

██████████
Senior Infrastructure Officer
Planning Services
Lincolnshire County Council
County Offices
Newland
Lincoln, LN1 1YL

Email: nsips@lincolnshire.gov.uk

Date: 06 February 2026

Dear Sir/Madam,

Application by Fosse Green Energy Park Limited for an Order Granting Development Consent for the Fosse Green Energy Park Project.

This letter sets out Lincolnshire County Council's (LCC) comments on the additional information and submissions received at Deadline 1, while noting the applicant's intention to provide further updated documents and information by Deadline 2 to respond to action points from Issue Specific Hearings (ISH) 1 and 2.

Ecology

Framework Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (Revision 4) (REP1-039)

The Council notes the reference to an "Ecological Advisory Group" at 7.1.9. and considers that this should align well with the Council's suggestion of an Ecological Steering Group in the Local Impact Report (REP1-053). The Council considers that a draft Terms of Reference for the group should be included in the Framework LEMP and is happy to provide the Applicant with a form of words for this used by other recent solar NSIP developments in Lincolnshire.

Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations (Revision 1) (REP1-047)

The Council notes the Applicant's responses to issues of concern relating to ecology and biodiversity raised in Relevant Representations and welcomes the clarification provided. Lincolnshire County Council and North Kesteven District Council met with the Applicant on 22/01/26 to discuss outstanding concerns in relation to ecology and biodiversity set out in the Local Impact Report (REP1-053) and at ISH1. The Councils provided clarification on the

issues raised in comments and the Applicant agreed to consider how best these concerns could be addressed.

Archaeology

The issues flagged in LCCs Local Impact Report regarding the major ground disturbances identified through the submitted documentation remain.

Sufficient archaeological evaluation will need to be undertaken before any works which could damage or destroy currently surviving archaeology take place. This must include proposed soil movements as well as works with the potential for compaction given that trenching has shown that archaeology survives at less than 30cm from the current ground surface.

Full site-specific detailed plans of the proposed works should be included in all Management Plans. This is essential for information and to assist in effective site management as well as to provide clarity in the event of any future potential enforcement issues.

The **Landscape Environmental Management Plan (Rev 4) (REP1-039)**, for example, includes bird mitigation and habitat creation areas (section 1.3.2) however there is no detail on any ground preparation or whether there would be scrapes or other work which would go below the archaeological horizon. Some habitat creation requires ground preparation which would damage or destroy surviving archaeology particularly in land previously in agricultural use where surviving archaeology may be close to the current ground surface. These areas therefore need to be included in the evaluation work and the results can be used to inform the design process effectively.

All Management Plans will need to include site-specific plans of the proposed works and these need to include any identified archaeological preservation in situ areas, any archaeological mitigation areas which have yet to be undertaken and any areas that have yet to be evaluated which will therefore need to be excluded from any activity that has potential to impact any surviving archaeology.

All management plans will need to be assessed and informed by the Applicant's archaeological advisors and cross referenced to the agreed final WSI which will form part of the Archaeological Requirement. This is to ensure that proposed site-specific impacts are understood and inform adequate evaluation and mitigation programmes to identify areas of archaeological potential which will be impacted across the Order Limits and to ensure reasonable and fit for purpose mitigation to deal with the range of developmental impacts.

Any management plan which includes proposed works which could impact on surviving archaeology in any preservation in situ, unmitigated or unevaluated areas will need to be tied into an agreed Archaeological Management Plan and Archaeological Clerk of Works.

Table 2: Key construction roles and responsibilities in section 2.2 of this **Construction Environmental Management Plan (Rev 2) (REP1-031)** includes an Environmental Clerk of Works (EnvCoW), an Archaeological Clerk of Works is also required.

Regarding **7.9 Framework Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (Rev 2) (REP1-035)**, we do not agree with the statement that *'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.'* (Section 3.3: Cultural Heritage, Table 2, CH-D1, p13) There is no information on how hundreds of thousands of piles will be dealt with to restore land to its previous agricultural use.

The revised documents including the **Framework Construction Environmental Management (REP-131)** and **Framework Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (Rev 2) (REP1-035)** make reference to Environmental and Ecological Clerks of Works as in section 2.2.1 *Key roles and responsibilities* in the DEMP. Again, as stated in our LIR, an Archaeological Clerk of Works will also be required as well as an agreed Archaeological Management Plan which will remain in place for the lifetime of the scheme until the end of the scheme's decommissioning phase to ensure that impacts on archaeological and unevaluated areas are dealt with in a reasonable and enforceable way with appropriate archaeological mitigation where required.

Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans [REP1-004]

It is noted that there are no obvious major changes to these plans as the drawings do not highlight any changes made in this Revision, it would be helpful to know what has changed, if anything. However, please see the below table, summarising comments from LCCs Public Rights of Way team with regard to the RoW Access plans.

Sheet one	Permanent diversion of Thorpe on the Hill PF13 is considered to be acceptable
Sheet two	LCC considers the temporary diversions proposed to be acceptable
Sheet three	LCC considers the temporary diversions proposed to be acceptable
Sheet four	LCC has no observations to make with regard to PRow
Sheet five	LCC considers the temporary diversions proposed to be acceptable

Sheet six	LCC considers the temporary diversions proposed to be acceptable LCC considers the temporary diversions proposed to be acceptable. The permanent diversion of Thulby PF2 is also considered to be acceptable.
Sheet seven	LCC has no observations to make with regard to PRow
Sheet eight	LCC has no observations to make with regard to PRow
Sheet nine	LCC has no observations to make with regard to PRow
Sheet ten	The temporary diversion Bassingham PF23 is considered to be acceptable. However LCC would highlight that the temporary diversion could be made to be permanent
Sheet eleven	LCC considers the temporary diversions proposed to be acceptable
Sheet twelve	LCC considers the temporary diversions proposed to be acceptable
Sheet thirteen	LCC has no observations to make with regard to PRow
Sheet fourteen	LCC has no observations to make with regard to PRow

Waste

[REP1-032] Framework CEMP, [REP1-034] Framework OEMP & [REP1-036] Framework DEMP

LCC notes there are no relevant major changes in this version with regard to waste matters but all alterations look reasonable as they stand. As secured by the DCO, the full versions provided later will be based on these and will require LCC approval.

LCC also notes that waste arising forecasts for each phase of the project are expected in the finalised versions of the framework management plans, to be discharged via requirement. However, LCC would highlight that arising forecasts at this stage would be too late in the process to enable the DCO decision to take proper account of the potential impacts of this waste.

LCC will continue to review future document alterations which may address queries that have not yet been resolved. In particular, LCC considers overall, the suite of documents lacks clear waste arisings forecasts for the Examiner and SoS to properly take into account the potential impacts of those wastes. ES Chapter 15 and the recent draft SoCG provide some of

this information but, as per LCC's feedback on the SoCG, these require further clarification and detail.

Draft Development Consent Order (dDCO) [REP1-008]

LCC welcomes the inclusion of Schedule 14, Part 3, Protective Provision of Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue.

Schedule 15 – Procedure for Discharge of Requirements

LCC note the addition of to 2(5) which states '*...and the requirement consultee will be given no less than 15 working days in which to respond to the relevant planning authority*'. LCC consider this addition to be unnecessary as timescales to respond are already referenced within the schedule at 2(1) and 3(3), the addition of a further timescale could create confusion, particularly when these timescales are running concurrently.