Planning Inspectorate

Application by Fosse Green Energy Limited for the Fosse Green Energy

The Examining Authority's DRAFT written questions and requests for information (dWQ1)
Issued on 23 December 2025

The following table sets out the Examining Authority's (ExA's) draft written questions and requests for information - dWQ1. This draft list of written questions is being issued to allow parties an opportunity to begin to prepare responses in advance of the formal submission of responses to what will become ExQ1 once the examination has begun. Responses to dWQ1 should therefore not be submitted. When the ExQ1 questions are issued by the ExA, that set of questions may include some additional questions, while some questions may be changed or updated following the holding of the first round of examination hearings between 6 and 8 January 2026. However, the ExA will seek to keep any amendments to a minimum.

The submission of replies to the written questions will be in response to the questions included in ExQ1, rather than those set out in dWQ1. The responses to ExQ1 will be for submission at Deadline 2, identified as 3 February 2026 in the draft Examination Timetable (Annex D in the ExA's Rule 6 letter [PD-008]). If necessary, the Examination Timetable enables the ExA to issue further rounds of written questions in due course. If this is done, the further round of questions will be referred to as ExQ2 and ExQ3.

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 9 December 2025 [PD-008]. Questions have been added to the framework of issues set out there as they have arisen from representations and to address the assessment of the application against relevant policies.

Column 2 of the table indicates which Interested Parties (IPs) and other persons each question is directed to. Although each question has been directed at the applicant or another named IP or both, that will not prevent other IPs giving consideration to a question that is not directed at them.

An editable version of this table in Microsoft Word is available on request from the case team: please contact FosseGreenEnergy@planninginspectorate.gov.uk and include draft ExQ – Fosse Green Energy in the subject line of your email.

Planning Inspectorate

Abbreviations used:

AC	Alternating current
ALC	Agricultural land classification
BESS	Battery energy storage system
BMV	Best and most versatile agricultural land
BNG	Biodiversity net gain
BoR	Book of Reference
CA	Compulsory Acquisition
CLLP	Central Lincolnshire Local Plan of 2023
CEMP	Construction Environmental Management Plan
CTMP	Construction Traffic Management Plan
dDCO	Draft Development Consent Order
DC	Direct current
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
EM	Explanatory Memorandum
ES	Environmental Statement
ExA	Examining Authority
FCEMP	Framework Construction Environmental Management Plan
FCTMP	Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan
FLEMP	Framework Landscape and Ecological Management Plan
FOEMP	Framework Operational Environmental Management Plan
FPRoWMP	Framework Public Rights of Way Management Plan

FSMP	Framework Soil Management Plan
GHG	Greenhouse Gas
ha	Hectare
HE	Historic England
HGV	Heavy goods vehicle
IP	Interested Party
ISH	Issue Specific Hearing
LCC	Lincolnshire County Council
LGV	Light goods vehicle
LIR	Local Impact Report
m	Metre
MW	Megawatt
MWh	Megawatt hour
NE	Natural England
NESO	National Energy System Operator
NFCC	National Fire Chiefs Council
NKDC	North Kesteven District Council
NPS	National Policy Statement
NSIP	Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project
NTS	National transmission system
PA2008	The Planning Act 2008
Proposed Development	The proposed Fosse Green Energy (solar farm and battery electrical storage system)

$PM_{2.5}$	Particulate matter (2.5 microns)
PRoW	Public right of way
RR	Relevant Representation
s	Section within an act of Parliament
SoCG	Statement of Common Ground
USI1	Unaccompanied site inspection 1
SoS	Secretary of State
WFD	Water Framework Directive
WR	Written Representation

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:

https://nsip-documents.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/published-documents/EN010154-000223-Fosse%20Green%20Energy%20Exam%20Library.pdf

It will be updated as the Examination progresses.

Planning Inspectorate

Index

Question Number	Question to:	Question
General and Cross-topic questions (GC)		
GC.1.01	Applicant	**The proposed development's position relative to the National Energy System Operator (NESO) review of grid connections** Confirm, following the conclusion of NESO's recent review of grid connections (December 2025), the status of the grid connection agreement referred to in [APP-200].
GC.1.02	Applicant	**Conversion of generated direct current (DC) electricity to exportable (AC) electricity** Provide a worked calculation or calculations, using any non-technical language as necessary, demonstrating the losses of electrical power involved in converting DC electricity generated by the proposed solar panel arrays to AC electricity capable of being exported to the national transmission system (NTS). The calculation(s) should demonstrate any power losses at each of the following stages: a) converting generated electricity from DC to AC via inverters; b) stepping up the voltage of the generated electricity to a level cable of being exported to the NTS; and c) charging and discharging the proposed battery energy storage system (BESS).
GC.1.03	Applicant	**Generating output for the proposed development and relationship with the secured grid connection limit** Provide the predicted electricity generating output, expressed in megawatt hours (MWh) for the proposed development for every hour in a typical calendar year (365 days/8,760 hours duration). In answering this question the applicant should also provide for a calendar year predictions for: a) the total number of hours in a year when the proposed development would be expected to generate electricity in excess of the secured grid limit of 240 megawatts (MW) (paragraph 2.1.2 in the Grid Connection Statement [APP-200]); and b) the total number of hours in a year when the proposed development would be expected to generate electricity at levels below the secured grid connection limit, for each of the following percentage bands: 0 to 9; 10 to 19; 20 to 29; 30 to 39; 40 to 49; 50 to 59; 60 to 69; 70 to 79; 80 to 89; and 90 to 99%.

Question Number	Question to:	Question
GC.1.04	Applicant	**Justification for the proposed solar array overplanting ratio of 1.6** In paragraph 7.5.2 of the Statement of Need [APP-184] it is stated that an overplanting ratio of 1.6 has been applied to the design for the proposed solar array areas, resulting in a maximum installed capacity of 385MW DC (for the fixed south facing solar panel option). Provide the justification for needing to apply an overplanting planting ratio of 1.6 to the scaling for the proposed solar arrays, given a grid connection offer of 240MW has been secured (paragraph 2.1.2 in [APP-200]).
GC.1.05	Applicant	**Comparison between the proposed development and other utility scale solar farms** For each solar farm that is the subject of a made DCO or is currently at the application stage (accepted and is in pre-examination, in examination, in reporting or being determined) identify: a) The gross land area b) The net area for the solar arrays c) The overplanting ratio d) The net area identified for biodiversity net gain (BNG) provision e) The confirmed/anticipated generating capacity in MW for the solar arrays f) The confirmed/anticipated generating output in MWh or the secured transmission system or district network connection limit if the anticipated generating output has not been publicly stated g) Whether a BESS has been consented/proposed and the capacity of any consented BESS.
GC.1.06	Applicant	**Solar panel performance degradation** In paragraph 6.4.67 of Chapter 6 (Climate Change) of the Environmental Statement (ES) [APP-031] an explanation for the expected degradation rate for the solar panels (modules) to be installed as part of the proposed development is given, namely 2% for year one of the proposed development and then 0.45% for each year between year 2 and year 30. It being envisaged that the originally installed modules would be replaced from year 31 onwards. a) For a solar module with a generating capacity of 670 watts (the illustrative design referred to in paragraph 3.3.6 of Chapter 3 of the ES [APP-028]) provide a worked calculation for the performance degradation for the solar module for each year of its anticipated 30 year life, assuming 2% degradation in year one and 0.45% degradation in each of the subsequent years through to year 30.

Question Number	Question to:	Question
		b) Explain what accounts for a 2% reduction in panel performance in year one relative to a 0.45% reduction in performance in subsequent years. Clarify whether with the assumed panel replacement from year 31 onwards it would be correct to apply a performance degradation factor of 0.45% for year 31 and all subsequent years or whether a higher factor should be applied to year 31 and then 0.45% in all subsequent years.
GC.1.07	Applicant	**Justification for the scale of the proposed BESS** The grid connection offer for the proposed development would allow for the export or import of up to 240MW. Paragraph 3.3.33 of Chapter 3 of the ES [APP-028] states that the proposed BESS would have a capacity of up to 480 MWh. Explain the justification for the proposed BESS having a capacity that would be twice the grid connection limit that has been secured. In answering this this question, the applicant should: a) Identify typically how long it would take to fully charge and fully discharge the proposed BESS b) Comment on whether the generating station (solar arrays) element of the proposed development would or would not be financially viable without a BESS. c) If the answer to part b) of this question is no, identify the minimum capacity for a BESS that would be needed to render the generating station element of the proposed development viable. d) Comment on whether the BESS of the scale proposed within the submitted application would or would not accord with the principles for associated development set out in paragraph 5 of the *'Guidance on associated development applications for major infrastructure projects'* (Department for Communities and Local Government, April 2013). e) In terms of the operational revenue expected to be earned by the proposed development identify the proportion (percentage) arising from: the generation of electricity on-site, inclusive of any of that electricity that would be stored in the BESS prior to it being exported to the national transmission system; and the importation and exportation of electricity generated by a generating station other than that forming part of the proposed development.

Question Number	Question to:	Question
GC.1.08	Applicant	**Generating output for the proposed BESS relative to the proposed solar arrays** In paragraph 6.4.76 of Chapter 6 of the ES (Climate Change) [APP-031] it is stated *"Should the BESS be charged from the Proposed Development, and discharged back into the grid once each day, at a typical round-trip efficiency of 85% and an overall lifetime degradation rate of 80% (accounting for replacements), it will be able to supply 7,985 GWh to the electricity grid over its 60-year operational lifetime. As the lifetime generation figure of the BESS is significantly less than that of the Proposed Development, it is reasonable to assume that the battery will only store and discharge energy generated by the Proposed Development."* In paragraph 6.4.67 of [APP-031] it is stated that the proposed solar arrays would have *"…a total energy generation figure of 19,438,499 MWh over the assessed 60-year Proposed Development lifetime"*. The ExA notes that the generation output figures for the solar arrays and the BESS have been quoted using different units, respectively megawatt hours (MWh) and gigawatt hours (GWh). If the anticipated generating output for the BESS is converted to MWh (7,985,000 MWh), and 7,985,000 MWh would be around 41% of the anticipated generating output for the proposed solar arrays, is it correct to say that the generation output for the BESS would be significantly less than the projected output for the proposed solar arrays. Would the capacity of the proposed BESS, as proposed associated development, "… be proportionate to the nature and scale of the principal development" (paragraph 5(iv) in Guidance on associated development applications for major infrastructure projects April 2013)?
GC.1.09	Applicant	**Operational safety of BESS** Multiple interested parties have raised concerns about the operational safety of the proposed BESS, particularly with regard to the potential for thermal runaway to cause fires. Worldwide identify instances of BESS having caught fire, advising on where those incidents have occurred and giving the reason(s) for those incidents.
GC.1.10	Applicant	**Minimum distance between proposed BESS and structures** North Kesteven District Council (NKDC) in its RR [RR-210] has questioned whether the minimum separation distances for a centralised BESS (790 metres) and a distributed BESS (200 metres) stated in paragraph 2.3.5 of [APP-198] have been applied.

