statement (ES).</p>
GCT.1.6	Applicant	<b>Other consents and permits</b>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>Other Consents and Licences Statement [APP-276] details the applicant's position in relation to those consents and agreements which the applicant currently anticipates may be required to supplement powers within the draft DCO and the status of any agreement with the regulatory authority (where required). The applicant is therefore asked to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Provide an update on progress with obtaining these consents, licences and permits.</li> <li>2. Include a section providing an update on these consents, licences and permits in any emerging Statements of Common Ground (SoCGs) that are being drafted with the relevant consenting authorities.</li> </ol>
GCT.1.7	<p>Applicant HLAs All local authorities Prescribed consultees Interested parties (IPs)</p>	<p><b>Central Government Policy and Guidance</b></p> <p>Are you aware of any updates or changes to Government Policy or Guidance (including emerging policies) relevant to the determination of this application that have occurred since it was submitted? If yes, what are these changes and what are the implications for the application?</p>
GCT.1.8	<p>HLAs All local authorities Prescribed consultees IPs</p>	<p><b>Issues for Examination</b></p> <p>Requests have been made to the ExA, at both the Preliminary Meeting (PM) and Issue Specific Hearing 1 (ISH1), for certain topics to be considered for future hearings. The ExA asks for a list of topics to be submitted which you believe would benefit from being examined in a hearing context and why a hearing, as opposed to written representations, would be needed?</p>
GCT.1.9	<p>Lincolnshire Wolds Joint Advisory Committee</p>	<p>The ExA thanks the Lincolnshire Wolds Joint Advisory Committee for their relevant representation [RR-009] and notes the concerns put forward particularly in relation to the effects of the proposed development on the setting of the Lincolnshire Wolds National Landscape. Considering the applicant's Fig. 6.1 Bareground Zone of Theoretical Visibility [APP-203] and Fig. 6.2 Screened Zone of Theoretical Visibility with Viewpoints [APP-204] which seems to demonstrate that the edge of the Zone of Theoretical Visibility will be at a significant distance from the Lincolnshire Wolds National Landscape, can the Lincolnshire Wolds Joint Advisory Committee provide further information regarding their concerns?</p>
GCT.1.10	<p>Applicant</p>	<p><b>ES Supporting Documents</b></p> <p>The applicant has confirmed, at ISH1 and in the ES supporting documents, that an element of flexibility in relation to the delivery of the proposed development has been retained within the</p>

**ExQ1: 01 October 2025****Responses due by Deadline 2: Tuesday, 21 October 2025**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		confines of a Rochdale Envelope. Although the ExA accepts that some flexibility is needed, can the applicant please explain what work has been carried out in order to minimise land take in relation to the proposed access route, as it appears to be wider in places?
GCT.1.11	Applicant HLAs	Can the applicant please set out what considerations it has given to the need to develop a s106 agreement with the HLAs, namely Lincolnshire County Council, North Kesteven District Council and Boston Borough Council? And, if the applicant feels there is a need for one, what are the topics and issues that the s106 agreement should cover?  Can the HLAs confirm their position in relation to the need for a s106 agreement and confirm if any discussions or consideration has been given to this?
GCT.1.12	Applicant HLAs Statutory Undertakers (SUs)	The applicant has presented a Long and Short List of Committed Development [APP-102] and [APP-103]. Can all HLAs confirm if they are happy with the list provided or if there are any further projects that they wish to add?  Other IPs, namely SUs, are also invited to comment.
GCT.1.13	Applicant	As per the Funding Statement [APP-043], the applicant estimates that the proposed development will cost £550m to build and that this will be funded by Low Carbon Limited off Low Carbon Limited's own balance sheet. Considering that the applicant is Beacon Fen Energy Park Limited, a company wholly owned by Low Carbon Limited, what assurances can the applicant provide that required funding will be available to Beacon Fen Energy Park Limited for the different phases of the development?
GCT.1.14	Applicant	In addition to GCT.1.13, the ExA would also specifically ask for further assurances and evidence that funding for the decommissioning phase of the proposed development is secured and will be available.
GCT.1.15	Applicant	How has the applicant taken into consideration the impacts of climate change on the proposed development and how has the proposed development been developed in order to respond to the challenges of climate change particularly the increase in frequency of extreme weather events?
GCT.1.16	Applicant Environment Agency (EA)	The Environment Agency (EA) in its representation [RR-006], have raised a number of concerns regarding the applicant's approach to flood risk which were also the subject of discussions at ISH1. The ExA would just like to clarify that it is hoping to see significant progress on this matter at the early stages of the examination as to avoid the need for any

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		significant changes to be made to the proposed development at a later stage in the examination process.
GCT.1.17	Natural England (NE)	The applicant states, in paragraph 4.1.1 of document 7.3 Biodiversity Net Gain Strategy [APP-280] that the proposed development is anticipated to provide a net gain of 36.43% in relation to habitat units, a 10.79% net gain in relation to hedgerow units and a 15.95% net gain in watercourse units. Can NE and the EA please confirm they are content with the applicant's calculations and the proposed net gain in relation to national policy and priorities?
GCT.1.18	Applicant	The Non-Technical summary of the ES does include reference to some benefits for the proposal, namely: habitat improvements; benefit on climate due to savings in emissions; employment and economic contributions to the local economy. Could the applicant please confirm that these are the key benefits of the proposal and provide further justification for why these outweigh, in the applicant's view, the adverse effects identified by the applicant, namely landscape and visual, cultural heritage and agricultural land?
GCT.1.19	Applicant	Due to their resolution and size, certain figures, namely [APP-194], [APP-195], [APP-233], [APP-234], [APP-235], [APP-236], [APP-237], [APP-238] are very difficult to load and often crash IT systems. The applicant is asked to submit these figures at a lower resolution if possible or in such a way as to make them less cumbersome to IT systems.
GCT.1.20	Applicant	<b>General Comments on the Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA)</b> The ES references, in ES Chapter 2: Proposed Development [APP-053], a National Grid substation at Bicker Fen, the HRA Report references this being near Bicker Bar, can the applicant confirm that these are the same location and ensure consistency going through the examination and within certified documents?
GCT.1.21	Applicant	Can the applicant confirm the construction, operation and decommissioning timescales used for the HRA and confirm that these are consistent with those used for the EIA?
GCT.1.22	Applicant	ES Chapter 2: Project Description [APP-053] references the potential for junction improvements to be required. These are not referenced in the HRA, can the applicant confirm and signpost where these have been considered in the HRA?
GCT.1.23	Applicant	Can the applicant confirm how the worst-case scenario has been considered within the HRA?



ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
2.	Need, site selection and alternatives	
NED.1.1	Applicant	Can the applicant confirm what type of Photovoltaic (PV) panels are proposed and what other options and alternatives were considered in relation to PV panel technology and why any options or alternatives considered were dismissed, including any risks identified?
NED.1.2	Applicant	The applicant has confirmed, at ISH1, that a 600MW connection to Bicker Fen substation has been secured. Can the applicant please confirm when the connection will become available?
NED.1.3	Applicant	<p>The proposed development includes a Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) which has a proposed capacity of 600MW. Can the applicant please provide further detail and information on why it believes that a 600MW BESS is appropriate for the proposed development and how likely it is that it will be used to maximum capacity considering the anticipated energy generation capacity of the proposed development?</p> <p><b>Response:</b>  The Applicant retains a 600 MW import / 600 MW export grid connection while proposing only ~400 MW of PV following the withdrawal of Beacon Fen South. This leaves approximately 200 MW of spare headroom in the connection agreement.  LCJMF's August 2023 offer of 618 acres of PV-capable land at Little Hale Fen corresponds almost exactly to this headroom. Using a standard NSIP deployment factor of 0.32 MW/acre, the offer equates to ~198 MW of PV export capacity, providing a quantitative match to the unallocated headroom in the Applicant's design.  This land lies within ~2.7 km of the Bicker Fen PoC, is entirely within LCJMF ownership, and is supported by a pre-identified hybrid cable corridor. Incorporating this offer would fully utilise the grid connection while enabling a proximate generation–demand node anchored by LCJMF's planned 1 GW data centre.  This alignment represents a credible, policy-compliant alternative under EN-1 §§4.2–4.5 and EN-5 §2.2.2, ensuring efficient use of existing grid infrastructure, supporting strategic co-location, and avoiding unnecessary underutilisation of national transmission capacity.  See ExD2.4–2.5, 2.10–2.11.</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p><i>These responses should be read alongside LCJMF's Deadline 2 Supplementary Exhibits Volume (ExD2.1–ExD2.13), which provides the spatial, ecological, technical and land-interest evidence relied upon throughout. Cross-references to exhibits are indicated in each answer.</i></p>
NED.1.4	Applicant	<p>What are the consequences for the applicant of the project underperforming? And how has the applicant prepared for this?</p> <p><b>Response:</b>  The Applicant has not demonstrated how it has mitigated the risk of underperformance, particularly arising from the ~200 MW of unallocated grid headroom left after the withdrawal of Beacon Fen South. If this capacity remains unused, the scheme would operate significantly below its 600 MW connection potential, leading to inefficient use of nationally significant transmission infrastructure and lost renewable generation potential.  LCJMF's August 2023 offer of 618 acres (~198 MW PV) provides a practical, policy-aligned mitigation route. By integrating this additional capacity and co-locating with LCJMF's planned 1 GW data centre, the Applicant could ensure full utilisation of the grid connection, enhance system efficiency, and strengthen the commercial case.  No evidence in APP-054, APP-079 or APP-285 shows that this mitigation route has been appraised. The absence of such consideration exposes the project to the risk of structural underperformance relative to its grid capacity.  See ExD2.4–2.5, 2.10–2.11.</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
NED.1.5	Applicant	<p>Most of the case for need as set out by the applicant is based on a national need analysis. Is there a case for local need and has any case for local or regional need taken into consideration the cumulative effects of other renewable energy generation proposals in the area?</p> <p><b>Response:</b>  The Applicant's need case relies almost entirely on EN-1 §3.3 national policy and does not engage with local or regional system opportunities around Bicker Fen. The Little Hale Fen / Great Hale Fen area already hosts or is proposed to host multiple nationally significant generation and transmission assets within a short radius of the Bicker Fen substation, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Triton Knoll offshore wind farm (800 MW);</li> <li>• Viking Link HVDC interconnector (1.4 GW);</li> <li>• Ecotricity Heckington Fen NSIP (400 MW PV + 400 MW BESS, consented);</li> <li>• AGR3 Solar + BESS (49.9 MW, passed appeal 13.08.25);</li> <li>• LCJMF's August 2023 PV offer (618 acres ≈ 198 MW PV), designed to match the 200 MW post-BFS headroom.</li> </ul> <p>Together these form a regional generation and transmission cluster with exceptional co-location and hybridisation potential.</p> <p>LCJMF's 1 GW data centre proposal would provide a local anchor demand, turning this concentration into a strategically valuable local need case: maximising grid efficiency, minimising network losses, and supporting national resilience objectives through behind-the-meter integration.</p> <p>The Applicant has not demonstrated that it assessed local or regional need in this cumulative context, nor how the retained 200 MW headroom could support locally driven renewable generation and strategic demand integration. This is a material gap under EN-1 §§4.2–4.5.  See ExD2.4–2.5, 2.7–2.11.</p>
NED.1.6	Applicant	<p>In [PDA-012] and at ISH1 a series of comments were made in relation to the applicant's approach to alternatives, particularly in relation to the location of the proposed cable corridor,</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>and with alternatives being put forward by an Affected Person, as set out in [PDA-012], have been assessed. Can the applicant please provide clarification in relation to the points raised, particularly how the November 2021 offer put forward by LCJ Mountain Farms has been assessed and how the applicant has taken into consideration the need to minimise Best and Most Versatile (BMV) land loss?</p> <p><b>Response:</b>  LCJMF first put forward a November 2021 alternative comprising 516 acres of PV-capable land within LCJMF's single ownership, located entirely within the Applicant's original post-BFS 10 km search area. This offer aligned with the Applicant's early routing corridor and was structured to support a viable alternative cable alignment across Great Hale Fen and Little Hale Fen under LCJMF control.</p> <p>The Applicant has not provided evidence that this 2021 offer was subject to a proportionate, like-for-like appraisal, despite being raised in [PDA-012] and reiterated at ISH1. Instead, the Applicant relied on generic statements regarding "non-contiguity" and "a greater number of land interests" without technical or spatial substantiation.</p> <p>As set out in LCJMF's Deadline 1 Written Representation (Section 1.4), the two Great Hale Fen blocks (~150 ac and ~190 ac) were separated by ~800 m and LCJMF offered to bridge this internally with PV, eliminating non-contiguity concerns.</p> <p>In August 2023, LCJMF refined its offer to 618 acres to exactly match the Applicant's post-BFS 600 MW connection configuration. This alternative incorporates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A hybrid cable corridor via Car Dyke and Little Hale Drove, connecting LCJMF's offered land to Bicker Fen using existing linear features;</li> <li>• BESS siting on Flood Zone 1 land east of Car Dyke, meeting the Applicant's stated parameters for topography, proximity, and sequential preference; and</li> <li>• A spatially coherent routing option entirely within LCJMF ownership, reducing third-party land interactions and enabling strategic integration with nearby anchor demand (1 GW data centre).</li> </ul> <p><b>BMV minimisation:</b>  The LCJMF alternatives materially reduce BMV land loss relative to the Applicant's preferred corridor. Large parts of the LCJMF eastern alternative lie on Grade 3 land</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>(Flood Zone 1), whereas the Applicant's corridor relies heavily on Grade 1 land, including a 1.2 km longitudinal alignment along LWS 4722 through high-value soils. No evidence has been provided that the Applicant undertook a comparative ALC analysis between its corridor and LCJMF's 2021/2023 offers, despite EN-1 §4.4.2 and NPSNN requirements to minimise BMV land take.</p> <p><b>Summary:</b>  The Applicant has not evidenced any structured or proportionate assessment of LCJMF's November 2021 or August 2023 offers, nor how these alternatives could reduce BMV land loss. LCJMF invites the ExA to issue a targeted Rule 17 request requiring the Applicant to provide a like-for-like appraisal of routing and siting alternatives against ALC, flood zone, land interest, and ecological criteria.  See ExD2.1–2.5, 2.10–2.12; LCJMF D1 WR Section 1.4.</p>
NED.1.7	Applicant	<p>The Electricity Grid Connection Statement [APP-285] states, in paragraph 4.1.6 that the Grid Connection Agreement specifies an import and export capacity of 600MW each. Can the applicant please provide confirmation of how that import/export capacity will function in practice, namely if the 600MW capacity of the connection will be divided between import and export at any given time, or if the import and export capacity are independent? If they are independent, then does the applicant believe that the proposed development should be assessed as having a 1200MW, of which 600MW are generating capacity, and that its description should reflect that?</p> <p><b>Response:</b>  Clarity is needed on whether import and export capacities operate concurrently or are operationally constrained, and how the ES has treated import flows (e.g. grid-to-BESS charging cycles). LCJMF requests disclosure of the Applicant's connection and operational assumptions so the ExA can assess the scheme on a correct functional basis, including any material import component.  See ExD2.7.</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
NED.1.8	Applicant	<p>At ISH1 the applicant confirmed that the secured 600MW connection to Bicker Fen substation has the potential to import/export energy from/to the proposed development.</p> <p>Can the applicant please explain how the ES has taken the importing of energy into consideration as part of its assessment and how much of the proposed capacity of the BESS does the applicant anticipates will be used for this, assuming that imported energy would be stored in the BESS?</p> <p><b>Response:</b>  <b>LCJMF's 1 GW data centre and 60-acre glasshouse form part of a proximate "FenResilience" generation-demand hub beside Bicker Fen, Viking Link (1.4 GW) and Triton Knoll (800 MW). This offers national-scale efficiency through co-location and behind-the-meter optimisation, consistent with EN-1/EN-5 objectives for coordinated network development. The Applicant's need case does not engage with this credible integration pathway raised during consultation. See ExD2.4–2.5, 2.10–2.11.</b></p>
NED.1.9	Applicant National Grid	Following from NED.1.7, can the applicant and National Grid please provide confirmation of discussion regarding the proposed development's capacity to import energy from the national grid and why this component of the proposed development is needed in the context of the relevant national policy statements?
NED.1.10	Applicant	Following from NED.1.7, can the applicant also please clarify how it proposes the ExA takes into consideration the proposed development's capacity to import energy from the national grid, as opposed to generating energy, as part of the ExA assessment against relevant national policy statements, particularly considering that most of the tests are set out in relation to generating energy.
NED.1.11	Applicant	Fig. 3.3 Alternative Access Routes [APP-199], sets out 5 different options which were researched by the applicant. Option 1, which broadly accompanies the proposed cable corridor, was not the preferred option for the applicant, as confirmed in Chapter 3 of the ES Alternatives & Design Evolution, as it would require significant engineering and detailed foundation design to support the required loads for the proposed development. Could the

