



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

The Examining Authority's second written questions and requests for information (ExQ2)

Issued on 08 December 2025

The following table sets out the Examining Authority's (ExA's) second set of written questions and requests for information – ExQ2.

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.2.1. **When you are answering a question, please start your answer by quoting the question reference number.**

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 Second Written Questions (ExQ2)' when asked.

If you are responding to a small number of questions, you can submit your answers by choosing 'Make a comment' and entering your answers in the 'Your comments' box. If you are answering a larger number of questions you should download a copy of the Microsoft Word version of the document, enter your answers and save the document using an appropriate file name. You can then submit the completed document by selecting 'Upload files'.

Microsoft Word version: [https://nsip-documents.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/published-documents/EN010151-000704-Examining%20Authority's%20Written%20Questions%202%20\(ExQ2\)%20MS%20word%20version.docx](https://nsip-documents.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/published-documents/EN010151-000704-Examining%20Authority's%20Written%20Questions%202%20(ExQ2)%20MS%20word%20version.docx)

Responses are due by Deadline 5 on Monday 29 December 2025.



Abbreviations used:

APs	Affected Persons	LPA	Local Planning Authority
Art	Article	MP Order	The Infrastructure Planning (Model Provisions) Order 2009
ALA 1981	Acquisition of Land Act 1981	MW	Megawatts
BESS	Battery Energy Storage System	NE	Natural England
BMV	Best and Most Versatile	NKDC	North Kesteven District Council
BoR	Book of Reference	NPS	National Policy Statement
BNG	Biodiversity Net Gain	NSIP	Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project
CA	Compulsory Acquisition	PA2008	The Planning Act 2008
CAH	Compulsory Acquisition Hearing	PRoW	Public Right of Way
dDCO	Draft DCO	PV	Photovoltaic
EA	Environment Agency	R	Requirement
EM	Explanatory Memorandum	RIES	Report on Implications for European Sites
ES	Environmental Statement	RR	Relevant Representation
ExA	Examining Authority	SAC	Special Area of Conservation
Fig.	Figure	SPA	Special Protection Area
HGVs	Heavy Goods Vehicles	SI	Statutory Instrument
HLAs	Host Local Authorities	SoS	Secretary of State
IPs	Interested Parties	SUs	Statutory Undertakers
ISH	Issue Specific Hearing	TP	Temporary Possession
LCC	Lincolnshire County Council	WMS	Written Ministerial Statement
LIR	Local Impact Report		



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	5
3.	Compulsory Acquisition, Temporary Possession, Land Rights and related matters.....	5
4.	Development Consent Order (DCO) and other consents	6
5.	Biodiversity and ecology.....	6
6.	Historic environment.....	6
7.	Landscape and visual.....	7
8.	Land Use	8
9.	Socio-economics.....	8
10.	Traffic and transport	9
11.	Water environment and flood risk	9
12.	Cumulative effects	9

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
1. General and cross-topic matters		
GCT.2.1	Applicant	Could the applicant please provide more detail in relation to its approach to the design and layout of the solar array panel area and how buffers and potentially other design measures have been considered as part of a mitigation strategy for both Gashes Barn itself and the access road leading to Gashes Barn and why the applicant has chosen the proposed approach? Although the Design and Access Approach document [APP-278] mentions a meeting to discuss the buffers to Gashes Barn and then a follow up meeting, the ExA would welcome further detail (including extent of buffer considered, how wide it should be and any assessment that justifies why the buffers proposed, particularly for the access road, was chosen).
2. Need, site selection and alternatives		
NED.2.1	National Electricity Systems Operator (NESO)	The ExA has raised questions in its Rule 17 request [PD-010] in relation to the applicant's approach to the proposed Battery and Energy Storage System (BESS), particularly its capacity. The applicant has replied to this concern in Appendix 1 of [REP2-040] and the National Grid Electricity Transmission PLC in [REP2-058]. Considering that part of the applicant's justification for a 600MW BESS in this project is to provide ancillary services to NESO, the ExA asks NESO if they have any comments they would like to make in relation to the proposed approach and the fact that a 600MW BESS is proposed for a project with an expected generation capacity of approximately 400MW.
3. Compulsory Acquisition, Temporary Possession, Land Rights and related matters		
CA.2.1	Applicant	Considering that Gashes Barn (R4) would be surrounded by solar panels from all directions as a consequence of the proposed development, has the applicant considered the possibility of needing to compulsorily acquire the property? If yes, why has the applicant not pursued this option and if no, why was this option not considered as part of the overall proposal?
CA.2.2	Applicant	In relation to plot 1-4, the applicant is seeking the permanent acquisition of new rights over a private road (Black Drove), verge and unnamed drains leading to Gashes Barn. As the only access to Gashes Barn itself is via the land in plot 1-4 how has the applicant secured that the occupiers and residents of Gashes Barn will have appropriate means of access in and out of their property at any time and how is this secured via the dDCO?