Question Number	Question to:	Question
		a) With respect to the proposed centralised BESS, submit a plan showing the full extent of the BESS compound relative to nearby structures and annotate around the entirety of the BESS compound the minimum separation distance: 1) recommended by the National Fire Chiefs Council (NFCC) in its extant and/or emerging BESS planning guidance for fire and rescue services or any other relevant extant or emerging regulations or guidance; and 2) the 790 metre minimum separation distance referred to paragraph 2.3.5 of [APP-198]. b) Submit copies of the NFCC's extant and draft versions of its Grid Scale Battery Energy Storage System planning – Guidance for FRS c) With respect to the proposed distributed BESS clarify whether in all circumstances the minimum separation distance of 200 metres between elements of the BESS and off site structures stated in paragraph 2.3.5 of [APP-198] would be possible. In the event the applicant identifies any instances where that separation distance could not to be achieved the structures in question should be listed (giving its address) and the distance between the distributed BESS and the structures in question should be quoted.
GC.1.11	Applicant	**Relationship between Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) and the Framework Construction Environmental Management Plan** In paragraph 1.4.2g of the Framework Battery Management Safety Plan [APP-198] it is stated that the battery management plan would form part of the Emergency Response Plan included in the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) [APP-189]. However, the CEMP, including its Emergency Response Plan, would be a control document applicable only to the construction phase for the proposed development. BESS safety would primarily relate to the proposed development's operational phase. Accordingly, should BESS safety form any part of the CEMP or be treated as a standalone matter subject to the Battery Safety Management Plan secured under requirement 7 of the draft development consent order (dDCO) [APP-016]?
GC.1.12	Applicant	**Related Applications and Consents** With respect to other consents potentially required to implement the proposed development, within paragraph 10.1.1 of the Statement of Reasons (SoR) [APP-020] reference is made to obtaining a *"Section 171 Licence"*. Explain what a Section 171 licence is?

Question Number	Question to:	Question
GC.1.13	Applicant and National Grid	**Grid Connection** Section 3.7 of ES Chapter 3: The Proposed Development [APP-028] identifies that the proposed development would connect to the national electricity transmission network at National Grid's proposed substation near Navenby, which is subject to a separate planning application. Provide an update on the anticipated date for submitting a planning application for the proposed Navenby substation and how that compares with the timings described in paragraph 3.4.2 of the Grid Connection Statement [APP-200].
GC.1.14	Applicant and National Grid	**Implication for the proposed development were the proposed Navenby substation not to be consented and/or constructed** If the proposed development was to be consented but the proposed Navenby substation did not receive permission and/or the approved substation was not built, what implications would the unavailability of a new substation at Navenby have for the delivery of the proposed solar farm?
GC.1.15	Applicant	**Funding for decommissioning** The Funding Statement [AS-014] identifies costs and funding associated with construction and maintenance, for example, paragraphs 1.3.1, 1.4.2, 1.4.3, and 1.4.5. Explain: a) How decommissioning activities have been factored into the costs estimate and funding availability and commitments? b) How funding for undertaking decommissioning works, potentially sixty years after the proposed development became operational, would be secured?
GC.1.16	Applicant	**Waste Management** Section 5.15 of NPS EN-1 addresses resource and waste management including identifying requirements for the applicant assessment. That includes, at paragraph 5.15.9, that applicants should include an

Question Number	Question to:	Question
	Lincolnshire County Council (LCC) Environment Agency	assessment of the impact of the waste arising from development on the capacity of waste management facilities to deal with other waste arising in the area for at least five years of operation. Views are sought on whether this has been adequately addressed in the ES, for example, in Appendix 14-E: Materials and Waste Impact Assessment Methodology and Baseline [APP-174].
GC.1.17	Applicant	**Waste management** The Framework Operational Environmental Management Plan (FOEMP) [APP-190] states that it is not proposed to store waste batteries on site, with it being stated any such batteries would be removed from the containers and taken away straight away. a) Explain how waste battery removal would be ensured, given the lack of nearby battery storage or treatment facilities, as identified by the Environment Agency in its RR [RR-089]. b) Comment on the need to include protection measures for battery storage in the FOEMP, should it not be possible to remove waste batteries straight away.
GC.1.18	LCC	**Minerals safeguarding** The Minerals Safeguarding Assessment [APP-162] considers that minerals resources would not be sterilised because the proposed development would be temporary in nature and the land would be restored to a condition that would not inhibit mineral extraction and the Lincolnshire Local Aggregates Assessment demonstrates that there should be sufficient sand and gravel and limestone resources to last beyond the Lincolnshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan period. However, as the proposed development's operational period could potentially be 60 years that would extend beyond the period covered by the extant Minerals and Waste Local Plan. Advise on: a) the current landbank for sand and gravel and limestone; b) the effects of the proposed development on minerals supply in the area; and c) any mitigation required to safeguard mineral resources.

Question Number	Question to:	Question
GC.1.19	Applicant	**Planning obligations** Advise on whether there have been any discussions regarding a potential section 106 agreement to cover matters such as the skills and education package and monitoring fees, as identified by NKDC in its RR [RR-210].
GC.1.20	Applicant	**Glint and glare** Where screening is relied upon to mitigate the effects of glint and glare for receptors, such as those points along the A46, as noted by National Highways in its RR [RR-201]: a) Explain what measures would be adopted to ensure that appropriate screening would be in place to mitigate the effects of glint and glare in the short term until any necessary new or additional planting had become established to the required height and density. b) How would such mitigation be managed in the long term, given that paragraph 5.3.22 of the Framework Landscape Environmental Management Plan (FLEMP) [AS-101] identifies that on-going management measures would cover a period of five years post-construction?
Climate Change (CC)		
CC.1.01	Applicant	**Assessment of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions offset (carbon savings) compared with other forms of electricity generation** In paragraph 6.4.33 of Chapter 6 of the ES (Climate Change) [APP-031] it is stated that *"…On this basis, the production of electricity from the Proposed Development and associated carbon savings is compared against the future baseline of the production of electricity at the average grid intensity without decarbonisation. …"*. Given the move towards the decarbonisation of electricity generation in the United Kingdom, does it remain reasonable to make comparisons between the proposed development's carbon savings and a future baseline based on an average grid intensity without decarbonisation, given the government's expectation that there will be a transition to renewable generation sources bringing to an end the recent historic dominance of the generation of electricity by generating stations emitting GHGs? Have the carbon savings

Question Number	Question to:	Question
		identified for the proposed development been over estimated given the likelihood there will be decarbonisation which will reduce the average grid intensity?
CC.1.02	Applicant	**Assessment methodology** Clarify whether the levels of *"likelihood of climate impact occurring"* and levels of *"consequence of a climate impact"* in Table 6-17 of ES Chapter 6: Climate Change [APP-031] are correct, given the respective descriptions in Tables 6-15 and 6-16 of ES Chapter 6: Climate Change [APP-031].
Draft Development Consent Order (dDCO)		
Note All references to the numbering of Articles and Schedules (including Requirements have been updated to refer to those used in the version of the dDCO submitted with the application for the proposed development [APP-016]		
DCO.1.01	Applicant	**Article 6 and Schedule 3 – Legislation to be disapplied** Article 6 and Schedule 3 of the dDCO [APP-016] refer to acts and byelaws that have been identified for proposed disapplication. However, the Explanatory Memorandum (EM) [APP-019] only provides a partial explanation of the reasoning for why the proposed disapplication of legislation identified in the dDCO would be necessary to facilitate the construction and/or operation of the proposed development. For example, it is unclear what turnpikes might be affected by the proposed development. The need for the proposed disapplication of the legislative sought should be reviewed and the EM should be revised to provide a full explanation for why each legislative disapplication sought would be necessary to facilitate the construction, operation or decommissioning of the proposed development.
DCO.1.02	Applicant	**Article 2 – interpretation** This article defines *"working day"*. However, there are several references throughout the dDCO to just *"day"*. For consistency, the same terminology should be used throughout the dDCO. The wording of the dDCO should be reviewed and a consistent approach should be taken to use of working day or day.

Question Number	Question to:	Question
DCO.1.03	Applicant NKDC LCC Environment Agency Natural England Historic England	**Article 2 - interpretation** Article 2 of the dDCO [APP-016] includes provisions for *"permitted preliminary works"*. Section 5.7.21 of Advice Note 15 "Drafting Development Consent Orders" advises that such provisions have been removed by the Secretary of State (SoS) in some decisions, particularly where such advance works were themselves likely to have significant environmental effects, for example, in terms archaeological remains. a) **For the applicant** - comment on the nature and scope of the identified permitted preliminary works in the context of section 5.7.21 of Advice Note 15. b) Given that the permitted preliminary works could take place with just the framework plans in place, views are sought on whether the level of detail in these documents would secure adequate control and manage the likely effects arising from the preliminary works?
DCO.1.04	Applicant NKDC LCC	**Articles 2 and 5 - maintenance** Article 2 provides a definition for *"maintain"* which includes *"inspect, repair, adjust, alter, remove, refurbish, reconstruct, replace and improve any part of the authorised development (but not remove, reconstruct or replace the whole of Work No. 1 at the same time)"*. Article 5 describes the power to maintain the authorised development. Paragraph 2.3.3 of the FOEMP [APP-190] identifies that every 12 months from the date of final commissioning and before undertaking the maintenance for the year ahead, the applicant would submit a planned maintenance schedule for the year ahead to the relevant planning authorities, excluding unforeseen emergencies that require maintenance throughout the year. Paragraph 2.3.4 sets out what the maintenance schedule must include, with item e being confirmation that any environmental effects that are

Question Number	Question to:	Question
		likely to arise as a result of such maintenance and the environmental controls to be implemented are not to be materially worse than those reported in the ES. a) Would the provisions within Articles 2 and 5 and the commitments in the FOEMP be sufficient to ensure that any environmental effects from maintenance activities would not be materially worse than those reported in the ES. If not, what other measures should be included? b) Should be a mechanism for the relevant planning authorities to determine whether the extent of maintenance would/would not give rise to materially worse environmental effects and if so, what this should comprise?
DCO.1.05	Applicant	**Article 2 – interpretation** The list of definitions appears to be in alphabetical order other than *"waterbodies in a river basin management plan"*. The definition for waterbodies should be moved to its correct alphabetical position.
DCO.1.06	Applicant	**Article 8 and Schedule 4 – street works** Given that Article 8 would give the power to drill, tunnel or bore under the streets identified in Schedule 4, comment on National Highways' request in [RR-201] that the A46 be included within Schedule 4 in order to address the potential for undertaking trenchless crossings of the A46**.**
DCO.1.07	Applicant LCC	**Article 9 - application of the permit scheme** Paragraph 4.3.2 of the EM [APP-019] identifies that the applicant will continue discussions with LCC as to the need for this Article. Provide an update on the progress on any such discussions concerning the need for Article 9 to be included in any made DCO for the proposed development.
DCO.1.08	Applicant LCC	**Article 10 - power to alter layout, etc. of streets** Paragraph 2 would allow the undertaker, for the purposes of the authorised development, or in connection with the authorised development, to alter the layout of any street within the Order limits in addition to those specifically identified in the tables in Part 1 and Part 2 of Schedule 5.

