



Application by Fenwick Solar Farm Ltd for an Order granting development consent for Fenwick Solar Farm Project

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

Issued on Wednesday 9 July 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 D to the Rule 6 letter of 18 February 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 a 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.

References in these questions set out in square brackets (eg [APP-010]) are to documents catalogued in the Examination Library, which provides a link to each document: [Examination Library](#).

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

If you are responding to a small number of questions, then answers in an email or letter will suffice. If you are answering a larger number of questions, it will assist the ExA if you use a table based on the one below to set out your responses. An editable version of this table in Microsoft Word is available on request from the case team: please email FenwickSolar@planninginspectorate.gov.uk and include 'Fenwick Solar Project' in the subject line of your email.

All references to the draft Development Consent Order (dDCO) are to revision 04 [[REP3-006](#)].

Responses are due by deadline 4 (Wednesday 23 July 2025)



Abbreviations used

ATC	<i>Automatic Traffic Count</i>	fDEMP	<i>Framework Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan</i>
BESS	<i>Battery Energy Storage System</i>	fLEMP	<i>Framework Landscape and Ecological Management</i>
BHT	<i>Burnett Heritage Trust</i>	foEMP	<i>Framework Operational Environmental Management Plan</i>
BMV	<i>Best and Most Versatile</i>	fSMP	<i>Framework Soil Management Plan</i>
BNG	<i>Biodiversity Net Gain</i>	GCC	<i>Grid Connection Corridor</i>
BS	<i>British Standard</i>	HGV	<i>Heavy Goods Vehicle</i>
DBA	<i>Desk Based Assessment</i>	HRA	<i>Habitats Regulation Assessment</i>
DCO	<i>Development Consent Order</i>	ISH	<i>Issue Specific Hearing</i>
dDCO	<i>Draft Development Consent Order</i>	km	<i>Kilometre</i>
ECMR	<i>Environmental Commitments and Mitigation Register</i>	LWS	<i>Local Wildlife Site</i>
ES	<i>Environmental Statement</i>	m	<i>Metre</i>
ExA	<i>Examining Authority</i>	NSER	<i>No Significant Effects Report</i>
ExQ1	<i>ExA's First Written Questions</i>	ODPS	<i>Outline Design Parameters Statement</i>
ExQ2	<i>ExA's Second Written Questions</i>	OMH	<i>Open Mosaic Habitat</i>
FAMS	<i>Framework Archaeological Mitigation Strategy</i>	PPs	<i>Protective Provisions</i>
fCEMP	<i>Framework Construction Environmental Management Plan</i>	PRoW	<i>Public Right of Way</i>
		PV	<i>Photovoltaic</i>



SAC	<i>Special Area of Conservation</i>
SoCG	<i>Statement of Common Ground</i>
SPA	<i>Special Protection Area</i>
SSSI	<i>Site of Special Scientific Interest</i>
YWT	<i>Yorkshire Wildlife Trust</i>



Index

1.	The draft Development Consent Order and other consents.....	5
2.	General matters	6
3.	The need case, electricity generated and climate change	6
4.	Other projects and cumulative effects	6
5.	Landscape and visual, glint and glare, good design.....	7
6.	Biodiversity (including HRA and Biodiversity Net Gain).....	7
7.	The water environment	13
8.	Soils and agriculture	13
9.	The historic environment.....	14
10.	Transport and access, highways and public rights of way	14
11.	Noise, vibration, air quality, and nuisance	16
12.	Socio-economics, tourism, and recreation	16
13.	Other planning matters	16
14.	Compulsory Acquisition and related matters	18