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		applicant please provide further detail on this matter and what the applicant considers significant engineering and detailed foundation design?
NED.1.12	Applicant	In light of NED.1.11, can the applicant also please clarify how the aim of reducing the amount of land take has been taken into consideration as part of the applicant assessment of the different access routes considered as well as the effect that the preferred option, option 2, would have on woodland?
NED.1.13	Applicant	Can the applicant please set out clearly its approach to overplanting, which the applicant confirmed at ISH1 that is seeking to do, the proportion of overplanting and how overplanting has been calculated?
<b>3. Compulsory Acquisition, Temporary Possession, Land Rights and related matters</b>		
CA.1.1	Applicant	<p>Section 122 of the Planning Act 2008 (PA2008) states that an order granting development consent may include provision authorising the Compulsory Acquisition (CA) of land only if the SoS is satisfied that the land:</p> <p>(a) is required for the development to which the development consent relates,</p> <p>(b) is required to facilitate or is incidental to that development, or</p> <p>(c) is replacement land which is to be given in exchange for the order land under section 131 or 132.</p> <p>And that there is a compelling case in the public interest for the land to be acquired compulsorily.</p> <p>Can the applicant please confirm that all of the land included within the Order Limits, as set out in the Land Plans [AS-005] and identified as subject to CA, meets the requirements set out in Section 122?</p>