Question Number	Question to:	Question
		a) **The applicant** - provide a justification for why paragraph 2 would be appropriate in the specific circumstances of the proposed development. b) **LCC** - comment on whether you consider the extent of this general power would be necessary and reasonable.
DCO.1.09	Applicant	**Article 12 and Schedule 6 – public rights of way** The applicant should review the consistency of the public rights of way (PRoW) identified in Schedule 6 with those in ES Chapter 5: Traffic and Transport [APP-038], the Framework Public Rights of Way Management Plan (FPRoWMP) [APP-195] and the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans [AS-007]. For example, paragraph 3.3.3 of the FPRoWMP identifies several PRoWs as not having been assessed further as they are unlikely to be impacted during the construction phase. This includes PRoW LL|NoDi|4/1, which is identified in Part 3 of Schedule 6 for the permanent use of motor vehicles. If required, any necessary changes to the documents and the implications for the assessment of effects should be identified and be incorporated in submitted revised versions of the document(s) in question.
DCO.1.10	Applicant	**Article 13 – stopping up of PRoWs** Paragraph 4.3.9 of the EM [APP-019] explains that the Article 13 provides the undertaker with the power to stop up the PRoWs shown on the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans [AS-007] with a brown dashed line. The EM goes on to state that these PRoWs would be permanently stopped up with a replacement route to be provided, as shown on the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans. a) Paragraph 5.6.1 of the EM [APP-019] identifies that Schedule 6 relates to Article 13. The applicant should signpost where in Schedule 6 the reference to the stopping up of PRoWs is. b) The applicant should clarify where in the dDCO the provision for replacement routes for those stretches of PRoWs that would be stopped up can be found.

Question Number	Question to:	Question
DCO.1.11	Applicant LCC	**Article 16 - traffic regulation measures** Paragraph 2 includes a general power that would authorise temporary traffic regulation measures on *"any road"* in addition to those specifically identified in Parts 1 and 2 of Schedule 8 (traffic regulation measures) and shown on the Traffic Regulation Measures Plans [AS-008]. a) Noting that Article 16 is not in the model provisions, the **applicant** should provide a justification for why it would be appropriate in the specific circumstances of the proposed development for it to be included in any made DCO for the proposed development. b) **LCC** - should comment on whether it considers the extent of the general power in Article 16 would be necessary and reasonable.
DCO.1.12	Applicant	**Article 40 – trees subject to tree preservation orders** Paragraph 2(b) of Article 40 states that the duty contained in section 206(1) (replacement of trees) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 would not apply although where possible the undertaker would seek to replace any trees which are removed. Explain why it is considered this provision should not apply to the proposed development.
DCO.1.13	Applicant	**Schedule 1 - Authorised development and the description of individual works** Various application documents, including the ES, refer to the installation of buried electrical cables. However, the description of the individual proposed works included in Schedule 1 of the dDCO only refer to the installation of cables and those descriptions would not necessarily secure the installation of buried cables. The applicant, for the avoidance of doubt, should therefore amend the wording of the descriptions for the proposed works in Schedule 1, as necessary, to refer to the installation of buried cables.
DCO.1.14	Applicant	**Schedule 1 – Further associated development** In Schedule 1 14 works (items (a) to (n)), in addition to proposed Work Nos 1 to 9, have been identified as *"further associated development"* and there is an additional section of text stating *"… and further*

Question Number	Question to:	Question
		associated development comprising such other works or operations as may be necessary or expedient for the purposes of or in connection with the construction, operation and maintenance of the authorised development which are within the Order limits and fall within the scope of work assessed in the environmental statement." The further associated development listed as items (a) to (n) inclusive appears to comprise a comprehensive list of works. Given that: a) What other works might come within in the scope of the further associated development that have not been included in items (a) to (n) and if there are other such works could they be added as items following item (n)? b) Could the proposed development be implemented without the inclusion of the section of text that follows item (n)?
DCO.1.15	Applicant	**Requirements general** Proposed requirements 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14 15, 16 and 18 start with the phrase *"No part of the authorised development may commence until …"*. The ExA considers that wording to be imprecise and should be replaced with 'must not' phraseology.
DCO.1.16	Applicant	**Requirements - management plans** Clarify why Requirements 7, 8, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20 of the dDCO are qualified by the word "substantially" in accordance with the various framework management plans and justify its use given its imprecision.
DCO.1.17	Applicant	**EM - missing text** Paragraph 4.6.1 of the EM [APP-019] appears to have missing text. This should be amended as required.

Question Number	Question to:	Question
DCO.1.18	Applicant	**Requirements - tailpieces** Section 5.3.17 of Advice Note 15 'Drafting Development Consent Orders' advises against using tailpieces in requirements. Requirement 5 of the dDCO [APP-016] includes a tailpiece element and that should be deleted or an explanation should be provided indicating why it is considered the tailpiece would be appropriate.
DCO.1.19	Applicant	**Requirement 6 – detailed design approval** Should the *"design commitments"* referred to in paragraph 2(a) be amended to 'Design Commitments at Appendix A of the Design Approach Document' for clarity? This would also apply to the reference in Article 2 (interpretation), Requirement 9(3) and Schedule 12 (documents to be certified).
DCO.1.20	Applicant	**Requirement 11 – archaeology** There is a slight difference in terminology used in Requirement 11 ('The authorised development may not commence until') compared to other requirements which require action prior to the commencement of development ('No part of the authorised development may commence until'). Do these terms mean the same thing, and if so, should Requirement 11 be amended for consistency?
DCO.1.21	Applicant	**Requirement 16 – operational noise** The applicant should clarify whether Requirement 16 would apply to maintenance activities during the operational phase.
DCO.1.22	Applicant LCC	**Requirement 17 – permissive paths** a) Should this requirement include a provision specifying that the permissive paths would be made available to the public for a specified number of days a year during the operation of the proposed development or would the reference in paragraph 6.1.2 of the FLEMP [AS-101] be sufficient?

Question Number	Question to:	Question
		b) Should the wording in the FLEMP and Requirement 17 be more prescriptive than "up to" 364 days a year as this could be interpreted as being a maximum and therefore allow for less than 364 days?
DCO.1.23	Applicant	**Requirement 18 - Public Rights of Way** Requirement 18 would prevent the commencement of the proposed authorised development until a public rights of way management plan for any sections of public rights of way shown to be **temporarily** (ExA emphasis) closed on the streets, rights of way and access plans for that part has been submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority. However, three PRoWs would need to be permanently closed with permanent diversions created. Explain how the trigger in Requirement 18 would apply to sections of PRoWs that would be permanently closed. For example, if a PRoW was to be permanently closed in advance of the temporary closure of any section of PRoW.
DCO.1.24	Applicant NKDC LCC	**Requirement 20 – decommissioning** a) **For applicant** – Having regard to the definition for the *"date of final commissioning"* stated in paragraph 1 of Schedule 2 *(""date of final commissioning" means in respect of each part of the authorised development the date on which each part of the authorised development commences operation by generating electricity on a commercial basis but excluding the generation of electricity during commissioning and testing."*) and the wording of subparagraph (1) of Requirement 20, what does each part of the development mean and how would the commencement of each part of the proposed development on a commercial basis be recorded and be made known to the relevant local planning authority? b) Would Requirement 20 adequately address the situation where the proposed development ceases to be in use/generate electricity before the 60-year period ends (early cessation)? If it is considered that the draft wording of subparagraph (1) would inadequately address early cessation, provide wording that is considered to be appropriate, including the triggering for an early cessation procedure. c) Should a timescale for completion of decommissioning works be included?

Question Number	Question to:	Question
DCO.1.25	Applicant	**Schedule 14 – protective provisions, Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue** Comment on the request in LCC's RR [RR-157] for a protective provision for Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue, including a financial contribution for monitoring of the BESS.
DCO.1.26	Applicant	**Schedule 15 – procedure for discharge of requirements** a) Explain why the procedure for discharging requirements needs to be included in a freestanding schedule (Schedule 15) rather be set out in a second part for Schedule 2 (Requirements), given that all of the proposed requirements would be for the approval of the relevant planning authority. b) Under paragraph 4 (Appeals), what purpose would subparagraph (9), most particularly the provision that the relevant planning authority may confirm any determination given by the appointed person in an identical form, serve given that under subparagraph (8) decisions made by appointed persons would be final and binding on the parties? Would subparagraph (9) be superfluous and should be deleted? c) Explain how the fees in paragraph 5 have been determined and the rationale for the different fees that would apply to different requirements. d) Clarify whether the reference to schedule 16 in paragraph 5.15.1 of the EM [APP-019] should be schedule 15 and amend if required.
Ecology and Nature Conservation (ENC)		
ENC.1.01	Applicant	**Landtake required to meet a BNG level of 10%** The ExA's notes the applicant's comments relating to its commitments for providing BNG, included in [AS-004] as a response to item 5 raised by the ExA in [PD-005]. Notwithstanding those submissions the applicant is requested to identify the minimum landtake required to achieve the provision of 10% for BNG habitat units and BNG hedgerow units, as opposed to the commitment levels respectively of 30.64% and 50.62% included in the application, as identified in for example the submitted BNG Report [APP-194]. In responding to this question the applicant should identify the necessary hectarage in writing and show that on a plan or plans for comparison with the extent of proposed Work No. 9 shown on the Works Plans [AS-006] and the figures included in the Framework Landscape and Ecological Mitigation Plan [AS-101].

Question Number	Question to:	Question
ENC.1.02	Applicant	**NPS EN-1 - 25 Year Environment Plan** Paragraph 5.4.39 of NPS EN-1 states that regard should be had to the aims and goals of the government's Environmental Improvement Plan 2023, and any relevant measures and targets, including statutory targets set under the Environment Act or elsewhere. Clarify how the proposed development responds to the aims and goals of the government's Environmental Improvement Plan 2023.
ENC.1.03	Applicant	**Location of Ancient Woodland and Priority Habitats** Confirm whether the notations and key on Figure 8-3 [AS-044] are consistent with each other and if not resubmit this figure.
ENC.1.04	Applicant	**Study areas** Paragraph 8.4.4 of ES Chapter 8: Ecology and Nature Conservation [APP-033] describes the definition for the study areas and advises they have adopted standard good practice, being informed by published guidance and professional judgement. Explain why the distances used are appropriate for capturing all of the potential impact pathways associated with the proposed development.
ENC.1.05	Applicant	**Baseline – statutorily designated sites** Table 8-8 in ES Chapter 8: Ecology and Nature Conservation [APP-033] and Figure 8-1: Sites Statutorily Designated for Biodiversity Value [AS-042] identify Whisby Nature Park as a Local Nature Reserve. In relevant representations [RR-139] and [RR-263] reference is made to Whisby Nature Park as being a Site of Special Scientific Interest. Confirm which is correct and what changes, if any, would be required to the assessment of effects.