Ref:	Question to:	Question:
1.	The draft Development Consent Order and other consents	
1.1.1	Applicant	Article 11 - Notwithstanding other precedents, please explain why this power is not limited to streets and rights of way within the Order limits. Please also provide further justification as to why the power is appropriate and proportionate having regard to the impacts on pedestrians and others of authorising temporary working sites in these streets.
1.1.2	Applicant	<p>Articles 9 and 10 - This is a wide power – authorising alteration etc. of <u>any</u> street within the Order limits. Please explain why this power is necessary for this particular project and why it should not be limited to identified streets.</p> <p>Article 9(5) says that paragraphs (3) and (4) do not apply where the undertaker is the street authority. Please explain in what circumstances the undertaker might also be the street authority (ie when this sub-paragraph might apply). A similar point arises in relation to sub-paragraph 10(6).</p>
1.1.3	Applicant	<p>Article 38(1) says that the undertaker may fell or lop any tree or shrub within or overhanging the authorised development.</p> <p>Consider whether “authorised development” should be replaced with “order limits”. This would make more sense and would be consistent with the wording in article 39(1).</p>
1.1.4	Applicant	The ExA notes the inclusion of subparagraph 3(3) in the recently made Oaklands Solar Farm Order. This provision was inserted by the SoS to make clear that the development consent granted does not authorise works which are likely to give rise to any materially new or materially different environmental effects. Please include a similar provision in the draft order or explain why it is not necessary.
1.1.5	Applicant	Article 35(3)(a) – please inset the word ‘or’ after the semi colon to ensure consistency with other made orders.
1.1.6	Environment Agency	Please confirm whether the protective provisions (PPs) included in Schedule 14, Part 5 for the protection of the Environment Agency are agreed. If not, please identify any outstanding concerns (including any alternative drafting being proposed).
1.1.7	Applicant	In REP3-031 (Summary of Oral Submissions for ISH2), the applicant indicates that it has provided an appendix (Appendix A) which explains the changed made by the SoS to the East Yorkshire Solar Farm decision and

Ref:	Question to:	Question:
		why these have or have not been carried forward to the dDCO. Please signpost where in the deadline 3 documents this appendix can be found.
2. General matters		
1.2.1	City of Doncaster Council	Please confirm what planning status and use of the property located at South Fork on Bunfold Shaw Lane has including dates and reference numbers.
1.2.2	Applicant	<p>Environmental Commitments and Mitigation Register (ECMR) [REP3-011], the Outline Design Parameters Statement (ODPS) [REP2-027] and ES Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [APP-063].</p> <p>Commitment #NV-08 within the ECMR states that there could be a situation in the future where the number of field stations could increase from the 28 that have been modelled based on the illustrative layout. However, the ODPS (page 5) for Field Stations states there would be a maximum number of 28 field stations. Paragraph 11.4.54 of Chapter 11 states that for the purposes of the Rochdale Envelope, that 28 field stations were modelled and that up to 28 field stations can be located within the solar photovoltaic (PV) site without triggering significant effects provided they are not within 250m of any residential receptor. Please:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> comment on this discrepancy between the ECMR and the ODPS and Chapter 11; given the ODPS provides the guiding framework for the detailed design of the project, comment on how the information within Commitment #NV-08 aligns with the overarching principles, objectives and assessments carried out as part of the ES, for example Appendix 11-4: Construction and Operation and Maintenance Noise Modelling [APP-172] and the Rochdale Envelope for Chapter 11 of the ES; and confirm how many field stations were modelled as part of Appendix 11-4: Construction and Operation and Maintenance Noise Modelling and Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [APP-063].
3. The need case, electricity generated and climate change		
No further questions at this time.		
4. Other projects and cumulative effects		
1.4.1	Applicant	ES Chapter 15: Cumulative Effects and Interactions [APP-067].

Ref:	Question to:	Question:
		Given the potential for overlap of construction vehicles at Thorpe Marsh Substation for this proposal and those identified within the cumulative impact short list, please confirm if there are updates to the projects within the short and long list review. Please confirm how heavy goods vehicles (HGVs) accessing Thorpe Marsh Power Station would interact with HGVs accessing/ egressing those schemes contained within the short and long list review.
5. Landscape and visual, glint and glare, good design		
No further questions at this time		
Glint and Glare		
No further questions at this time.		
6. Biodiversity (including HRA and Biodiversity Net Gain)		
1.6.1	Applicant	<p>Table 8-11 of Chapter 8: Ecology [APP-060], non-statutory designated sites within the Order limits (pages 8-117 - 8-118 Decommissioning).</p> <p>This section states that whilst it is preferred to leave the grid connection cables <i>in situ</i>, the cables can be removed by opening up the ground at regular intervals and pulling the cables through to an extraction point. It states that dependent on decommissioning methods it should be possible to avoid siting extraction points within local wildlife sites (LWSs) which are present within the grid connection corridor to avoid any impact pathways to these sites. It states that “<i>measures to remove impacts to LWS’s during decommissioning are included within the Framework DEMP and secured as part of the DCO. This includes siting extraction points away from LWS’s (if cabling is to be removed) and pollution control</i>”. Please direct us to where these measures are secured in the framework Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (fDEMP) or update that document accordingly (along with the ECMR).</p>
1.6.2	Applicant	<p>Table 8-12 of Chapter 8: Ecology [APP-060], determination of potential impacts and effects on important ecological features – habitats and species (page 8-132).</p> <p>For aquatic macroinvertebrates and macrophytes, why (when it has said impacts will be temporary and habitats reinstated within two years) there would not be potential for an effect to occur and given there would</p>