ExQ2: 08 December 2025**Responses due by Deadline 5: Monday, 29 December 2025**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
CA.2.3	Applicant	Can the applicant please clarify why plot 1-4, which the applicant is seeking the permanent acquisition of new rights to, is needed? And can the applicant please provide justification for why it is needed, particularly in light of the need to reduce CA? This is in addition to the request made to the applicant at CAH1 to provide detailed assessment on a plot by plot basis for why CA powers are required, which is expected at Deadline 5.
4. Development Consent Order (DCO) and other consents		
DCO.2.1	Applicant, IPs, APs, SUs and HLAs	Following from the DCO hearing on this matter at ISH3, the ExA will provide further comments (if any) on the dDCO on Monday 26 January alongside ExQ3 (if any).
5. Biodiversity and ecology		
BIO.2.1	Applicant, IPs, APs, SUs and HLAs	Following from ISH2 and the ExA's questioning, the applicant has confirmed, in its response to ISH2 Actions 11 and 12 in Table 3.1 of [REP4-026], that it will review ES Chapter 7 [REP2-013] and submit a revised version of this at Deadline 5. The ExA will therefore pose any questions that may remain at ExQ3, Monday 26 January.
BIO.2.2	Applicant, Natural England, Environment Agency, NKDC	Please see questions included in the RIES published on the 8 December 2025.
6. Historic environment		
HEN.2.1	Applicant	The applicant has confirmed in [APP-059] that the Church of St. Andrew at Asgarby would be impacted by the Bespoke Access Road, particularly during construction stage, due to new movement in the landscape, an increase in traffic noise, increase in vehicular lighting and increase in air pollutants and the presence of new highways infrastructure. Although it is accepted that at operation stage, all the factors that the applicant has considered which are linked to the use of the Bespoke Access Road will be greatly reduced, can the applicant please explain how the presence of a new highway infrastructure was considered and why its effect is not deemed to be significant?
HEN.2.2	Applicant	The ExA notes that the applicant is expecting to provide a response to ISH2 Action 8 in Table 3.1 of [REP4-026] in relation to views from the top of Kyme Tower at Deadline 5. However, the ExA would like to confirm that, having had the opportunity to carry out a Access Required Site Inspection to Kyme Tower and experience views from the top of the tower, the ExA does believe that the proposed solar array area may be visible from the top of the Kyme Tower and

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		therefore does urge the applicant to consider this issue and provide a response to this matter at Deadline 5.
HEN.2.3	Applicant	In Table 8.11 of Chapter 8 of the ES [APP-059] the applicant assesses that the permanent and irreversible removal of the Victorian Pumping Station in N1 would not constitute a significant effect as this would be preserved by record. Can the applicant please clarify its reasoning in relation to this assessment?
HEN.2.4	Applicant, HLAs	Following from ISH2 and the concerns raised by LCC in relation to the applicant's assessment of Farmstead in the ES, the ExA notes that the applicant will submit a response at Deadline 5.
7. Landscape and visual		
LSV.2.1	Applicant	In the applicant's response to ISH2 Action 3 in Table 3.1 of [REP4-026] and in relation to the effects of the proposed development on the principal (northern) elevation of Gashes Barn (R4), the applicant states that it sought to maintain some perception of openness and that the mixed species hedge proposed would be managed to a maximum height of 3.5 metres. The applicant goes on to state that the intention of this hedgerow is to screen views of solar panels whilst allowing longer distance views of the wider landscape. Considering Figure R4 Photomontages [AS-031] does show a solid hedgerow along the northern boundary of Gashes Barn with the proposed development, can the applicant please clarify how it considers that the proposed mitigation maintains some perception of openness?
LSV.2.2	Applicant	The applicant's response to ISH2 Action 3 in Table 3.1 of [REP4-026] refers the ExA to Figure R4 Photomontages [AS-031] as illustration of the effects of the proposed development on Gashes Barn. However, and as acknowledge by the applicant in its response, Figure R4 Photomontages [AS-031] provide a view of the proposed development from the northern elevation only. Considering that Gashes Barn would be surrounded on all four sides by the proposed solar array, can the applicant please provide photomontages of views from all other elevations?
LSV.2.3	Applicant	Following from LSV.2.2, if the applicant is not able to provide photomontages of views from all other elevations of Gashes Barn and these were not done for the applicant's assessment, can the applicant please clarify how it was able to assess the effects of the proposed development on Gashes Barn as a whole (i.e. what work has been done in order to assess the visual effects