Question Number	Question to:	Question
ENC.1.06	Applicant	**Baseline - habitat types** The Environment Agency in relevant representation [RR-089] has questioned the direction of flow for the River Whitham and River Brant stated in Table 8-10 of ES Chapter 8: Ecology and Nature Conservation [APP-033]. Confirm the direction of flow and any implications for the assessment that has been undertaken.
ENC.1.07	Applicant	**Baseline – defining biodiversity importance** Using otter and water vole as examples, explain the reasoning behind categorising them as species of "district" importance in Table 8-11 of ES Chapter 8: Ecology and Nature Conservation [APP-033] when they are a Species of Principal Importance and water voles are identified as decreasing in population size and range and are considered endangered in England.
ENC.1.08	NKDC LCC Forestry Commission Natural England Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust Environment Agency	**Mitigation commitments** Table 8-13 in ES Chapter 8: Ecology and Nature Conservation [APP-033] sets out the proposed development's mitigation commitments. Comment on the extent of mitigation measures proposed and whether they would be sufficient to achieve their objectives?
ENC.1.09	Applicant	**Mitigation – pre-construction surveys** Paragraph 7.1.1 of the FLEMP [AS-101] identifies that the baseline data collected in 2023/2024 would require updating prior to construction by repeating the surveys, with those survey updates to be undertaken

Question Number	Question to:	Question
		a year prior to construction to identify any ecological constraints, including any protected species licensing requirements. ES Chapter 8: Ecology and Nature Conservation [APP-033] points to the Framework CEMP [APP-189] as the document that would secure the pre-construction surveys, for example, in Table 8-13. Table 3 in the Framework Construction Environmental Management Plan (FCEMP) [APP-189], which addresses ecology and nature conservation, refers to pre-construction surveys, for example ECO-C6 to ECO-C9 and ECO-C11. Monitoring requirements and responsibilities within Table 3 identify that the identified mitigation/enhancement measures would be confirmed in detailed CEMP(s). Given that the detailed CEMP(s) would only be required prior to the commencement of the authorised development under the terms of Requirement 12 of the dDCO [APP-016], explain how the implementation of pre-construction surveys would be secured and how they would inform any necessary mitigation.
ENC.1.10	Applicant NKDC LCC	**Mitigation - Navenby Green Man Road Verges Local Wildlife Site** Paragraph 8.12.7 in ES Chapter 8: Ecology and Nature Conservation [APP-033] identifies specific measures to limit the potential impacts to the Local Wildlife Site and that these would be included in the CEMP. Paragraph 8.12.8 in [APP-033] explains it may be possible to supplement the re-instated areas with seed collected from more diverse sections of the Local Wildlife Site. Table 3.4 of the FCEMP [APP-189] under ECO-C1 part b. identifies measures specific to the Local Wildlife Site. Comment on whether the measures set out in ECO-C1 part b of [APP-189] would adequately cover those identified in paragraphs 8.12.7 and 8.12.8 of [APP-033].
ENC.1.11	Applicant	**Mitigation – horizontal directional drilling** Table 8-13 in ES Chapter 8: Ecology and Nature Conservation [APP-033] provides a summary of embedded avoidance and mitigation measures. That includes using trenchless methods such as horizontal

Question Number	Question to:	Question
		directional drilling for the two main rivers (River Witham and River Brant). That point is also made in paragraph 2.6.5 of the Water Framework Directive Assessment [APP-145]. a) Clarify whether a detailed survey been undertaken to inform the feasibility of horizontal directional drilling in these locations. b) If horizontal directional drilling would not be feasible or it fails for whatever reason, what alternative technique(s) would be available for crossing the River Witham and River Brant?
ENC.1.12	Applicant	**Mitigation – ground nesting birds** Figure 8-5: Bird Mitigation Land Allocation [AS-046] identifies areas of permanent grassland (grassland A to D) and managed arable (arable A to F) as the bird mitigation areas. Figure 7.15-1 of the FLEMP [AS-101] identifies “bird mitigation areas – permanent grassland” and “bird mitigation areas – managed arable” which appear to be the same as the areas of permanent grassland and managed arable in Figure 8-5. The post development habitat plan in Appendix D of the Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Report [APP-194] identifies “grassland – other neutral grassland” and “cropland – cereal crops” which appear to be the same as the areas of permanent grassland and managed arable in Figure 8-5. Paragraph 4.2.4 of the FLEMP [AS-101] advises that there would be approximately 83 hectares (ha) of permanent grassland for bird mitigation purpose, while paragraph 5.3.57 states that a minimum 64ha of permanent grassland would be created, although the size of Area D would be confirmation.

Question Number	Question to:	Question
		Paragraph 5.2.18 identifies that a minimum of 181ha of managed arable would be provided for bird mitigation purposes. Paragraph 3.3.4 of the BNG Report [APP-194] states that 124.82 ha would be utilised primarily for bird mitigation (Cropland and Grassland habitats) by offering a variety of flowering plants that support pollinators and serve as a food source and nesting habitat for numerous bird species. Explain: a) the relationship between the various documents referred to in this question b) the reasons for the differences in the figures identified in the FLEMP and BNG Report c) how the areas identified as bird mitigation have been considered in the BNG Report
ENC.1.13		**Mitigation – ground nesting birds** In terms of the construction phase effects, paragraph 8.12.26 in ES Chapter 8: Ecology and Nature Conservation [APP-033] states that with the application of the identified mitigation measures, the magnitude of habitat loss for ground-nesting birds would be reduced to low, resulting in a minor adverse effect which would not be significant. The identified mitigation would be the provision of sufficient areas of undeveloped land (64ha of permanent grassland and 181ha of retained arable) that would be utilised for habitat creation and enhancement to offset the impact of loss of arable farmland for breeding ground-nesting birds. Given that, even with the mitigation provided by the previously mentioned land and its management, there would remain a minor adverse effect on ground nesting birds, explain why this would not be carried forward into the operational effects, given that it would remain during the operational phase.

Question Number	Question to:	Question
ENC.1.14	Forestry Commission	**Mitigation – ancient woodland** Natural England and Forestry Commission's Standing Advice on Ancient Woodland (NE/FC Standing Advice) recommends for ancient woodlands, proposals should have a buffer zone of at least 15m from the boundary of the woodland to avoid root damage. Table 8-13 in ES Chapter 8: Ecology and Nature Conservation [APP-033] identifies that the proposed development's design includes undeveloped areas of at least 15 metre (m) between woodlands, which includes ancient woodlands, thereby avoiding any direct impact on these habitats. a) Provide an update for when the revised NE/FC Standing Advice is likely to be published. b) Explain why there is reasonable doubt that deterioration of the ancient woodlands could still occur as a result of the proposed development if they were only afforded a 15m minimum buffer and what difference a 30m buffer would make.
ENC.1.15	Applicant	**Mitigation – fish spawning** The summary of engagement presented in Table 8-3 (page 43) of ES Chapter 8: Ecology and Nature Conservation [APP-033] states that the embedded mitigation in Table 8-13 includes mitigation to avoid horizontal directional drilling activities within key spawning/migration windows of September to February (salmonids) and March to May (coarse fish) wherever practicable. It is noted that paragraph 4.2.3 of Appendix 8-C Aquatic Ecology [AS-081] identifies that no suitable fish spawning habitat for notable species were present in any of the surveyed watercourses. However, to address the point made by the Environment Agency in its relevant representation [RR-089], confirm whether or not the submitted assessment includes course fish species and if not advise on how this issue will be addressed during the examination.

Question Number	Question to:	Question
ENC.1.16	Applicant LCC NKDC	**Cumulative effects** Table 8-16 in ES Chapter 8: Ecology and Nature Conservation [APP-033] identifies the residual effect for ground nesting birds of the proposed development in isolation as minor adverse (not significant). The assessment presented in Table 8-19 of [APP-033] concludes that there would be a negligible cumulative effect assuming appropriate mitigation measures would be included within respective developments to ensure there would be no significant residual effects. However, if several projects are identifying a minor adverse effect due to a loss of land for ground nesting birds, which is not significant in isolation, at what point might the effects for ground nesting birds become significant?
ENC.1.17	Applicant Forestry Commission	**Veteran trees –** Paragraph 6.6.21 in Appendix 10-H: Arboricultural Impact Assessment [APP-155] identifies that a total of five root protection area incursions for veteran trees would be required to facilitate the use of existing access roads by construction traffic. The affected veteran trees have been identified as: T708; T709; T1004; T1120; and T572 in paragraphs 6.6.22 and 6.6.23 of [APP-155]. a) **Applicant** - explain how the proposed development accords with the NE/FC Standing Advice in this regard, particularly in respect of avoiding and reducing (mitigating) impacts. b) **Applicant** - explain why it is considered that there would be no change from the existing use, in terms of for example, the potential to cause soil compaction, for those access roads that would be within the root protection areas for T708, T709, T1004 and T1120, as stated in paragraph 6.6.22 in [APP-155]? c) **Applicant** - what type and weight of vehicles would use the access road that would be within the root protection area for T572 and for what purpose and what would be the extent of the incursion into the root protection area, in percentage terms? d) What would be the effectiveness of a cellular system, as identified in paragraph 6.6.23 in [APP-155], for preventing compaction of the roots of T572 arising from vehicle movements.

Question Number	Question to:	Question
ENC.1.18	Applicant	**Ancient and veteran trees** Provide the additional detail requested by NKDC in its relevant representation [RR-210] on how ancient and veteran trees have been classified.
ENC.1.19	NKDC	**Arboricultural Impact Assessment – mitigation** The Arboricultural Impact Assessment [APP-155] identifies that the final specification for mitigation measures would be detailed in the Arboricultural Method Statement which it is proposed would be secured via the FCEMP [APP-189]. Would the mitigation mechanism proposed by the applicant be sufficient to address the point raised in your relevant representation [RR-210] about root and stump removal and, if not, what other details would be required to address the council's concern?
ENC.1.20	Applicant	**Connectivity** An embedded mitigation measure during construction identified in Table 8-13 of ES Chapter 8: Ecology and Nature Conservation [APP-033] would be a security perimeter fence with gaps to allow mammals, including small deer, badger, brown hare, hedgehog and otter to pass underneath at strategic locations to maintain ecological connectivity. A beneficial impact identified during the operational phase would be increased connectivity across the Order Limits and into the wider area, through the planting of trees and hedgerows (paragraph 8.9.3 in ES Chapter 8: Ecology and Nature Conservation [APP-033]). a) Provide a plan showing the potential corridors for species movement across the Order Limits. b) Comment on the potential for the proposed development to alter deer movements and their browsing and grazing patterns, as identified by the Forestry Commission in its relevant representation [RR-091].

Question Number	Question to:	Question
ENC.1.21	Applicant	**Tree belts** The Forestry Commission, in its relevant representation [RR-091] is seeking clarity on some woodland references in the Framework Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (FLEMP) [AS-101]. a) Confirm whether or not the tree belts referenced in the FLEMP [AS-101] would be in addition to the 200 trees referred to. b) Confirm that the area proposed for tree belts is that shown on sheet 6 of Figure 7.15-1 of the FLEMP [AS101]. c) Clarify where the proposed woodland that is referred to in the FLEMP [AS-101] would be located.
ENC.1.22	Applicant	**Hedgerow plan [AS-013]** The Hedgerow Plan [AS-013] identifies areas where lengths of hedgerow are proposed for removal together with maximum removal lengths. As referred to by NKDC in its relevant representation [RR-210], explain the extent to which the detailed design might affect the hedgerow removal identified on the Hedgerow Plan and therefore the assessment of effects and mitigation requirements.
ENC.1.23	Applicant	**Invasive non-native species** The Environment Agency in its relevant representation [RR-89] has raised the potential for the introduction/ spread of Signal Crayfish during construction and the need for specific mitigation measures. Comment on what consideration, if any, that has been given to the introduction/spread of Signal Crayfish during the proposed construction phase.