Ref:	Question to:	Question:
		be a direct loss of Low importance running water habitats and potential for fragmentation of populations of species and habitats (page 8-131).
1.6.3	Applicant	Table 8-12 of Chapter 8: Ecology [APP-060] , determination of potential impacts and effects on important ecological features – habitats and species (page 8-133) states there would be appropriate mitigation to relocate aquatic species away from the works area during construction. Please direct us to where it states this within the framework Construction Environmental Management Plan (fCEMP) [REP3-013] and the ECMR [REP3-011] .
1.6.4	Applicant	Table 8-12 of Chapter 8: Ecology [APP-060] , determination of potential impacts and effects on important ecological features – habitats and species (page 8-139) states that there would be no potential for an effect to occur on terrestrial invertebrates. However, during the construction phase, it is acknowledged that open mosaic habitat (OMH) has value for invertebrate species and that would be temporarily removed as part of the grid connection corridor (GCC) works. Temporary loss of OMH during the construction phase on page 8-129 is said to have potential for an effect. Please explain how temporary removal of OMH would not have an effect on terrestrial invertebrates using that habitat.
1.6.5	Applicant	Table 8-12 of Chapter 8: Ecology [APP-060] , determination of potential impacts and effects on important ecological features – habitats and species (page 8-147). Please explain how any pre-commencement checks for where any unexpected maintenance is required on trees potentially supporting roosting bats would be delivered within the Framework Operational Environmental Management Plan (fOEMP) [REP2-031] and the ECMR [REP3-011] .
1.6.6	Applicant	Paragraph 8.12.11 of ES Chapter 8: Ecology [APP-060] says that there would be a temporary loss to an area of OMH in the GCC for the installation of cables by trench. The paragraph says that materials and vehicles would not be stored on retained areas of this habitat and appropriate measures would be in place to ensure there is no incursion during construction into retained habitat and stand-off buffers would be in place. If GCC cable laying is taking place within the OMH, how would a 'sacrificial' area of OHM be established to ensure safeguarding of retained OMH and therefore an appropriate buffer zone.
1.6.7	Applicant	Tables 8-13, 8-14 and 8-15 ES Chapter 8: Ecology [APP-060] . There appear to be typos within paragraphs 8.1.39 and 8.1.46. Please confirm the purpose of table 8-15 (which appears to have the same title as table 8-13) is to display the magnitude of impact and significant

ExQ2 issued on 9 July 2025. Responses are due by deadline 4 (23 July 2025)