**ExQ1: 01 October 2025****Responses due by Deadline 2: Tuesday, 21 October 2025**

<b>ExQ1</b>	<b>Question to:</b>	<b>Question:</b>
CA.1.2	Applicant	Please advise whether the Book of Reference (BoR) [APP-015/016] is fully compliant with the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) Guidance related to procedures for the compulsory acquisition of land (Sept. 2013) <sup>1</sup> . If it isn't, please amend accordingly.
CA.1.3	Affected Persons (APs) Interested Persons (IPs)	The BoR [APP-015/016] identifies, on a plot by plot basis, all parties who own or occupy land and/or have an interest in or right over the land affected by the proposal, and/or who may be entitled to make a 'relevant claim' as defined in section 57 of the PA2008. Are any APs or IPs aware of any inaccuracies in the BoR [APP-015]? If so, please set out what these are and provide details.
CA.1.4	APs IPs	Are any APs or IPs aware of any inaccuracies in the Statement of Reasons (SoR) [AS-013/014] or Land Plans [AS-005/006]? If so, please set out what these are and provide details.
CA.1.5	Applicant	There are a number of Category 1, 2 and 3 persons identified as 'unknown' in the BoR [APP-015/016]. Can the applicant confirm whether further steps have been taken, or will be taken during the examination, to identify any persons having an interest in the land?
CA.1.6	Applicant	Certain special categories of land, such as crown land, are subject to additional provisions in the Planning Act where it is proposed that they should be compulsorily acquired. The applicant has confirmed, in the Detailed Land and Rights Negotiations Tracker (Rev.2) [PDA-005/006] that negotiations to deal with the section 135 consent and Deed of Covenant are on-going. Can the applicant confirm how these are being progressed?
CA.1.7	HLAs National Highways	In your role as the Local Planning Authority (LPA) and the Highway Authority are you aware of: <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Any reasonable alternatives to CA or Temporary Possession (TP) for land sought by the applicant?</li><li>2. Any areas of land or rights that the applicant is seeking the powers to acquire but that you consider would not be needed? If so, please provide details on which plots and explain why you consider they would not need to be acquired.</li></ol>

---

<sup>1</sup> [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/236454/Planning\\_Act\\_2008\\_-\\_Guidance\\_related\\_to\\_procedures\\_for\\_the\\_compulsory\\_acquisition\\_of\\_land.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/236454/Planning_Act_2008_-_Guidance_related_to_procedures_for_the_compulsory_acquisition_of_land.pdf)



ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
CA.1.8	APs	Do any APs have concerns that they have not yet raised about the legitimacy, proportionality or necessity of the CA or TP powers sought by the applicant that would affect land that they own or have an interest in?
CA.1.9	Applicant	<p>The Equality Act 2010 legally protects people from discrimination in the workplace and in wider society. Can the applicant please clarify how:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It has had regard to the Equality Act 2010 in relation to the powers sought for CA and TP?</li> <li>2. Have any APs been identified as having protected characteristics? If so, what regard has been given to them?</li> </ol>
CA.1.10	Applicant	Are any land or rights acquisitions required in addition to those sought through the draft DCO before the proposed development could become operational?
CA.1.11	Applicant	The ExA notes that the latest version of the Detailed Land and Rights Negotiations Tracker [PDA-005/006] is not colour coded similarly to previous versions of the Land and Rights Negotiations Tracker [APP-045]. The ExA requests that future versions of the Detailed Land and Rights Negotiations Tracker are colour coded similarly to [APP-045].
<b>4. Development Consent Order and other consents</b>		
DCO.1.1	Applicant	<p>Notwithstanding that drafting precedent has been set by previous DCOs or similar orders, full justification should be provided for each power/provision taking into account the facts of this particular DCO application. Where drafting precedents in previous made DCOs have been relied on, these should be checked to identify whether they have been subsequently refined or developed by more recent DCOs so that the DCO provisions reflect the Secretary of State's current policy preferences.</p> <p>If any general provisions (other than works descriptions and other drafting bespoke to the facts of this particular application and draft DCO) actually differ in any way from corresponding provisions in the Secretary of State's most recent made DCOs, an explanation should be provided as to how and why they differ (including but not limited to changes to statutory provisions made by or related to the Housing and Planning Act 2016).</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>Can the applicant, therefore, please:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Update the Explanatory Memorandum [AS-011/012] in order to clearly identify which articles differ from model provisions and why?</li> <li>2. For those articles where a drafting precedent has been relied upon, check that the final wording is as included in the granted DCO. If it isn't, the applicant is asked to provide justification for the proposed wording.</li> <li>3. Provide a list of all the previous DCOs that have been used as a precedent for the drafting of this draft DCO or signpost where in the application documentation this can be found.</li> </ol>
DCO.1.2	Applicant	<p>Please supply subsequent versions of the dDCO in both .pdf and Word formats and in two versions, with the first forming the latest consolidated draft and the second showing changes from the previous version in tracked changes, along with comments/explanations outlining the reason for the change. The consolidated draft version in Word is to be supported by a report validating that version of the dDCO as being in the Statutory Instrument (SI) template and with updated revision numbers.</p>
DCO.1.3	Applicant	<p>The applicant states that the proposed development has been designed to maintain flexibility and that design parameters have been set to support this. Can the applicant please provide the ExA with a table listing all those design parameters that the applicant wishes to use, alongside lower and upper limits for each parameter and a brief justification of why the applicant considers those parameters to be appropriate taking into consideration the 'Rochdale Envelope' approach?</p>
DCO.1.4	Applicant	<p>Article 21 allows the undertaker to survey and investigate land, including bringing equipment onto the land and making trial holes, subject to a number of conditions including a requirement for 14 days' notice to be given and is subject to the payment of compensation. Does the applicant believe that a period of time should be specified for works under article 21 to be carried out?</p>
DCO.1.5	Applicant	<p>Does the applicant believe that article 26 Compulsory acquisition of rights and imposition of restrictive covenants, similarly to article 22 Compulsory acquisition of land, should also be subject to a time limit for the exercise of the authority? If not, please provide further justification in the Explanatory Memorandum [AS-011/012].</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
5.	<b>Biodiversity and ecology</b>	
BIO.1.1	Applicant	The applicant states in paragraph 2.12.6 of Chapter 2 of the ES Proposed Development [APP-053], that vegetation and hedgerows lost during the construction of the bespoke access road will be re-instated following decommissioning subject to the road being removed. Can the applicant please confirm if the proposed re-instatement will be like for like in relation to the level of maturity of vegetation and hedgerows? And can the applicant please clarify if the biodiversity value of the re-instated vegetation and hedgerows has been quantified? Can the applicant also confirm where this is secured?
BIO.1.2	Applicant	The proposed development is located in a site within a Nitrate Vulnerable Zone. Can the applicant please confirm what measures it has put in place in order to mitigate any potential effect of the proposed development on the levels of nitrates in the area?
BIO.1.3	Applicant	A 3m high post and wire deer fencing is proposed for the solar array area. The applicant also confirms that the movement of other mammals, such as hedgehogs, has also been considered. Can the applicant please confirm how the impact of the fencing on mammals other than deer has been considered?
BIO.1.4	Applicant	Fencing will be required along the boundary of the access road working area during construction and gates will be installed at the entry points to prevent unauthorised access. Can the applicant please also confirm how the effects on biodiversity of this type of fencing has been considered and how any impacts may have been mitigated against?
BIO.1.5	Applicant	What options has the applicant considered in order to maximise biodiversity in the site, particularly at operational stage?
BIO.1.6	Applicant	<b>Shadow Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA) Report</b> Can the applicant set out further detail in relation how screening distances were identified for example, any criteria used and how these related to the potential pathways and geographical extent of effect. Can the applicant confirm whether these distances were agreed with relevant statutory nature conservation bodies (SNCBs)?
BIO.1.7	Applicant	The ExA and NE have noted that whilst information is provided in relation to the species that has been identified as potentially being impacted, no information is provided to justify why other qualifying species of the site would not be impacted and therefore screened out of the