Question Number	Question to:	Question
ENC.1.24	Applicant	**FLEMP – monitoring** Section 7 of the FLEMP [AS-101] sets out the proposed monitoring regime. a) Explain how any actions determined necessary from the monitoring would be secured for implementation. b) Explain what involvement the relevant authorities and other bodies would have in that process.
ENC.1.25	Applicant	**BNG Report [APP-194] – metric assumptions** Under "post development data", paragraph 2.5.4 confirms that for the creation and enhancement of habitats, a delay of three years has been included in the metric, based on a predicted construction period of between 24 to 30 months. In terms of assumptions for area-based habitats and hedgerows, paragraph 2.8.4 in the BNG Report identifies that, given an anticipated construction duration of 24 to 30 months, a two-year delay has been applied to post-development habitats in the Principal Site. Explain the different delay periods identified in paragraphs 2.5.4 and 2.8.4 of the BNG Report and confirm which should be relied on.
ENC.1.26	Applicant LCC NKDC Natural England	**BNG Report [APP-194] – strategic significance** Paragraph 2.6.2 of the BNG Report sets out that NKDC has yet to produce a Local Nature Recovery Strategy and because of that strategic significance has been assigned to habitats using the alternative methodology in line with guidance set out in the Statutory Biodiversity Metric User Guide. LCC, in its relevant representation [RR-157], considers that significance has not been applied in accordance with the Statutory Biodiversity Metric User Guide, as NKDC has identified criteria for assessing

Question Number	Question to:	Question
		strategic significance (Central Lincolnshire Biodiversity Opportunity Mapping). NKDC, in its relevant representation [RR-210] also refers to a failure to apply locally adopted strategic significance criteria. a) Comment on what would be the most appropriate approach for assigning strategic significance within the context of the advice stated in the Statutory Biodiversity Metric User Guide. b) **NKDC** - provide an update on when the council's Local Nature Recovery Strategy is expected to be published.
ENC.1.27	Applicant NKDC LCC Forestry Commission Natural England	**BNG Report [APP-194] – trading rules** Paragraphs 3.3.2 to 3.3.6 in the BNG Report explain the trading rules. Paragraph 3.3.2 confirms that for area habitats, the trading rules within the Statutory Biodiversity Metric currently would not satisfied for each distinctiveness level. That would be because of the loss of "Lakes – Reservoirs", "Heathland and shrub – Mixed scrub" and "Cropland – Arable field margins" habitats, which would not be directly mitigated for by the proposed development. a) For the **applicant** - paragraphs 3.3.3 and 3.3.4 in the BNG Report provide more detail with respect to Lakes – Reservoirs' and Cropland – Arable field margins. Clarify why a similar explanation is not provided for Heathland and shrub – Mixed scrub. b) Comment on the approach to the trading rules.
ENC.1.28	Applicant	**BNG Report [APP-194] – approach** Respond to the points raised by NKDC in its relevant representation [RR-210] concerning the robustness of the approach that has been taken in the BNG assessment.

Question Number	Question to:	Question
ENC.1.29	Applicant LCC NKDC	**Ecological Steering Group** **Applicant** - confirm its view on establishing such a group. **Councils** - explain how it is envisaged that the ecological steering group referred to in NKDC's relevant representation [RR-210] could be secured.
Farming and Soils (FS)		
FS.1.01	Applicant	**Effects on the availability of farmland** a) What is the land area of England? b) What is the land area of the county of Lincolnshire? c) How much of the county of Lincolnshire is farmland and of that farmland how much is classed as being best and most versatile (BMV) and not BMV? d) Cumulatively how much farmland within the county of Lincolnshire would be occupied by the solar farms currently benefitting from made DCOs and of that farmland how much is classed as BMV and not BMV? e) For the proposed solar farms subject to accepted applications submitted under the Planning Act 2008 (PA2008) within the county of Lincolnshire that are currently in pre-examination, examination, recommendation or decision stages, cumulatively how much farmland would be occupied by those proposed developments and of that farmland how much is classed as BMV and not BMV? (In the event of any of the applications for the proposed solar farms being determined and becoming the subject of a made DCO in the period between the issuing of this question and the reply date, then the information relating to that development should be incorporated into the answer for part d) of this question).
FS.1.02	NKDC	**Availability of brownfield land** In many of the relevant representations that have submitted it has been contended that the proposed development could be accommodated on brownfield land rather utilising farmland. Advise on how much

Question Number	Question to:	Question
		brownfield land is available within the Council's area and whether that brownfield land availability would or would not be sufficient in scale and available to accommodate the proposed development.
FS.1.03	Applicant Natural England	**Agricultural land classification survey** Paragraph 12.4.16 in ES Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use [AS-016] advises that the soil survey for the cable corridor would be undertaken post consent, with that to be secured in the final approved CEMP. That is described in SOC-C3 in the FCEMP. Table 12-15 in [AS-016] describes the agricultural land classification within the principal site. This identifies that 18.4ha (1.8%) was not surveyed or was inaccessible. a) Has the partial surveying of the Order Limits prevented a comprehensive assessment of the effects of the proposed development on agricultural land? b) Would the measures in the FCEMP [APP-189] be sufficient to secure the required surveys? If not, what additional measures would be required? For example, should there be a specific provision in the dDCO to secure the survey work?
FS.1.04	Applicant	**Agricultural land classification survey** Table 6 in Appendix 12-B: Agricultural Land Classification Report [APP-161] identifies 241ha as grade 3a and 790ha as grade 3b. Table 12-15 in ES Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use [AS-016] identifies 282.9ha as BMV land and 702.4ha as non BMV land within the Principal Site. While appreciating [APP-161] covers a slightly larger area than the Order Limits, the applicant should explain the reason for the different BMV and non BMV figures quoted in [APP-161] and [AS-016].
FS.1.05	Applicant	**Agricultural land classification survey** Explain the methodology used to define the agricultural land grade boundaries on Figure 12-5 [AS-068] in the context of Natural England's issue NE11 raised in its relevant representation [RR-202].

Question Number	Question to:	Question
FS.1.06	Applicant	**Assessment methodology – receptor sensitivity** a) Explain why grade 3a land is defined as “medium” sensitivity in Table 12-10 in ES Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use [AS-016] when the guidance published by the Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment, referred to in paragraph 12.4.19 of [AS-016], indicates that the sensitivity should be classed as “high”. b) If the sensitivity should be defined as high, explain the implications for the assessment reported on [AS-016]. For example, paragraph 12.7.44 in [AS-016] considers that the permanent loss of agricultural land, which would include 1.5ha of BMV land, would be a minor adverse effect, but a high sensitivity receptor would result in a moderate adverse and significant effect when applying the approach described in Table 12-14 of [AS-016].
FS.1.07	Applicant	**Land take** a) Provide details of the amount of land take, including the Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) classification where relevant, for each of proposed Work Nos 1 to 9 inclusive. b) Plate 6-1 within the Planning Statement [AS-098] shows the areas proposed for solar arrays and arable and bird mitigation together with agricultural land. Provide a similar plan which also includes the other components of the proposed development notably the BESS and substation.
FS.1.08	Applicant	**BMV land – permanent loss** Paragraph 12.7.44 in ES Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use [AS-016] explains that the only areas of agricultural land considered to be permanently lost would be areas of planting and habitat creation introduced as part of the proposed development. The extent of permanently lost agricultural land would be 4.6ha, of which 1.5ha would be BMV land (Subgrade 3a). Explain why all areas of planting and habitat creation would not be on lower quality land, given the statement in paragraph 2.10.29 of National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy Infrastructure EN-3 (NPS EN-3) that where the proposed use of any agricultural land has been shown to be necessary, poorer

Question Number	Question to:	Question
		quality land should be preferred to higher quality land avoiding the use of BMV agricultural land where possible.
FS.1.09	Applicant	**Restoration of solar farms to productive farmland** Provide any examples in the United Kingdom or in another country where at the conclusion of the operation of a solar farm(s) there has been restoration of the affected farmland to its original ALC classification.
FS.1.10	Applicant	**Food security** Respond to concerns raised in multiple relevant representations, such as [RR-028], [RR-066], [RR-081], [RR-172], [RR-174], [RR-220], regarding the impact of the proposed development on the UK's food security and Lincolnshire's role in that. The response to this question should include an estimate of loss in yield due to the proposed development.
FS.1.11	Applicant LCC NKDC Natural England	**Framework Soil Management Plan** Within the Framework Soil Management Plan [AS-100] mention is made of a number of documents that would need to be referred to for the management of soils, for example, the soil resource survey, DEFRA's Construction Code of Practice for the Sustainable Use of Soils on Construction Sites document, as well as the SMP. a) **Applicant** - for each element of the proposed development, explain the approach to managing soils during construction, operation and decommissioning. This should include the methods for stripping, storing and replacing soils, including during wet weather, and activities during the aftercare period. b) Comment on other matters which you consider should be included in a final soil management plan to ensure that it provides an appropriate basis for the preparation of a detailed plan for the management of soils during construction, operation and decommissioning.

Question Number	Question to:	Question
FS.1.12	Applicant Natural England	**Framework Soil Management Plan – topsoil** Paragraph 5.4.1 of the Framework Soil Management Plan (FSMP) [AS-100] refers to any significant vehicular movement over topsoil being restricted. a) **Applicant** - explain how "significant" would be defined, for example, by type of vehicle, by number. b) Should this requirement be more definitive, for example, it should not happen except for the purposes of stripping operations?
FS.1.13	Applicant	**Framework Soil Management Plan – offsite uses** Section 6.7 in FSMP [AS-100] refers to potential off-site uses for materials including topsoil. Explain why soils would need to be removed rather than being retained for re-use on-site.
FS.1.14	Applicant Natural England LCC NKDC	**Framework Soil Management Plan – restoration** Restoration to previous quality appears to be one of the reasons for a finding of minor adverse effect for the land temporarily affected (paragraph 12.7.42 in ES Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use [AS-016]. It is also referenced in SOC-C3 in the FCEMP [APP-189]. Given this context, should there be a stronger commitment in the FSMP to restoring to the pre-development grade of agricultural land? If not, explain why that is considered to be the case?
FS.1.15	Applicant Natural England	**Framework Soil Management Plan – aftercare** Paragraph 7.2.3 in the FSMP identifies that the period for aftercare would be determined during the preparation of the Soil Management Plan, the period of aftercare would be agreed with landowner and it

Question Number	Question to:	Question
		would be the responsibility of the appointed person to determine when the reinstatement standard had been met. a) **Applicant** – what is the reasoning behind not establishing a more clearly defined aftercare period at this stage? b) Is there a need for a clearer definition of when land would be put into aftercare, for example, following the completion of topsoil replacement?
FS.1.16	Applicant Natural England	**Framework Soil Management Plan – aftercare** Section 9 of the Framework Soil Management Plan [AS-100] addresses soil maintenance (aftercare requirements). It refers to green spaces and input from a landscape specialist. a) **Applicant** – would the aftercare requirements also apply to areas that would be returned to an agricultural use such as in the cable corridor? b) If so, should the specialist soils consultant referred to in paragraph 4.5.1 of the FSMP [AS-100] be identified as having a role in aftercare, as indicated in that paragraph?
FS.1.17	Applicant	**Framework Soil Management Plan – monitoring** Paragraph 7.2.3 of the FSMP [AS-100] identifies that a monitoring schedule must be determined prior to the compilation of the Soil Management Plan. Provide more detail on the aims for the monitoring and what it would cover.

Question Number	Question to:	Question
FS.1.18	Applicant	**Farm holdings** Work No. 5A relates to the works in the cable corridor. The Proposed Development Parameters document [APP-187] refers to a minimum soil cover of 0.9m in areas of farmland and identifies several bits of infrastructure such as manholes, marker poles, joint bays. Comment on the extent to which the proposed soil cover and other infrastructure associated with the cable corridor would be a constraint to farming activities, including any specific planting, fencing, hedging, equipment or other uses.
FS.1.19	Applicant	**Farm holdings** In the summary of the scoping opinion responses presented in Table 12-1 in ES Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use [AS-016], it is stated that a reduction in farming employment has been assessed as part of the assessment of employment during operation. The reference in the assessment of employment during operation appears to be at paragraph 12.7.52 which identifies that it has been confirmed by all landowners that there is expected to be no job losses resulting from the removal of agricultural land. Signpost where in the documentation the evidence on this is.
Historic Environment (HE)		
HE.1.01	Applicant	**Effects of decommissioning works on archaeological remains** In section 3.3 of the Framework Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan [APP-191] it is stated *"The decommissioning phase is not expected to result in any impact beyond the already-disturbed footprint of the Proposed Development. Therefore, it is not anticipated that decommissioning activities will have a direct physical impact upon buried archaeological remains"*.