Ref:	Question to:	Question:
		effect on ecological features where enhancement measures are to be delivered not a summary of magnitude during the construction phase.
1.6.8	City of Doncaster Council, the applicant	Please confirm who currently has responsibility for the Went Valley LWS within the Order limits and who would be responsible for its management during the life of the project and how this would interact with the management plans.
1.6.9	Applicant	Table 8-16 ES Chapter 8: Ecology [APP-060] . Please clarify why a cumulative significant effect of 'yes' has been given when there appears to be no interaction with the schemes identified in the table?
1.6.10	Natural England, City of Doncaster Council	Breeding Bird Report [APP-152] , Breeding Bird Report – Annex A (Confidential) [APP-153] and Non-Breeding Bird Report [APP-154] . The Burnet Heritage Trust (BHT) have questioned the thoroughness of the breeding bird and non-breeding bird surveys conducted for the project, the data used and the omission of curlew records from the applicant's surveys ([RR-011] , [REP1-054] , [REP2-075] and [REP3-035]). Please comment on the bird survey methodology and approach for the project and the comments raised by the BHT on this matter.
1.6.11	Applicant	Figure 8-5-2 of the Hedgerow Report [REP3-010] . Hedgerow 94 appears to have multiple sections removed as shown on figure 8-5-2 totalling approximately 77.5m in length which is approximately 53% of that total hedgerow. There is also proposed to be gapping up of this hedgerow. Please explain whether the hedgerow removal for H94 is temporary for the construction phase or the duration of the operation and in which case, how will gapping up align with this. Why is this called "N/A defunct" in table 2 under the heading "Important hedgerow Y/N".
1.6.12	Applicant	Framework Landscape Ecological Management Plan (fLEMP) [REP3-017] Appendix A Indicative Landscape Masterplan. Please confirm: a) why this drawing identifies construction compounds on it; b) which phase (construction/ operational) this plan is for; and c) why wetland scraps are not shown on this drawing to identify where they would be located.

Ref:	Question to:	Question:
1.6.13	Applicant, City of Doncaster Council	<p>fLEMP [REP3-017] and BHT written representation at deadline 3 [REP3-035].</p> <p>Please comment on the BHT request for a commitment to include a number of small headlands of pollinator and bird seed crop mixes along hedgerow edges or planned ecological mitigation areas and the request for a commitment that these areas remain ungrazed and reinstated biannually for the duration of the scheme.</p>
1.6.14	Applicant	<p>fLEMP [REP3-017]. Paragraph 5.3.9 of the fLEMP says that the scheme would provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. 6.76km of enhanced species rich native hedgerow in good condition b. 1.35km enhanced species rich native hedgerow associated with bank or ditch in good condition c. 8.38km enhanced species rich native hedgerow with trees in good condition d. 6.71km enhanced species rich native hedgerow with trees associated with bank or ditch in good condition. <p>This paragraph says that this is based on the Indicative Landscape Masterplan within Appendix A in the fLEMP and Figure 2-3: Indicative Site Layout [APP-074]. Please provide details as to which proposed native hedgerow/ vegetated boundary and proposed riparian edge hedgerow and trees equates to these.</p>
1.6.15	Applicant	<p>The BHT made several suggested mitigation measures within their written representations at deadline 1 [REP1-054]. We note the applicant has responded to this at Deadline 2 [REP2-058]. Please clarify why permissive footpaths and the creation of a bird hide could not and would not form part of enhancement measures provided for this proposal.</p>
1.6.16	Applicant	<p>fLEMP [REP3-017] section 6: pre and post construction monitoring.</p> <p>This section sets out what monitoring of flora and fauna would take place. Paragraph 6.1.5 states that results from the post construction monitoring would feed into the management plan and, if required, management may be amended. Please confirm whether the monitoring and management would include adaptive land management measures introduced if any adverse results became apparent through monitoring and what these triggers would be for adaptive measures.</p>
1.6.17	Applicant	<p>Please direct us to where within Chapter 8: Ecology [APP-060], the ECMR [REP3-011] and the fCEMP [REP3-013] there are details of what mitigation measures would be in place to reduce disturbance from construction noise, including piling, for breeding and non-breeding birds.</p>

ExQ2 issued on 9 July 2025. Responses are due by deadline 4 (23 July 2025)