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>likely significant effects assessment. Can the applicant provide information relating to all qualifying species of the sites included in the assessment for each site along with justification and conclusions as to whether LSE are predicted project alone and/or in-combination?</p> <p><b>Response:</b>  <b>Independent surveys for LCJMF identify higher sensitivity and connectivity for LWS 4722 and associated ditches within the Applicant's corridor than presented in the ES. The ES downplays or omits ditch quality and hydrological connectivity and does not provide a like-for-like proximity analysis against LCJMF's hybrid route, which avoids longitudinal LWS interfaces. LCJMF invites the ExA to seek reconciliation of the competing baselines and a proportionate, comparative LWS appraisal. See ExD2.1–2.3, 2.6.</b></p>
BIO.1.8	Applicant	Can the applicant respond to NE's view, expressed in their RR, that NE deem that lapwing should have been considered as part of the Waterbird assemblage qualifying feature for the Wash Special Protection Area (SPA) and Ramsar Functionally Linked Land (FLL)?
BIO.1.9	NE	Can NE confirm they are in agreement with the methodology and data used in relation to ecology/HRA matters and that the applicant's approach is to their satisfaction?
BIO.1.10	Applicant	Can the applicant clarify how potential pathways and screening distances were determined and applied, what these were and whether these were agreed with relevant SNCBs?
BIO.1.11	Applicant	Can the applicant confirm whether it considered in-combination effects at the screening stage for the identification of the likely significant effects (LSE) on any European Sites?
BIO.1.12	Applicant	<p>Can the applicant please set out:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>whether it considered lapwing in the assessment for the FLL at the Wash SPA and Ramsar sites as part of the waterbird assemblage.</li> <li>If lapwing had not been considered, the applicant is requested to update its HRA.</li> <li>If lapwing has been considered, please provide the justification as to why it was screened out.</li> </ol>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
BIO.1.13	Applicant	In relation to the Appropriate Assessment and Adverse Effects on Integrity, can the applicant and NE confirm, for the sites listed in HRA Report Table 1, the conservation status of those sites?
BIO.1.14	Applicant	<p>The applicant set out the following information in the Shadow HRA Report on mitigation measures in relation to the Wash SPA and Ramsar – Overwintering gadwall</p> <p>Paragraph 5.2.5 sets out that:</p> <p>“where works are required in the vicinity of the reservoir a buffer will be set up during the winter months (November to February). Over distance the noise from the machinery will be reduced, and at a certain distance it will be quiet enough to avoid causing disturbance. At 60 m from the loudest plant the noise will fall below 70 dB and there will be no significant effect on the overwintering gadwall. Therefore, the buffer should be 60 m from the reservoir”.</p> <p>The applicant is requested to signpost where this mitigation is secured.</p>
BIO.1.15	Applicant NE	<p>In relation to the Wash and North Norfolk Coast Special Area of Conservation (SAC) – Otter HRA report paragraph 5.2.11 sets out that horizontal directional drilling (HDD) is to be adopted at Heckington Eau and South Forty Foot Drain as a mitigation for LSE on otter qualifying species at the Wash and North Norfolk Coast SAC. Can the applicant set out how it has taken into account any potential impacts of the launch sites for the HDD equipment in this mitigation measure?</p> <p>NE are requested to provide a view on the adequacy of this mitigation measure. Specific reference in its response should include, the impact of the launch sites and the security of the mitigation measure as currently drafted in the outline Construction Environmental Management Plan [APP-077].</p> <p><b>Response:</b>  <b>No cumulative assessment is provided for the overlapping corridor with Viking Link despite physical co-location, shared linear works and operational interfaces. This is a material omission under EN-1 and the EIA Regulations. LCJMF requests a targeted cumulative appraisal covering construction widths, haul roads, hydrology, access</b></p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<b>safeguarding and operational coexistence for the two 400 kV-class assets. See ExD2.1–2.3, 2.9.</b>
<b>6. Historic environment</b>		
HEN.1.1	Historic England HLAs	Can Historic England and the HLAs confirm they are in agreement with the applicant's methodology and overall assessment of effects on cultural heritage?
HEN.1.2	Applicant	<p>Considering that the SoS should give considerable importance and weight to the desirability of preserving all heritage assets from any harm or loss of significance, can the applicant please clarify if it believes that no significant effect is the same as no effect?</p> <p><b>Response:</b>  <b>LCJMF's east-of-Car-Dyke alternative would have reduced intrusive works and widths in more sensitive western parcels, with corresponding heritage setting benefits. The Applicant's approach conflates "not significant" with "no effect" while not testing reasonable alternatives that lower effects at source. A proportionate options appraisal is warranted.</b>  <b>See ExD2.10–2.12.</b></p>
HEN.1.3	Applicant	Table 15.2 Summary of matters to be scoped out of the assessment of appendix 1.1. Scoping Report [APP-071] states that direct physical effects on archaeological assets have been scoped out, as physical effects will only occur during construction. Can the applicant please clarify why it believes that no physical effects will occur during decommissioning?
HEN.1.4	Applicant	Can the applicant please clarify its use of " <i>Operation: Long term but temporary impact to the setting of the asset</i> " to describe impacts on cultural heritage as set out in Table 8.11 of Chapter 8 of the ES Cultural Heritage [APP-059]?

