



National Infrastructure
Planning
Planning Inspectorate
c/o QUADIENT
69 Buckingham Avenue
Slough
SL1 4PN

Customer: 0303 444 5000
Services: FrodshamSolar@planninginspectorate.gov.uk
e-mail:

Applicant

Your Ref:

Our Ref: EN010153

Date: 24 April 2026

Dear Sir / Madam

The Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010 – rule 17 (request for further information)

Application by Frodsham Solar Limited for an order granting development consent for the Frodsham Solar project

Rule 17 - Request for further information

We are writing under rule 17 of the Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010.

Sulphur hexafluoride (SF₆)

The ExA notes that table 5-1 of the outline Operational Environmental Management Plan (oOEMP) [REP5-023] and table 5-1 of the outline Decommissioning Management Plan (oDEMP) [REP5-025] include mitigation measures to prioritise the use of SF₆-free electrical components wherever feasible, but that this is not included as a mitigation measure in the outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) [REP5-021] (the same is true of the Deadline 6 versions, references unavailable at present).

The ExA consider the construction phase would be the first opportunity to avoid the use of SF₆ containing components to eliminate emissions from gas-insulated switchgear and transformers, which is a requirement within NPS EN-5 paragraph 2.10.14. The ExA requests that the mitigation measure to prioritise the use of SF₆-free electrical components wherever feasible is added to table 5-1 of the oCEMP and an updated version submitted at Deadline 7.

The ExA also notes that compliance with the F-gas Regulation or its successors is not specifically committed to by the applicant in the oCEMP [REP5-021], oOEMP [REP5-023] or oDEMP [REP5-025], as required by NPS EN-5 paragraph 2.10.15. The ExA requests

this is specifically added to the oCEMP, oOEMP and oDEMP as appropriate, and those updated documents submitted into the examination at Deadline 7.

Trading rules

The ExA notes that in the case study from Natural England on the application of Rule 4, provided in the Biodiversity Net Gain report [REP4-038] (the same is true of the Deadline 6 version, reference unavailable at present) there were insufficient open mosaic habitat units available to buy on the private market. Can the applicant explain to the ExA why it has not proposed to purchase off-site units of reedbed habitat of high distinctiveness and scrub broad habitat of medium distinctiveness to offset the anticipated losses from the proposed development. Would the applicant consider committing to purchasing sufficient off-site units of these types to achieve no net loss of these particular units and if so, securing that commitment in the draft Development Consent Order?

Responses should be submitted at the latest by **Deadline 7 (29 April 2026)**.

Yours faithfully

David Wallis

Lead member of the panel of Examining Inspectors

This communication does not constitute legal advice.

Please view our ['Privacy Notice'](#) before sending information to The Planning Inspectorate.