Question Number	Question to:	Question
		In relation to the installation and removal of the supporting legs for the proposed solar “panel mounting structures”, which in the case of the single axis tracker type could have a ground penetration of up to 4.0 metres Table 3-2 in [APP-028] identify/explain: a) The estimated number of legs that would be installed for the proposed fixed panel and single axis tracker options. b) The anticipated procedure for removing the legs, including the anticipated depth and extent of any below ground disturbance and the volume of any earth displaced (brought to the surface) as part of the process of extracting the legs.
HE.1.02	NKDC	**Conservation area character appraisals and management plans** Submit copies of maps and any adopted or emerging conservation area appraisals and management plans for the following conservation areas: a) Bassingham b) Boothby Graffoe c) Coleby d) Navenby

Question Number	Question to:	Question
Land Rights (Compulsory Acquisition (CA) and Temporary Possession (TP) (LR)		
LR.1.01	Applicant	**Freedom of parties with landowning interests who have signed heads of terms (HoTs) or entered option agreements to make representations about the submitted application** Confirm whether or not parties with landowning interests who have signed HoTs or option agreements with the applicant have been free to submit representations about the submitted application.
LR.1.02	Applicant	**Clarification as to whether the permanent acquisition of freeholds or long leaseholds are being sought under the powers included in the draft DCO** The Land Plans [AS-005], Book of Reference (BoR) [APP-022] and the Statement of Reasons [APP-020] variously show/refer to the proposed permanent acquisition of land. However, in paragraph 3.4.2 of the BNG report [APP-194] it is stated *"Where the DCO allows for either grassland or arable land areas, the Applicant is currently in dialogue with landowners over whether they have a preference and how this land will be managed. …"*, which appears to be inconsistent with the majority of the applicant's land rights proposals stated in the BoR, with the Land Plans depicting no distinction between the proposals for freehold or leasehold acquisition. Precisely who would be the landowner(s) of the land subject to the dialogue referred to in paragraph 3.4.2 of [APP-194]? The applicant should clarify its intentions about where it is proposing to permanently acquire freeholds or enter into leaseholds and make any necessary amendments to the Land Plans, BoR and any of the other submitted documents to clarify its proposed acquisition of freeholds or leases.
LR.1.03	NKDC	**Clarification as to whether any of the land included in the Order Limits for the proposed development should be considered as being commons or open spaces for the purposes of s131 and/or s132 of PA2008** With respect to the proposed Order Limits within the Witham Valley Country Park, advise as to whether any of that land should be considered as being special category land for the purposes of sections 131 and/or 132 of the PA2008? Any part of the Order Limits that is considered to be constitute special category land should be identified on a plan and the reason(s) for that conclusion should be given.

Question Number	Question to:	Question
LR.1.04	Applicant	**Proposals for providing BNG and meeting the conditions for the CA of land under s122 of PA2008** The applicant has made commitments to achieve minimum levels of around 30% BNG in habitat units and 50% BNG in hedgerow units, as stated in the submitted BNG Report [APP-194], in response to the minimum level of 10% provision which is due to be enacted via s99 and Schedule 15 of the Environment Act 2021. It is intended that those BNG levels would be secured via Requirement 8 included in Schedule 2 of the dDCO. The applicant's proposed minimum provision of around 30% BNG in habitat units and 50% BNG in hedgerow units would exceed the minimum level to be enacted under the Environment Act 2021. With respect to the proposed CA of land for BNG: a) Confirm whether the proposed BNG provision would exclusively serve the proposed development or might be used to facilitate the trading of BNG credits capable of being traded with and purchased by other developers unable to accommodate onsite BNG provision within their proposed developments? b) Explain why it is considered the proposals for BNG provision would satisfy the conditions stated in subparagraphs (2) and (3) of s122 of PA2008 and meet the guidance included in the *"Planning Act 2008 Guidance related to procedures for the compulsory acquisition of land"* (Department for Communities and Local Government, September 2013).
Landscape and Visual (LV)		
LV.1.01	Applicant	**Plans showing the locations for viewpoints and photomontages** Submit a plan clearly showing the locations for: a) the viewpoints included in ES Figure 10-8 Viewpoint Photography (Rev B) [APP-095] b) the photomontages included in ES Figure 10-10 Photomontages (Part 1) (Rev 1) [APP-097] and ES Figure 10-10 Photomontages (Part 2) (Rev 1) [APP-098].

Question Number	Question to:	Question
LV.1.02	NKDC LCC	**Applicant's methodology for assessing landscape and visual effects** Advise on whether you agree or disagree with the methodology the applicant has used to assess the proposed development's landscape and visual effects. If you disagree with any aspect of the methodology adopted by the applicant the reason for that should be explained.
LV.1.03	NKDC LCC	**Applicant's assessment of landscape and visual effects** The applicant has summarised the proposed development's effects for landscape and visual amenity for the fifteenth operational year in Table 10-13 in ES Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity [APP-035]. a) Advise on whether you agree or disagree with the applicant's classification of significance of effects, for both landscape and visual amenity, for the fifteenth operational year for each receptor summarised in Table 10-13 in [APP-035]? b) For any receptors for which you disagree with the applicant's classification of significance, state your preferred effect classification and explain why that is the case. c) For any instances of disagreement, you should also explain whether the provision of any additional or different mitigation would address your reasons for disagreeing with the applicant's assessment.

Question Number	Question to:	Question
LV.1.04	NKDC LCC	**Visual effects for users of public rights of way (PRoW)** Paragraph 2.10.43 in NPS EN-3 states *"Applicants are encouraged where possible to minimise the visual impacts of the development for those using existing public rights of way, considering the impacts this may have on any other visual amenities in the surrounding landscape.[89]"* Most of the proposed Order Limits through which PRoWs pass is open in character. To mitigate the visual effects of the proposed development for PRoW users the applicant is proposing to plant hedgerows. Having regard to the above quote from NPS EN-3, do you consider the planting of the proposed hedgerows would or would not be an appropriate form of mitigation for users of the affected PRoWs? If you consider such hedgerow planting would not be appropriate, are there any other forms of mitigation which you consider would be more appropriate?
LV.1.05	Applicant NKDC LCC	**Effectiveness of the proposed roadside screen planting** The ExA observed while undertaking its unaccompanied site inspection 1 (USI1) that throughout the area of the proposed development all roadside hedgerows appear to be subject to managed pruning, resulting in hedgerows in the winter period being around 1.5m to 2.0m in height above carriageway level. a) C**ouncils** - is there local legislation in force (a byelaw or similar) requiring roadside hedgerows to be subject to managed pruning applying to the proposed Order Limits and the nearby area? b) If the proposed roadside hedgerow planting was to be pruned in the manner observed by the ExA during its USI1, would those hedgerows provide effective screening for the proposed development? For example would the proposed array area occupying field 62 on sheet 8 of Figure 7.15-1 in the FLEMP [Appendix A in AS-101], adjoining Clay Lane west of Bassingham and east of Norton Disney be effectively screened by the proposed roadside hedgerow planting?

Question Number	Question to:	Question
LV.1.06	Applicant	**Clarification as to whether any advanced planting would be undertaken** Clarify whether there is any intention to undertake advanced planting in association with the proposed development, given that neither ES Chapter 10 [APP-035] nor the FLEMP [AS-101] refer expressly to the undertaking of any such planting. Should the intention be to undertake any advanced planting its location and form should be explained and shown on a plan.
LV.1.07	Applicant	**Maximum height for any freestanding lighting columns** What would be the maximum height for any freestanding lighting columns installed as part of the proposed development?
LV.1.08	Applicant	**Type of security fencing** In paragraph 3.3.63 of ES Chapter 3: The Proposed Development [APP-028] it is stated that the fencing around the solar array areas, onsite substation and BESS compound *"… is likely to be a stock proof mesh-type security fence with wooden posts and up to 2m in height … Access gates will be of similar construction and height as the perimeter fencing …"*. How confident are you that stock proof fencing would provide an adequate level of security for many of the proposed development's elements. Would there be potential for more sturdy fencing needing to be installed that could have more significant visual effects for the character and appearance for the area affected by the proposed development?

Question Number	Question to:	Question
LV.1.09	Applicant	**Submission documents referred to in ES Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity [APP-035]** Submit copies of the following documents (including cover pages, full text and dates of publication): a) NCA Profile: 47 Southern Lincolnshire Edge, Natural England (2012) b) NCA Profile: 48 Trent and Belvoir Vales Natural, England (2012) c) East Midlands Region Landscape Character Assessment, Natural England (2010) d) North Kesteven District Landscape Character Assessment, North Kesteven District Council (2007) Each of the above documents should be submitted as a freestanding document
Population Effects (PE)		
PE.1.01	Applicant	**Particulate matter 2.5 microns ($PM_{2.5}$) – interim planning guidance** Interim planning guidance on the consideration of the Environment Act $PM_{2.5}$ targets in planning decisions (the Interim Guidance on $PM_{2.5}$) was published on 4 October 2024. It applies to future developments and those that were in pre-application at the publication date. The applicant should clarify whether ES Chapter 14: Other Environmental Topics [APP-039] needs to be updated to incorporate the Interim Guidance on $PM_{2.5}$? If so, explain the measures that are needed, including actions in the design approach, that address its requirements.
PE.1.02	NKDC	**Dust Management Plan** Would the level of detail in the FCEMP [APP-189] be sufficient to understand the proposed dust mitigation measures for the construction period and thus provide an adequate framework for the preparation of a final dust management plan?

Question Number	Question to:	Question
PE.1.03	Applicant	**Socio-economic assessment of construction effects – local accommodation facilities** Paragraph 12.7.22 in ES Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use [AS-016] identifies the July figure for room availability as 17% but Table 12-26 appears to identify the availability rate as 11%. Clarification of the correct room availability rate should be provided.
PE.1.04	Applicant	**Socio-economic assessment of construction effects – temporary workforce** The assessment in ES Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use [AS-016] considers the effect on tourist accommodation. However, in the context of LCC's relevant representation [RR-157], the applicant should explain what consideration has been given to the *"impact of a changing influx of workers"*, as set out in paragraph 5.13.4 of NPS EN-1 which identifies that this could change the local population dynamics, alter the demand for services and facilities in the settlements nearest to the construction work, and affect social cohesion.
PE.1.05	Applicant NKDC LCC	**Socio-economic assessment of decommissioning effects – temporary workforce** Paragraph 12.7.74 in ES Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use [AS-016] states that it is assumed that the same number of jobs required for constructing the proposed development would be needed to carry out the activities required to remove the infrastructure from the site. However, no assessment of effects on local accommodation facilities or the effects of an influx of workers is presented. Comment on the need for any effect during the construction phase to be covered in the assessment.