**ExQ1: 01 October 2025****Responses due by Deadline 2: Tuesday, 21 October 2025**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
HEN.1.5	Historic England Applicant	Historic England's relevant representation [RR-008] raises some concerns in relation to identified assets (South Kyme Tower, Church of St Mary and All Saints, South Kyme and the Church of St Oswald, Howell) and how the proposed mitigation of impacts, which included deletion of elements of the array, does not appear to be taken forward. Can the applicant please provide clarification of how it has addressed this concern?
HEN.1.6	Applicant	In Table 8.11 Cultural Heritage – Summary Assessment Matrix the applicant states, in relation to Gashes Barn, Unnamed Farmstead in Ewerby and Evedon Non - Designated (HER MLI121913) and Westmorelands (Asgarby Fen Farm) that even though the impacts of the proposal is major adverse, the applicant finds its effects are not significance due to the application of mitigation which is landscaping to be used to create a sense of separation. Can the applicant provide more information or explain further how landscaping and the creation of a sense of separation is sufficient mitigation to reduce an effect on a cultural asset rom major adverse to not significant?
HEN.1.7	Applicant	<p>In Table 8.11 Cultural Heritage – Summary Assessment Matrix the applicant acknowledges, in relation to Car Dyke, the Victorian Pumping Station and other assets, that the construction of the proposed development would result in the permanent irreversible removal of the asset and suggest a preservation by record. In the applicant's assessment this would mean that the effects would be not significant in EIA terms. Can the applicant please explain further how preservation by record is sufficient mitigation to reduce an effect on cultural assets from major adverse to not significant?</p> <p><b>Response:</b> Where permanent loss or high setting harm is predicted, reliance on “preservation by record” should not substitute for avoiding or lessening impacts through siting/routing choices. LCJMF's alternative BESS siting in FZ1, with a hybrid corridor using existing linear features, is a sequentially preferable means to reduce need for the bespoke carriageway and associated intrusion. No comparative engineering/heritage appraisal is evidenced. See ExD2.10–2.12.</p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
HEN.1.8	Applicant	<p>Does the applicant consider that permanent and irreversible removal of an asset can be suitably mitigated by preservation by record and what further measures is the applicant proposing in order to secure the preservation by design of any assets that would be otherwise lost and permanently removed?</p> <p><b>Response:</b>  Where permanent loss or high setting harm is predicted, reliance on “preservation by record” should not substitute for avoiding or lessening impacts through siting/routing choices. LCJMF’s alternative BESS siting in FZ1, with a hybrid corridor using existing linear features, is a sequentially preferable means to reduce need for the bespoke carriageway and associated intrusion. No comparative engineering/heritage appraisal is evidenced.  See ExD2.10–2.12.</p>
HEN.1.9	Applicant Historic England HLAs	Can HLAs confirm if they are in agreement with Historic England’s assessment in relation to the effects of the proposed development on the setting of designated heritage assets and on archaeological remains?
HEN.1.10	North Kesteven District Council (NKDC)	If not submitted as part of their LIR, NKDC are asked to provide the ExA with a character appraisal, if available, of the Heckington Station Conservation Area and Heckington Village Conservation Area.
HEN.1.11	Applicant	Can the applicant please clarify how it has considered the effects of the proposed development on the setting of the South Kyme Tower, the Church of St Mary and All Saints, South Kyme and the Church of St Oswald, Howell?
<b>7. Landscape and visual</b>		
LSV.1.1	LPAs	Are the relevant LPAs satisfied that the assessment has established an appropriate study area and all relevant landscape and visual receptors have been identified?
LSV.1.2	LPAs IPs	Are the relevant LPAs and other IPs content with the methodology used by the applicant to identify the landscape and visual effects of the proposed development



ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
LSV.1.3	Applicant	Can the applicant confirm if it believes that changes in season will have an impact on views of the proposed development and whether winter views have been used or considered as part of a worst case scenario in relation to sensitive receptors?
LSV.1.4	Applicant	Can the applicant explain how the height of the proposed substation, the BESS and the solar panel array have been taken into account during the assessment of landscape and visual effects, particularly considering that the maximum height of the solar panels will vary across the site?
LSV.1.5	Applicant	Can the applicant explain in more detail the mitigation measures considered in relation to adverse effects on landscape and visual receptors, referring separately to the Public Rights of Way (PRoW) network and residential properties? Please detail the answer with reference to the construction, operation and decommissioning phases.
LSV.1.6	Applicant	<p>The proposed development includes a 6m wide bespoke carriageway needed to facilitate the construction, maintenance and decommissioning of the proposed development. Considering the level of change a new carriageway will introduce into the landscape, can the applicant please confirm what mitigating measures it has considered and proposes to deploy in order to minimise its visual and landscape impacts?</p> <p><b>Response:</b>  <b>The proposed 6 m bespoke access corridor (with 30 m construction width) drives significant landscape and visual change. LCJMF's east-of-Car-Dyke alternative would leverage existing farm tracks/Little Hale Drove and reduce new engineered access in constrained areas. A like-for-like options and width-minimisation appraisal should be provided.</b>  <b>See ExD2.10–2.12.</b></p>
LSV.1.7	Applicant	Further to LSV.1.5 can the applicant please confirm if it has looked at the possibility of reducing the width of the proposed bespoke carriageway in order to minimise its visual and landscape impacts?
LSV.1.8	Applicant	The applicant states in paragraph 2.12.6 of Chapter 2 of the ES Proposed Development [APP-053], that vegetation and hedgerows lost during the construction of the bespoke access road