Ref:	Question to:	Question:
1.6.18	Applicant	<p>Applicant's Response to ExQ1 [REP2-059], fLEMP paragraph 7.3.19 [REP3-017] and framework Soil Management Plan (fSMP) [REP2-033].</p> <p>In answer to ExQ1.6.17, the applicant states that the fSMP outlines measures that will be taken to protect topsoil from ecologically important locations such as woodland and hedgerow soils. Please explain why soils stripped from OMH are not included within paragraph 4.6.4 of the fSMP given paragraph 7.3.19 of the fLEMP states that the substrate must be stored appropriately to prevent it from mixing with any nutrient-rich substrates.</p>
1.6.19	City of Doncaster Council	<p>Natural England response to deadline 2 [REP2-070] written question 1.6.1 on the candidate Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and Yorkshire Wildlife Trust (YWT) [REP3-038] and BHT [REP3-035] written representations at deadline 3.</p> <p>Please comment on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) the extent and adequacy of the surveys carried out on land identified as part of the candidate SSSI; b) the adequacy of mitigation proposed and compensation design for the candidate SSSI designation area; and c) the adequacy of potential impacts to habitats and species that form the candidate SSSI site being addressed within the submission and the fLEMP [REP3-017].
1.6.20	Applicant	<p>YWT written representations at deadline 3 [REP3-038] and BHT written representations at deadline 3 [REP3-035].</p> <p>Please clarify which mitigation measures and what compensation design has been provided within the fCEMP [REP3-013] and fLEMP [REP3-017] that expressly mitigates for the candidate SSSI.</p>
1.6.21	Applicant	<p>YWT representations at deadline 3 [REP3-038] and BHT written representations at deadline 3 [REP3-035].</p> <p>Please confirm whether BHT ornithological data has informed the assessment and conclusions of Chapter 8 of the ES [APP-060] and explain how. If the ornithological data has not formed the assessment and conclusions of Chapter 8 please explain the reasoning behind this and what implication the omission of this data has on the assessment and conclusions of Chapter 9.</p>
1.6.22	Applicant	<p>The effect of the proposal on the local deer population has been raised in the BHT response to deadline 3 [REP3-035]. Please comment on concerns about impacts arising from changes to deer movements in the</p>

Ref:	Question to:	Question:
		area as a result of the proposed development, particularly arising from the perimeter fencing around the solar PV panel areas.
No Significant Effects Report (NSER)		
1.6.23	Natural England	<p>NSER Rev 3 [REP2-038] and the BHT responses at relevant representations [RR-011], deadline 1 [REP1-054], deadline 2 [REP2-075] and deadline 3 [REP3-035].</p> <p>The BHT have commented that for Pink Footed Goose, European Golden Plover, Eurasian Curlew and Eurasian Marsh Harrier, these bird species are of a number that would make them functionally linked to the Humber Estuary Special Protection Area (SPA) / Ramsar site. The BHT also say that the spatial distribution of both local scape observations and region observation rates demonstrates a very clear spatial link between birds occurring within the order limits of the DCO and those breeding and roosting on Thorne Moor SPA. The BHT comment that the reporting demonstrates how the feeding areas of the DCO are linked to breeding populations of Thorne Moors Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and Humber Estuary SPA.</p> <p>Please comment on the points raised by the BHT within their written representations on these bird species being functionally linked to Thorne Moor SPA/ SAC and Humber Estuary SPA/ Ramsar; whether the number of qualifying bird species in the area in question is too low and/ or the area of land is too small to be classified as functionally linked. Please comment whether the comments raised by the BHT would alter the outcomes and conclusions of the NSER.</p>
Biodiversity Net Gain		
1.6.24	Applicant	<p>Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Assessment [REP2-035].</p> <p>We note the headline results for Hedgerow Units 'Total Net Unit Change' and 'Total Net % Change' at paragraph ES7 and Table 4: Summary of Results alongside Section 4 Conclusion do not align with the figures given in Appendix G Statutory Biodiversity Metric Calculation headline summary page. Please amend and update accordingly.</p> <p>We have also noted a number of rows in Table F5: Retained and Lost Hedgerow Habitats, F8: Enhanced Hedgerow Habitats and F11: Created Hedgerow Habitats in the BNG report were amended at Deadline 2. Please explain why this is the case and what the implications are of these amendments.</p>