Question Number	Question to:	Question
PE.1.06	Applicant	**Framework Employment, Skills and Supply Chain Plan** Section 5 in the Framework Employment, Skills and Supply Chain Plan [APP-197] sets out the methods by which it would be monitored and measured. What would happen if it was found that the objectives of the final Employment, Skills and Supply Chain Plan were not being met?
PE.1.07	NKDC	**Skills and Education Package** Clarify whether the skills and education package that is sought in [RR-210] would be a mitigation or an enhancement measure.
PE.1.08	Applicant Environment Agency	**Contaminated land** Table 3.11 in the FCEMP [APP-189] identifies the proposed mitigation/enhancement measures for ground conditions, including the stopping of works if potentially contaminated land was to be encountered during the construction works. a) **Environment Agency** - clarify what other commitments it would expect to see to ensure that works would stop in an area where unexpected contaminated land was encountered. b) **Applicant** - explain why a similar provision is not included in the FOEMP [APP-190] and the Framework Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan [APP-191]?

Question Number	Question to:	Question
Transport and Traffic (TT)		
TT.1.01	Applicant NKDC LCC	**NPS EN-1** Paragraph 5.14.21 of NPS EN-1 states that the Secretary of State should only consider refusing development on highways grounds in the absence of a demonstration of how consideration has been given to the provision of adequate active public or shared transport access and provision. Paragraphs 5.14.7, 5.14.9 and 5.14.11 of NPS EN-1 identify measures to be considered in that regard. The measures proposed to promote sustainable modes of transport are set out in the Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (FCTMP) [AS-102]. Paragraph 1.2.1 of [AS-102] refers to the preparation of a combined FCTMP and Travel Plan. a) Would the identified measures in the FCTMP go far enough? b) Is sufficient detail provided in the FCTMP to provide a context for securing a detailed travel plan? If not, what other matters should be included?

Question Number	Question to:	Question
TT.1.02	Applicant LCC	**Impact assessment methodology** Paragraph 13.4.22 in ES Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [APP-038] explains that an initial screening process of links and junctions has been conducted to identify receptors which record hourly traffic flow increases of less than 30 vehicles per hour as a result of the proposed development. Receptors that would be below that threshold have been screened out of the assessment. a) Paragraph 13.4.19 in [APP-038] advises that the assessment methodology has been informed by the 2023 IEMA guidelines: Environmental Assessment of Traffic and Movement. **E**xplain how the threshold identified in paragraph 13.4.22 as described above relates to the IEMA guidance, which appears to recommend, as a starting point, that a 30% increase in traffic flows represents a reasonable threshold for including a highway link within an environmental assessment, other than for road safety and driver delay reasons. b) **Applicant** - signpost which part of the transport scoping presentation (Appendix 13-B) in [APP-164] identifies that the approach described in paragraph 13.4.22 has been agreed and **LCC** - confirm whether you agree with the approach taken by the applicant and if not what the reason for that is.
TT.1.03	LCC	**Impact assessment methodology** Paragraph 13.4.23 in ES Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [APP-038] explains that a movement rule has been applied to the magnitude of impact assigned to receptors to avoid potentially misleading percentage impacts being identified as a result of very low baseline flows. Confirm whether you agree with that approach with and if not explain why that is the case.

Question Number	Question to:	Question
TT.1.04	Applicant	**Assessment assumptions and limitations - peak construction vehicle movements** Paragraph 13.4.65 in ES Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [APP-038] states that there would be a daily peak of 25 light goods vehicles (LGVs) and 50 heavy goods vehicles (HGVs) associated with the proposed Principal Site and 12 LGVs and 16 HGVs associated with the Cable Corridor works. Those vehicle movement figures would seem to accord with the figures in Table 2 of the FCTMP [AS-102] which identifies that there would be 50 two-way LGV movements and 100 two-way HGV movements to the Principal Site and 24 two-way LGV movements and 32 two-way HGV movements to the Cable Corridor. However, paragraph 3.4.19 in [APP-028] identifies a peak of 100 two-way HGV movements to the Principal Site and 16 two-way HGV movements to the Cable Corridor. a) Confirm the HGV figure for the proposed the Cable Corridor used in the traffic and transport assessment. b) If needed, explain any consequent adjustments to the assessment and make any changes to the wording of [APP-038] or [AS-102], as necessary, and resubmit either [APP-038] or [AS-102].

Question Number	Question to:	Question
TT.1.05	Applicant	**Assessment assumptions and limitations - traffic routing** Paragraph 13.4.67 in the ES Chapter: Traffic and Transport [APP-038] states that although the proposed development would be located close to several villages/settlements including Thorpe on the Hill, Haddington and Bassingham, only a small proportion of trips are expected to either originate from or pass through those villages during the construction, operation, or the decommissioning phases. Any such trips would be expected to be local construction worker trips and not HGV trips or trips directly associated with the proposed development's construction. a) Explain the above advice in [APP-038] in the context of Figure 13-4 (HGV Routing) in [AS-072] which shows the principal site HGV routing as passing through Haddington. b) Explain what is meant by *"where practicable"* in paragraph 13.4.68 in [APP-038] where it refers to the FCTMP restricting HGVs to routes which avoid the previously mentioned villages when travelling to/from the proposed construction compounds.
TT.1.06	Applicant LCC	**Future baseline** Paragraph 13.5.42 in ES Chapter: Traffic and Transport [APP-038] explains the future baseline year as being 2032. a) **Applicant** - clarify whether it is traffic growth only that has been projected, with no consideration built in about future road improvements which may be in place. b) **LCC** - comment on whether the data and assumptions to establish the 2032 baseline used in the assessment are reasonable and if not explain why that is the case.

Question Number	Question to:	Question
TT.1.07	Applicant	**Assessment of likely impacts and effects – construction staff** Paragraph 13.7.2 in ES Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [APP-038] explains that staff arrivals have been assumed to take place between 07:00-08:00 and staff departures have been assumed to take place between18:00-19:00 (Monday to Friday). Table 13-23 of [APP-038] describes the peak daily number of HGVs, LGVs, shuttle buses, and construction staff required for the Principal Site during the peak construction phase (2032) split by hour of the day. a) Would the workforce arrival and departure times vary in the winter due to shorter daylight hours compared with the summer? b) If so, would that have any implications for the assessment and conclusions included in [APP-038]?
TT.1.08	Applicant	**Assessment of likely impacts and effects – construction staff** Paragraph 13.7.3 in ES Chapter: Traffic and Transport [APP-038] explains that the construction staff vehicle split has been based on the same assumptions used for Gate Burton Energy Park. Explain how the features of Gate Burton Energy Park compare to those of Fosse Green in this context.

Question Number	Question to:	Question
TT.1.09	Applicant	**Assessment of likely impacts and effects – construction staff** Tables 13-21 and 13-22 of ES Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [APP-038] identify the modal split for construction staff as 55% (330 staff) by shuttle bus (non-local staff), 35% (208 staff) as car driver (local staff), 10% (62 staff) as car passenger. However, paragraph 5.4.7 of the Framework CTMP [AS-102] identifies that construction staff travelling by private vehicle would result in 160 staff vehicles (320 daily movements), based on a 1.3 vehicle occupancy rate. The forecast peak daily and hourly construction trips set out in table 13-23 of ES Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [APP-038] include 208 one-way staff trips. a) Explain how the occupancy figure of 1.3 in paragraph 5.4.7 of the Framework CTMP [AS-102] has been derived. b) Explain the relationship between the 160 staff vehicles (320 daily movements) in paragraph 5.4.7 of [AS-102] and the forecast peak daily and hourly construction trips of 208 for staff presented in table 13-23 of [APP-038].
TT.1.10	Applicant	**Assessment of likely impacts and effects – construction traffic** Table 13-26 of ES Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [APP-038] identifies the increase in traffic flows for the various highway links included in the assessment before the screening exercise identified in paragraph 13.4.22 was undertaken (that is, receptors which record hourly traffic flow increases of less than 30 vehicles per hour as a result of the proposed development have been screened out of the assessment). a) Clarify why the increase in construction traffic for link 4 during the 12 hour period is identified as 43 in Table 13-26 in [APP-038] and in Appendix 13-D: Receptor Traffic Flow Tables [APP-166] but Table 14-3 in ES Chapter 14: Other Environmental Topics [APP-039] shows 106 HGVs on link 4 from the proposed development. b) If the figure for link 4 is 106 HGVs, explain whether this would have any impact on the screening exercise described in paragraph 13.4.22 in [APP-038] as it applies to link 4 and therefore the assessment of effects. c) Provide a plan identifying the links and junctions referred to in [APP-038].

Question Number	Question to:	Question
TT.1.11	Applicant NKDC LCC	**Assessment of likely impacts and effects – construction traffic** Table 13-26 in ES Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [APP-038] identifies the forecasted construction traffic movements on each link within the study area, which has formed the basis of the assessment of effects. To ensure that effects do not arise that have not been assessed in the ES, comment on whether the movement figures stated in Table 13-26 should be secured by including a requirement within the dDCO.
TT.1.12	Applicant LCC	**Assessment of likely impacts and effects – construction traffic** Figures 13-4 [AS-072] and 13-5 [AS-073] show HGV and abnormal indivisible load routing as passing through Harmston. In relevant representation [RR-037] reference is made to there being a weight limit in Harmston coming into effect in 2025. a) **LCC** – provide further detail about the weight restriction referred to in [RR-037]. b) If a weight restriction is confirmed, what would be the implications for the routing of HGVs and abnormal indivisible loads?
TT.1.13	Applicant	**Assessment of likely impacts and effects – traffic flows** Paragraph 3.4.40 in ES Chapter 3: The Proposed Development [APP-028] identifies that solid waste materials generated during construction would be transported off site, with an estimate of 2 two-way HGV movements a day being generated. Sections 6.6 and 6.7 of the Framework Soil Management Plan [AS-100] indicates that there may be a need for the export or import of soil materials. a) Confirm whether the traffic flows used in the assessment described in section 13.7 in ES Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [APP-038] include vehicles that would be required for the movement of waste or other materials. b) If not, how would these vehicle movements affect the assessment included in [APP-038]?

Question Number	Question to:	Question
TT.1.14	LCC	**Assessment of likely impacts and effects – decommissioning** Are the assumptions/statements about decommissioning set out in ES Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [APP-038] considered to be reasonable? If not, explain why that is considered to be the case.
TT.1.15	Applicant NKDC LCC	**Construction traffic routes** The proposed HGV and abnormal indivisible load routings are shown on Figures 13-4 and 13-5 [AS-072] [AS-073]. a) **LCC** – would the proposed routes be acceptable, if not explain why that is considered to be the case? b) To ensure that effects would not arise that have not been assessed in the ES, should the HGV and abnormal indivisible load routings be secured via a requirement within the dDCO?
TT.1.16	Applicant NKDC LCC	**Abnormal Indivisible Loads** a) **Councils** - is there sufficient detail on the abnormal indivisible loads in the application documents, such as ES Chapter 13: Traffic and Transport [APP-038], the FCTMP [AS-102] and the FCEMP [APP-189] to understand what would be required and the effects? If not, what other information do you consider would be necessary? b) Are there any implications arising from the fact that only a preliminary vehicle swept path assessment has been undertaken for the routes to the Principal Site and the Cable Corridor access points so far (paragraph 5.7.3 in [AS-102])?
TT.1.17	Applicant LCC	**Framework CTMP – conditions surveys** Paragraphs 7.3.2 to 7.3.4 in the Framework CTMP [AS-102] set out that a road condition survey would be carried out pre-construction, during construction and post-construction, to identify any defects that arise to highways assets/verges during the construction phase for the proposed development and during decommissioning. How would the undertaking of any necessary repairs be secured?