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		will be re-instated following decommissioning subject to the road being removed. Can the applicant please confirm if the proposed re-instatement will be like for like in relation to the level of maturity of vegetation and hedgerows offering similar levels of visual impact? Can the applicant please also state where this is secured and how the suitability of the re-instated vegetation will be assessed?
LSV.1.9	Applicant	The applicant recognises in Chapter 6 of the ES Landscape and Visual that some residential receptors will experience significant effects during construction, namely residents of Ewerby Thorpe Farm (R1a) and Ewerby Thorpe Lodge (R1b), Property Group R2, R4, and Property Group R20. In its assessment, the applicant appears to rely on existing screening and on the Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) for mitigation. Considering that the oLEMP is to be developed at design stage, what assurances can the applicant offer that proposed mitigation will be effective?
LSV.1.10	Applicant	Residents of Gashes Barn will be significantly affected by the proposed development as the residential dwelling is located in the middle of the panel area. Can the applicant please confirm that it believes that the effects of the proposed development will not be such as to amount to overbearing or overwhelming or gone beyond the visual amenity threshold?
LSV.1.11	Applicant	The applicant includes open views across the site as part of the description of the visual amenity for properties included in the RVAA, in Appendix 6.5 Residential Visual Amenity Assessment. The applicant also recognises that, through the proposed screening set out in the oLEMP, these open views across the site, will change. Can the applicant therefore please explain how this loss of open views has been taken into consideration and feed into the overall applicant assessment of effects of the proposed development and how the applicant has classified this loss?
LSV.1.12	Applicant	<p>Following from LSV.1.10, the applicant is also asked to set out clearly how the loss of open views has been assessed in relation to PRow, particularly those that have been assessed as experiencing significant effects at operational stage, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PRows near River Slea Ewer/8/2 Ewer/8/1 Anwi/2/2</li> <li>• Bridleway Ewer/1103/1</li> <li>• PRow network to the west of Asgarby</li> <li>• Views from Black Drove (linking Ewerby Waithe Common with Howell)</li> </ul>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		The ExA also asks if the applicant believes that reference to PRow network to the west of Asgarby should be included in Table 1.22 of Appendix 6.4 Visual Assessment, which does not appear to be.
LSV.1.13	Applicant	The applicant recognises in Chapter 6 of the ES Landscape and Visual, as set out in the Landscape and Visual Summary Assessment Matrix, that, at operational stage, there will be major adverse impacts on the landscape character of the site due to the introduction of solar PV arrays and associated infrastructure. The applicant also recognises that the Fenland Sub Area will experience moderate adverse impacts due to the implementation of the proposed development, that Black Drove/Ferry lane/Halfpenny Toll Lane will experience moderate adverse effects, as well as Howell Fen Drove. Can the applicant please set out how it views the overall impact of the proposed development in relation to landscape and visual effects?
<b>8. Land Use</b>		
LUS.1.1	Applicant	On 15 May 2024 the Secretary of State for Energy Security and Net Zero made a written ministerial statement (WMS) entitled 'Solar and protecting our Food Security and Best and Most Versatile (BMV) Land'. Please set out any implications for the consideration of the proposal arising from this WMS and how the applicant has taken it into consideration in order to minimise BMV land take.
LUS.1.2	Applicant	<p>Has the applicant considered what other uses could be co-located alongside the panel array and has the applicant has had any conversations or entered negotiations with local farmers or organisations in order to discuss the possibility of the site being used for other compatible uses, such as grazing of animals or supporting pollinators?</p> <p><b>Response:</b>  <b>LCJMF proactively engaged the Applicant on coordinated provision for a 1 GW data centre and 60-acre glasshouse (private-wire / heat-reuse), ~2.7 km from the PoC. No evidence shows these compatible uses were considered in site selection or network design, contrary to EN-1's good design and integration principles. See ExD2.4–2.5, 2.10–2.11.</b></p>

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
LUS.1.3	Applicant	Chapter 14 of the ES Soils and Agricultural Land appears to include two different tables numbered Table 14.15. The applicant is asked to correct this and number one Table 14.15 and another 14.17.
LUS.1.4	Applicant	Table 14.17 [sic] of Chapter 14 of the ES Soils and Agricultural Land sets out the applicant's summary assessment matrix of the overall impact of the proposed development. It identified Loss of Agricultural land at Construction Phase as having a Major Adverse impact, and at Operational Phase Minor Adverse. Does the applicant believe that this assessment is correct considering that the effects and loss of agricultural land at the operational phase will extend to a much longer and significant period than at construction phase?
<b>9. Socio-economics</b>		
SEC.1.1	Applicant	Several PRoW, as set out in Fig 15.3 [APP-273], will be intersected by the proposed development. Can the applicant please confirm if any of the existing PRoW is proposed to be stopped during the operational stage of the proposed development? And if yes, is there a suitable alternative proposed by the applicant which will be able to connect or direct non-motorised users (NMUs) to similar locations?
SEC.1.2	All IPs	The applicant states in paragraph 15.6.60 of Chapter 15 of the ES that the land take for the temporary access road will lead to long-term economic displacement of farming activities. However, landowners will be compensated for economic displacement as embedded mitigation. Does any IP wish to comment on this specific issue in relation to viability and feasibility of any farming activities?
SEC.1.3	Applicant	The applicant states, in paragraph 15.6.64, which deals with PRoW LL Ewer 12/1, that an undetermined number of footbridges (unlikely to be more than eight in number) to cross existing watercourses will be required. Can the applicant please specify how these will be agreed and what are the criteria that will preside to its determination?
SEC.1.4	Applicant EA	The ExA noted on its Unaccompanied Site Inspection, and the applicant has confirmed at ISH1, that PRoW LL Ewer 12/1 is currently not accessible nor used. The applicant also states, in paragraph 15.6.64 that as part of embedded design enhancements, PRoW LL Ewer 12/1 is being extended. It is assumed that the current barriers to access and use by NMUs will be lifted, however confirmation of this is being sought from the EA and the applicant if this is to be considered a benefit of the proposal. Can therefore the applicant and EA please confirm that it their intention to open PRoW LL Ewer 12/1 for NMUs and how this will be secured?