Ref:	Question to:	Question:
1.6.25	Applicant	Appendix C of the BNG Assessment [REP2-035] sheet 2 of 11 - the hedgerow around the substation (as shown on Figure 2-3 Indicative Site Layout [APP-074] and Appendix A Indicative Landscape Masterplan of the fLEMP [REP2-042]) appears to be missing on sheet 2 of 11. Please clarify why this is the case.
1.6.26	Applicant	fLEMP paragraph 7.3.19 [REP2-042]. Please confirm that the pre-construction surveys detailed in paragraph 6.1.1 of the fLEMP would also seek to re-establish the baseline for BNG as referenced in paragraph 2.2.3 of the BNG assessment [REP2-035]. We note that paragraph 6.1.3 of the fLEMP only refers to post construction monitoring and use of the BNG metric. It is unclear when and whether the BNG metric would be reviewed again (pre/ post construction).
1.6.27	Applicant	The BHT, in its deadline 3 response [REP3-035], commented that the BNG baseline for part of the order limits has not been reflected accurately. The BHT state that an area of neutral grassland within the Order limits was ploughed in contravention to the Environmental Impact Assessment (Agriculture)(England) Regulations 2006 and this has altered the BNG baseline. Please comment on how this change in habitat type would affect the conclusions and findings of the BNG assessment [REP2-035] and its Appendix G [REP2-037] and any mitigation measures to be provided.
7. The water environment		
No further questions at this time.		
8. Soils and agriculture		
1.8.1	Applicant	Applicant's Response to ExQ1 [REP2-059] and fSMP [REP2-033]. In response to ExQ1.8.11 and ExQ1.8.5, it is stated that during the operational phase, the condition of the soils beneath and surrounding infrastructure (including the PV arrays) would be monitored through the performance of the established vegetation, which acts as a proxy for soil health; and if vegetation or habitat performance does not meet expectations, further investigations into underlying soil conditions would be undertaken with appropriate management measures implemented to safeguard Best and Most Versatile (BMV) land. Please signpost where within the fSMP these measures are secured. It is noted that paragraphs 4.10.13 – 4.10.16 of the fSMP deal with soil replacement, paragraph 4.10.17 deals with soil decompaction,

ExQ2 issued on 9 July 2025. Responses are due by deadline 4 (23 July 2025)

Ref:	Question to:	Question:
		paragraphs 4.10.18 – 4.10.21 deal with achieving restoration standards post the development and section 4.11 deals with compaction of soils.
1.8.2	Applicant	Please provide an estimate of the total area of BMV agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 and 3a) within the regional area. Please express the area of BMV loss from the proposed development (both temporary and permanent) as a percentage of that total area.
9. The historic environment		
1.9.1	Applicant	<p>Desk Based Assessment (DBA) [APP-142], Archaeological Evaluation by Trial Trenching Assessment Report [REP1-045] and Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations [REP1-031].</p> <p>The applicant's response to representations made by the City of Doncaster Council on page 11 of document REP1-031 states that the full assessment report for the trial trench evaluation is to be submitted into the examination at deadline 1 and that the DBA has been updated with the full results of the trial trench evaluation and is also submitted into the Examination at deadline 1. We note an updated DBA has not been provided at Deadline 1 or any subsequent deadlines. Please submit the revised DBA for Deadline 4 and if required, a revised Chapter 7 [REP1-011] of the Environmental Statement taking into account the results of the trial trench evaluation.</p>
1.9.2	Applicant	<p>ECMR [REP3-011] #CH-01, #CH08, #CH-10 and #CH-11 and Applicant's Response to ExQ1 [REP2-059].</p> <p>The applicant confirms in document REP02-059 in answer to question 1.9.5 that the ECMR should be updated to include references to the Framework Archaeological Mitigation Strategy (FAMS) within the Commitment Securing Mechanism column. Please provide an updated version including these references.</p>
1.9.3	Applicant	<p>fDEMP [REP3-015].</p> <p>Table 2 says that there would be no direct physical impact on archaeology from the decommissioning phase. However, paragraph 2.1.2 says that there may be a requirement for mitigation measures in the form of bog matting. Please explain this disparity.</p>
10. Transport and access, highways and public rights of way		
1.10.1	Applicant	Chapter 13: Transport and Access [REP1-015] table 13-18 Future Year Flows Peak of Construction AM, PM and AADT (Two-Way Flows). Row 11 Fenwick Common Lane. Please confirm whether:

ExQ2 issued on 9 July 2025. Responses are due by deadline 4 (23 July 2025)