Question Number	Question to:	Question
TT.1.18	Applicant	**Framework CTMP – wheel washing** Paragraph 7.3.17 in the Framework CTMP [AS102] states that wheel washing facilities would be provided at every access (where possible) to minimise mud from being trafficked onto the highway. a) Where a wheel washing facility would not possible at an access, what measures would be put in place to ensure that no debris would be deposited on the pubic highway? b) How would the wheel wash water be managed to avoid a deterioration of water quality?
TT.1.19	LCC NKDC	**Framework Public Rights of Way Management Plan** Is there sufficient clarity in the Framework Public Rights of Way Management Plan (FPRoWMP) [APP-195] to provide an understanding of what is proposed for the affected PRoWs? If not, what other details would be necessary?
TT.1.20	Applicant	**Construction access** Other than for indivisible loads, accesses C-011 and C-012 would not be used by HGVs. Instead, HGVs associated with these two access points would travel to access C-008, where their loads would be transferred onto LGVs for onward delivery (paragraph 13.4.10 in ES Chapter: Traffic and Transport [APP-038]). Explain how the LGVs that would come from access C-008 and the 28 singular HGV deliveries of transformers identified in paragraph 13.4.10 in [APP-038] would be routed to accesses C-011 and C-012.

Question Number	Question to:	Question
TT.1.21	Applicant	**Construction access** Table 13-25 in ES Chapter: Traffic and Transport [APP-038] shows the assumed trip distribution of vehicles to each construction access within the proposed Principal Site. Table 13-25 identifies 0% HGVs for access C-011. However, paragraph 13.4.10 in [APP-038] states that there would be 28 singular HGV trips to access C-011. Explain the difference in the figures and correct [APP-038] as necessary.
TT.1.22	Applicant	**Operational access** Paragraph 13.4.12 in ES Chapter: Traffic and Transport [APP-038] identifies that the Cable Corridor access points would be reinstated to their original land use upon completion of the construction works. Explain how access would be gained to undertake any routine and reactive maintenance along the Cable Corridor.
TT.1.23	Applicant	**Consistency** Confirm the access names in Table 13-6 in ES Chapter: Traffic and Transport [APP-038] and paragraph 5.2.2 of the FCTMP [AS-102] with those in Annex B of the [AS-102].
TT.1.24	Applicant	**Glint and glare** Where screening is relied upon to mitigate the effects of glint and glare for receptors, such as those points along the A46 as noted in National Highways relevant representation [RR-201], explain the following: a) What measures would be adopted to ensure that appropriate screening would be in place to mitigate the effects of glint and glare in the short term until any necessary new or additional planting would be of the required height and density? b) How would such mitigation be managed in the long term, given that paragraph 5.3.22 of the FLEMP [AS-101] identifies that on-going management measures would cover a period of five years post-construction?

Question Number	Question to:	Question
Water Environment, including Hydrology and Flood Risk (WE)		
WE.1.01	Applicant Environment Agency LCC	**Compliance with the Water Framework Directive (WFD)** NPS EN-1 states at paragraph 5.16.14 *"The Secretary of State should be satisfied that a proposal has regard to current River Basin Management Plans and meets the requirements of the Water Environment (Water Framework Directive) (England and Wales) Regulations 2017 (including regulation 19). The specific objectives for particular river basins are set out in River Basin Management Plans. The Secretary of State* ***must refuse development consent*** *[ExA emphasis] where a project is likely to cause deterioration of a water body or its failure to achieve good status or good potential, unless the requirements set out in Regulation 19 are met. A project may be approved in the absence of a qualifying Overriding Public Interest test only if there is sufficient certainty that it will not cause deterioration or compromise the achievement of good status or good potential."* a) Comment on the relationship of the proposed development to any relevant River Basin Management Plan and the requirements of the WFD. b) Comment on whether there would likely be any deterioration of a water body or that any water body would not achieve a *"good status"* or *"good potential"* as a consequence of the proposed development, and whether Regulation 19 of the Water Environment (Water Framework Directive) (England and Wales) Regulations 2017 would be met?

Question Number	Question to:	Question
WE.1.02	Applicant Environment Agency Natural England NKDC LCC	**Drilling fluids** The FCEMP [APP-189] under WAT-C6 identifies mitigation measures for managing drilling muds and wastewater. a) Has sufficient detail been provided in the FCEMP [APP-189] to understand what action would be taken in the event of there being a drilling fluid leak? If not, what additional details should be submitted by the applicant? b) Notwithstanding the identified mitigation measures, would it be possible that in the event of a substantial breakout, for some drilling fluid not be contained? In such a scenario, what would be the residual impact for the environment?
WE.1.03	Applicant	**Swales** a) Paragraphs 9.4.63 and 9.6.68 in ES Chapter 9: Water Environment [APP-034] appear to suggest that the swales around the BESS (or groups of BESS) and substation areas would just collect water, which would then be tested to determine the next course of action. However, elsewhere in [APP-034] such as paragraphs 9.6.56 and 9.7.76 and paragraph 4.1.7 of the Framework Surface Water Drainage Strategy [APP-147], it appears that the swales would collect and treat surface water before discharge. Clarify what the intended role for the proposed swales would be. If treatment is intended, explain what that would involve. b) Confirm whether the penstock valves would be automatically activated in the event of a BESS fire. If not, provide an explanation of the procedure for manually closing the valves and how risks of accidental release would be managed, as requested by the Environment Agency in its relevant representation [RR-089]. c) Paragraph 9.6.58 in ES Chapter 9: Water Environment [APP-034] states that swales around the proposed BESS areas and onsite substation area would be lined with an impermeable membrane or similar impermeable barrier to prevent any pollution from entering the ground. However, paragraph 4.5.5 in the Framework Battery Safety Management Plan [APP-198] proposes that runoff from the battery storage area would be contained by local bunding and attenuated within gravel

Question Number	Question to:	Question
		subgrade of the lined permeable sustainable drainage system and attenuation swale features. Clarify which approach would be used. If gravel would be used, provide details on how the accumulation of silt and pollutants at the base of the gravel would be managed following a BESS fire event. d) The FOEMP [APP-190] should be updated to include measures for the ongoing maintenance and testing of the penstock valves.
WE.1.04	Applicant	**Assessment of effects – groundwater quality** Paragraph 9.7.48 in ES Chapter 9: Water Environment [APP-034] should be updated to reflect the most recent guidance on good practice for assessing impacts on ground water quality, as identified in the Environment Agency's relevant representation [RR-089].
WE.1.05	Applicant Environment Agency LCC	**Assessment of effects - water run-off, operational phase** Paragraph 9.7.74 in ES Chapter 9: Water Environment [APP-34] states that in order to limit the potential for channelisation from rainfall dripping off the end of the solar panels, the areas between, under and surrounding the solar panels would be planted with native grassland and wildflower mix. That planting would intercept and absorb rainfall running off the solar panels, preventing it from concentrating and potentially forming channels in the ground. a) What evidence is there demonstrating that this approach would adequately manage run-off from the proposed solar panels? b) Should monitoring of water run-off from the solar panels take place during the operational phase, with the potential for mitigation to be provided in the event that it was required? If so, how could any such mitigation be secured through any made DCO for the proposed development?
WE.1.06	Applicant	**Assessment of effects – water demand** Paragraphs 9.7.53 and 9.7.104 in ES Chapter 9: Water Environment [APP-034] conclude that as it has been confirmed through the Water Resources Assessment submitted to Anglian Water that the proposed development's supply requirements during construction and operation (and maintenance) can be delivered

Question Number	Question to:	Question
		without compromising water resources in the Anglian Water area and that there would be a negligible impact on water resources, giving a slight adverse effect. a) Provide a copy of the Water Resources Assessment. b) Identify the sources of water demand during the construction, operational (and maintenance) and decommissioning phases and explain where the water supply would be sourced, if that information is not included in the Water Resources Assessment. c) The Potential Main Issues for Examination document [APP-193] identifies that Anglian Water confirms that the rate of water can be supported within a Water Resource Zone (WE4). However, it goes onto identify that no local network capacity assessment has been carried out and the applicant has been advised to submit a pre-planning enquiry prior to any DCO approval, a point reiterated by Anglian Water in its relevant representation [RR-024]. Clarify whether that alters the conclusion of a slight adverse effect with respect to water demand as set out in paragraph 9.7.53 in [APP-034].
WE.1.07	Applicant	**Water storage capacity - BESS** Paragraph 4.3.3 of the Framework BESS Safety Management Plan [APP-198] identifies that each indicative BESS area design would contain a minimum of two firefighting water storage units of no less than 230,000 litres in capacity, capable of delivering 1900 litres per minute for **4 hours** (ExA emphasis) (exceeding National Fire Chiefs Council's (NFCC) guidance). Paragraph 9.6.70 in ES Chapter: Water Environment [APP-034] states that NFCC guidance ("Grid Scale Battery Energy Storage System planning – Guidance for Fire and Rescue Services", 2022, has been used to determine the volume storage of fire water runoff. The NFCC guidance states firefighting supplies

Question Number	Question to:	Question
		"*should be capable of delivering no less than 1,900 litres per minute for at least **2 hours**"* (ExA emphasis). On top of this supply requirement, a 30% additional capacity has been applied for storage in the swale. Clarify whether the different figures referred to in the two documents would have any implications for the volume of storage needed for fire water runoff.
WE.1.08	Environment Agency	**Foul water** In your relevant [RR-089] you have requested that more detail is provided on the foul water disposal strategy. Paragraph 7.1.4 of the Flood Risk Assessment [APP-146] states that drainage would be dealt with via a septic tank arrangement or similar sealed system. Paragraph 4.12.2 of the Framework Surface Water Drainage Strategy [APP-147] states that during the operational phase, foul water flows would be dealt with via a sealed cesspit. Clarify what further information you expect you require to consider this matter further.
WE.1.09	Applicant	**Per-and poly fluoroalkyl substances** Comment on the query (ID: EA21) raised by the Environment Agency in its relevant representation [RR-089] regarding per-and poly fluoroalkyl substances.
WE.1.10	Applicant	**Flood risk** Provide a table identifying which flood zone category each part of the proposed development would be situated in.

Question Number	Question to:	Question
WE.1.11	Applicant	**Flood Risk Assessment** Clarify the location of the three fields identified as 45, 54 and 57 in plates 10, 11 and 12 of the Flood Risk Assessment [APP-146] in the context of the wider Order Limits.
WE.1.12	Applicant	**Consistency** Confirm the consistency of: a) the cable trench widths given in ES Chapter 3: The Proposed Development [APP-028] and ES Chapter 9: Water Environment [APP-034], as queried by the Environment Agency in its relevant representation [RR-089] b) the solar array fields where infiltration swales would be required identified in paragraph 9.6.59 in [APP-034] with the drainage strategy general arrangement in Annex C of the Framework Surface Water Strategy [APP-147] c) the location of solar array fields in the drainage strategy general arrangement in Annex C of [APP-147], in particular fields 7 and 31, with the layout shown on Figure 3-2A and Figure 3-2B in [AS-023] d) the edge swales to capture excess runoff and reduce existing surface water risk along The Avenue in Morton identified in WA3 of the Design Approach Document [APP-186], paragraph 4.5.5 in the Flood Risk Assessment [APP-146] and paragraph 9.6.60 in [APP-034], with the location of solar array fields in the drainage strategy general arrangement in Annex C of [APP-147].