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
SEC.1.5	Applicant	The applicant is asked to confirm how it has considered the effects of the proposed development and consequential severance of access to existing recreational routes, facilities and visitor destinations, as set in Fig. 6.6 [APP-208] on the local communities and users at all stages of the proposed development (construction, operational and decommissioning)?
<b>10. Traffic and transport</b>		
TT.1.1	Applicant	The applicant confirms that the 6m wide bespoke access corridor would be in place during the operational phase to facilitate maintenance of the proposed development. Considering that traffic and use of the road is expected to be greatly reduced during the operational phase, can the applicant please confirm what their intentions are for the bespoke access corridor?
TT.1.2	Applicant	Further to TT.1.1, can the applicant please confirm if it has looked at the possibility of reducing the width of the proposed bespoke carriageway and considered its impact on transport?
TT.1.3	Applicant	For the construction of the bespoke access corridor, the applicant states that it will require a working width of 30m. Considering the proposed location of the access corridor and the current use of the land, can the applicant please clarify what work it has done in order to minimise land take and why a 30m corridor is necessary?
<b>11. Water environment and flood risk</b>		
WFR.1.1	Applicant	Earlier this year MHCLG has updated its planning guidance in relation to flood risk. The Applicant is asked to confirm if the current proposal is in line with the latest update?
WFR.1.2	Applicant EA NE IPs	<p>In relation to the Wash SPA and Ramsar and the Wash and North Norfolk Coast SAC, paragraph 4.3.2 sets out that “Measures to contain pollutants and avoid them entering the water courses have been set out in the OCEMP (Document ref 6.3 ES vol 2, 6.3.7) in particular Section 4.5. A minimum 5 m buffer will be maintained from all water courses. The hydrological regime has been considered in the OCEMP section 6.11, and water levels are maintained by the Internal Drainage Board.”</p> <p>The ExA seeks views from the EA, NE and other IPs as to whether the information provided in the oCEMP in relation to monitoring provides sufficient detail and therefore security to be relied upon to inform the final CEMP.</p>
<b>12. Cumulative effects</b>		

**ExQ1: 01 October 2025**

**Responses due by Deadline 2: Tuesday, 21 October 2025**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
CU.1.1	Applicant	The applicant states in Chapter 18 of the ES Cumulative Effects [APP-069], even with appropriate mitigation measures in place, the associated inter-cumulative effect in terms of the loss of agricultural BMV land would be moderate (Significant). Can the applicant please explain what further consideration it has given to the cumulative effects of the proposal in relation to BMV and how it has taken into consideration the cumulative effects of the proposed development on those whose agricultural land will be lost?
CU.1.2	Applicant	Can the applicant please set out its approach to assessment of cumulative effects on residential receptors, particularly those close or adjacent to the panel array area, namely R1 Group Receptor, R2 Group Receptor, R4 Gashes Barn and R20 Group Receptor?
CU.1.3	Applicant	Can the applicant please clarify what additional mitigation it has considered and why it has been dismissed?
CU.1.4	Applicant	Can the applicant please also confirm how it has assessed the cumulative effects of the proposed development on identified residential receptors, particularly considering those that might be potentially affected by any visual and landscape impacts as well as an additional effect such as noise and/or traffic, during construction and also during operational and decommissioning stages.
CU.1.5	Applicant	How has the applicant taken into consideration, in relation to need, the impact of other generating facilities located or proposed to be located within the vicinity of the proposed development?
CU.1.6	Applicant	<p>Considering the proximity of some residential units to the proposed development, can the applicant please provide further justification for why it believes that no cumulative effects exists particularly when noise and visual effects are taken into consideration?</p> <p><b>Response:</b>  <b>Great Hale Fen / Little Hale Fen have very low residential receptor densities. Consolidating BESS, corridor and demand assets within LCJMF's ownership would reduce dispersion and cumulative community effects relative to the Applicant's corridor. The cumulative assessment does not reflect this locational advantage or the benefits of single-ownership consolidation. See ExD2.4–2.5, 2.8, 2.10–2.12.</b></p>

**ExQ1: 01 October 2025**

**Responses due by Deadline 2: Tuesday, 21 October 2025**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
CU.1.7	Applicant	The applicant is requested to set out how plans and projects were identified for inclusions in the in-combination effects assessment. Reference should be made to [APP-081] and [APP-082] in response. A figure should also be provided showing the locations of these projects.

### Closing Statement

LCJMF has put forward credible, policy-aligned alternatives since 2021 (reiterated in August 2023) that could materially reduce ecological, soils/flood, heritage, landscape/visual and cumulative impacts while enabling strategic integration with proximate anchor demand.

The Applicant's submissions do not evidence a proportionate, like-for-like appraisal of these alternatives nor a cumulative assessment with Viking Link. LCJMF invites the ExA to issue targeted Rule 17 requests requiring the Applicant to:

1. Evidence grid utilisation for the 600 MW import / 600 MW export arrangement post-BFS (allocation, curtailment, import flows).
2. Reappraise BESS siting/routing alternatives on LCJMF's Flood Zone 1 land east of Car Dyke.
3. Provide a cumulative assessment with Viking Link (construction, hydrology, access safeguarding, operational coexistence).
4. Justify access corridor widths/necessity against an options study using existing tracks/droves and LCJMF's hybrid route.
5. Address strategic integration, setting out how the scheme could coordinate with proximate anchor demand and compatible uses in accordance with EN-1/EN-5.

LCJMF remains willing to engage constructively, including on protective provisions and commercial terms, to secure future-proofed connections and fair treatment of sterilisation while reducing examination risk and delay.