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		of the proposed development on the southern, eastern and western elevations of the property) and how the visual amenity would look like for any residents or occupiers?
LSV.2.4	Applicant	Although the ExA agrees, to an extent, with the applicant's assertion that the principal elevation of the proposed development is the northern elevation and the ExA recognises that some consideration has been given to buffers and its efficacy in protecting views from that specific elevation, doesn't the applicant believe that the cumulative effects of the proposed mitigation measures will be greater than the sum of its parts and potentially overbearing? And if not, why not?
LSV.2.5	Applicant	The applicant's response to ISH2 Action 1 in Table 3.1 of [REP4-026] states that the requirement for HGVs to pass each other determined the proposed carriageway width as well as the requirements for Abnormal Indivisible Loads (AILs) with the swept path analysis (vehicle tracking) on the preliminary design alignment, shown on the Bespoke Access Road Construction Method Statement [APP-075], indicates a carriageway width of up to 8m will be required at bends in the carriageway for this purpose. Can the applicant please clarify how likely it is that the full 8m carriageway width will be needed during operation phase? And if needed, has the applicant considered any mitigation?
8. Land Use		
LUS.2.1	Applicant	At ISH3 LCC raised concerns regarding the applicant's approach to Land Use, particularly in relation to the cumulative effects of the proposal on agricultural land. The ExA notes that the applicant is proposing to provide an update on this topic, as well as an update on the effects of recently granted DCOs on the proposed development, at Deadline 5.
9. Socio-economics		
SEC.2.1	Applicant, HLAs	The ExA notes the applicant's response to ISH3 Action 8 in Table 3.1 of [REP-027] and notes the applicant's statement that due to the low level of effect identified in relation to the economic displacement of farming activities in isolation, potentially significant cumulative effects on this aspect were not considered likely. This is obviously at odds with the LCC's concerns and post ISH3 submission [REP4-030] which raises concerns, not only on how BMV Land has been calculated, but also the overall amount of BMV land affected and impact on the local agricultural economy. In addition to the work described in LUS.2.1 can the applicant also clarify how it has arrived to its conclusions in relation to the impact of the proposed development on the local

ExQ2: 08 December 2025**Responses due by Deadline 5: Monday, 29 December 2025**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		agricultural economy and how it has been assessed and accounted for as part of the applicant's assessment?
10.	Traffic and transport	
TT.2.1		No questions at this point of the examination.
11.	Water environment and flood risk	
WFR.2.1	Applicant, Environment Agency	Following from ISH3, the ExA requests an update from the applicant and the Environment Agency in relation to flood risk and the applicant's approach to flood risk. The ExA also wishes to highlight the need for both parties to reach agreement on this matter with enough time left in the examination to properly scrutinise and assess the effects of the proposal on flood risk. If this is not the case and agreement is not reached early enough as to allow for appropriate consideration, the ExA's recommendation report will have to reflect that.
12.	Cumulative effects	
CU.2.1	Applicant, HLAs	The ExA notes the applicant's response to ISH3 Action 10 in Table 3.1 of [REP-027] and its intention to submit an updated version of Chapter 18 of the ES Cumulative Effects at Deadline 5. The ExA will therefore pose any questions that may remain at ExQ3, Monday 26 January.