Ref:	Question to:	Question:
		<p>a) the figure of 92 for development traffic along Fenwick Common Lane at AM Dev Peak (06:00 – 07:00) includes minibuses or not. If it does not, please confirm what the percentage increase would therefore be for AM Dev Peak and 24 Hour AADT in this table.</p> <p>b) Please explain how staff traffic movements (cars and minibuses) have been allocated across the automatic traffic count (ATC) links or please signpost to where within the documentation this information is contained.</p> <p>c) the figure of 20 for development traffic along Trumfleet Lane at AM Dev Peak (06:00 – 07:00) and PM Dev Peak (19:00 – 20:00) includes minibuses or not. If the figure of 20 does not include minibuses please explain how a figure of 20 has been arrived at based on 11% of total worker traffic (140 one-way movement) (11% being that shown 'Worker Distribution PV Site' Appendix 13-2 [APP-177]).</p>
1.10.2	City of Doncaster	<p>Chapter 13: Transport and Access [REP1-015] paragraphs 13.7.16 and 13.7.25 and table 13-3.</p> <p>This part of Chapter 13 explains that due to the baseline hourly two-way traffic flows on some of the ATC links, the magnitude of impact has been lowered by one step so that the impact magnitude is therefore medium instead of high and this is considered to be an appropriate method. Please comment on this approach and judgement. Please comment on the findings presented in Table 13-20 for ATC 10, 11, 12, 13 and 14.</p>
1.10.3	Applicant	<p>Paragraph 13.7.18 of Chapter 13: Transport and Access [REP1-015] says that the hourly construction traffic numbers on ATC 9, 10, 11, 12 13 and 14 are considered relatively small and it is expected there would be sufficient capacity on the road network to accommodate these additional trips. Please explain how you have reached this conclusion, and in particular the basis upon which it has been concluded that Fenwick Common Lane has sufficient capacity to accommodate the additional traffic movements within a 60 minute period.</p>
1.10.4	Applicant	<p>The response to ExQ 1.10.9(d) states that there is a typo on the corresponding flow diagram (page 20, Volume III Appendix 13-2: Traffic Flow Diagrams [APP-177] titled Minibus Assignment 06:00-07:00) that should indicate 8 minibus movements travelling west at ATC 9 and ATC 10. Please provide a revised flow diagram page 20 Minibus Assignment 06:00-07:00 that includes those westbound minibus movements. You may wish to correct page 6 with the correct title at the same time.</p>
1.10.5	Applicant	<p>Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan [APP-206] section 5.3.</p>

ExQ2 issued on 9 July 2025. Responses are due by deadline 4 (23 July 2025)

Ref:	Question to:	Question:
		Paragraphs 5.3.1 – 5.3.3 refer to HGV Measures and Controls. Please clarify why there is reference to signage and works at Haggs Lane when HGVs are not to travel to the solar PV site via Haggs Lane access point 4.
1.10.6	Applicant	A number of relevant representations express concern regarding damage to highway verges and associated utility services from construction vehicles, particularly given the narrowness of some roads in the area. Please comment on this concern and set out any measures to avoid or mitigate such damage
1.10.7	Applicant	In its response to the ExQ1 REP2-059] (question 1.10.22), the applicant confirms that public rights of way (PRoW) Moss 7 and 9 interact with the order limits associated with access point 1. Please explain why the list of PRoW in paragraph 2.1.4 has not been amended to include these PRoW. We note that PRoW Moss 7 and 9 appear interact with works associated with access point 2.
11. Noise, vibration, air quality, and nuisance		
1.11.1	Applicant	The applicant response to question 1.11.7 at Deadline 2 [REP2-059] says that paragraphs 11.8.15 and 11.8.16 contain legacy text from the Noise and Vibration Preliminary Environmental Information Report and were not correctly updated for the ES. Please confirm if there are any other paragraphs within ES Chapter 11 that are 'legacy text' from the preliminary environmental information report and please confirm how these paragraphs do not affect the conclusions of the chapter.
1.11.2	Applicant	fDEMP [REP3-015] Table 7 sub-title “volumes of noise that may cause public disturbance during decommissioning operations” point (e) states that hydraulic techniques for breaking would be used in preference to percussive techniques where reasonably practicable. Please direct us to where within the fDEMP or other documentation there are details as to what mitigation measures may be required/ provided should percussive techniques be used.
12. Socio-economics, tourism, and recreation		
No further questions at this time.		
13. Other planning matters		
Waste		
No further questions at this time.		

Ref:	Question to:	Question:
Ground Conditions and Land Contamination		
1.13.1	Environment Agency	<p>Environment Agency response to ExQ1 [REP2-069] and Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) with the Environment Agency [REP3-021].</p> <p>In your response REP2-069 you requested further details regarding the scope of the proposed ground investigation works. We note in the SoCG between the applicant and the Environment Agency that it states the Environment Agency will review updated to the fCEMP submitted at Deadline 3 to confirm whether this matter is resolved. We note the fCEMP [REP3-013] has been updated to include reference to BS 5930:2015+A1:2020 and BS 10175:2011+A2:2017. Please comment on this approach adopted by the applicant and the adequacy of the fCEMP regarding the scope of the proposed ground investigation works.</p>
1.13.2	Environment Agency	<p>Environment Agency relevant representation [RR-003].</p> <p>The Environment Agency comment in their relevant representation (page 34) that Figure 2, within Appendix 14-4: Phase 1 Preliminary Risk Assessment [APP-184], identifies 'remnant gas holders' within the footprint of the former Thorpe Marsh Power Station. The Environment Agency recommends that this area is targeted in any intrusive investigation works. The applicant's response [REP1-031] states this is addressed through the fCEMP and requirement 11. Please confirm if the fCEMP [REP3-013] has addressed this point with regards to targeted intrusive groundwork investigation.</p>
Battery Energy Storage System (BESS)		
No further questions at this time.		
Electromagnetic Fields		
No further questions at this time.		
Lighting		
1.13.3	Applicant	<p>fOEMP [REP2-031] paragraphs 2.4.4 – 2.4.6. These paragraphs discuss lighting that would be used at the Field Station Units, the substation, the BESS area and the Operations and Maintenance hub. Paragraph 2.4.5 states that task specific and fixed 'general' lighting would be used at the on site substation, BESS area and the operations and maintenance hub during the winter months to maintain safe working conditions and outside core working hours passive infra-red (PIR) controlled lights (motion sensors) would be used. Paragraph 2.4.6 goes on to say that no part of the scheme would be continuously lit. Please confirm what</p>

Ref:	Question to:	Question:
		are core working hours within the operational phase and what constitutes 'early mornings and evenings' in that context.
1.13.4	Applicant	fOEMP [REP2-031] paragraph 2.4.3 panel cleaning. Please confirm the estimated number of nights that panel cleaning would be expected to take place when undertaken every two years.
Framework Environmental Management Plans		
1.13.5	Applicant	fDEMP [REP3-015]. We note that section 4 of the fDEMP now contains a list of supplementary plans and procedures that would form part of the fDEMPs. We note the provision for pre-decommissioning ecological surveys to provide an update on the presence and location of invasive non-native species and provide a new baseline. Please explain what timescale pre-decommissioning ecological surveys would be carried out, who they would be submitted to and what would be done with the information gathered. Please confirm if the results of these surveys would be submitted as part of the final DEMP and, if they are to be, whether this would also include mitigation measures.
1.13.6	Applicant	fCEMP [REP3-013] and fOEMP [REP2-031]. Please explain why the maintenance activities proposed to take place during the operational phase on Saturdays are until 14:00 hours whereas for the construction phase these are proposed to be until 13:00 hours on Saturdays.
1.13.7	Applicant	fOEMP [REP2-031] table 3-3 states that a Habitat and Management and Monitoring Plan would be produced before the scheme becomes operational. Please confirm what the status of this plan would have and whether it would accompany the final OEMP. Please also confirm how this document would feed into the final DEMP table 3 and pre-decommissioning surveys.
14. Compulsory Acquisition and related matters		
1.14.1	DANVM Drainage Commissioners	Please comment on the PPs for the benefit of DANVM Drainage Commissioners included in Schedule 14, Part 3 of the dDCO [REP3-006] and identify any outstanding concerns (including any alternative drafting being proposed).

ExQ2 issued on 9 July 2025. Responses are due by deadline 4 (23 July 2025)

Ref:	Question to:	Question:
1.14.2	Applicant/Elba Securities Limited/Able UK Limited	Please provide an update on discussions and identify any areas of disagreement that are unlikely to be resolved by deadline 5.

END