



By email to:

FosseGreenEnergy@planninginspectorate.gov.uk

████████████████████
Senior Infrastructure Officer
Planning Services
Lincolnshire County Council
County Offices
Newland
Lincoln LN1 1YL
Email:nsips@lincolnshire.gov.uk

Date : 24 March 2026

Dear Sir/Madam,

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

Deadline 3A Submissions for Lincolnshire County Council (LCC)

LCC Comments on Deadline 2 documents

The following comments from LCC on the various DL2 documents are reported under technical headings.

Built Heritage

Following the Applicant's Response to the Local Impact Report (LIR) and associated technical notes, LCC wishes to clarify its current position on cultural heritage matters.

The technical note addressing the group value of historic farmsteads, together with Annex A (designated heritage assets scoped out at Step 1), has addressed the concerns previously raised by LCC on these matters.

In addition, the following assets referenced in the LIR are no longer considered to give rise to outstanding concerns:

- Church of St Germain and associated assets (NHLE 1061972; 1061973;1013082)
- Grange Cottage (NHLE 1061951)
- Hill Cottage (NHLE 1360507)
- Thurlby Hall and associated outbuildings (NHLE 1317332).

For non-designated heritage assets, including Tonge Farm, the Applicant identifies limited harm arising from changes to setting. LCC notes that embedded mitigation within the scheme design,

including stand-off distances and retention of intervening agricultural land, reduces the degree of impact.

LCC also notes that the scheme design has introduced stand-offs around certain heritage assets, including the cluster at St Germain's Church and Thurlby Hall. The retention of intervening fields currently provides separation between these assets and the array area. The extent to which this separation is maintained for the duration of the scheme is relevant to the assessment of effects.

LCC's remaining concerns therefore relate to a limited number of assets where the Council considers the Environmental Statement understates the effects on significance arising from changes to their setting. These are reflected in the locations identified within LCCs response to ISH3 action points to assist the Examining Authority during the Unaccompanied Site Inspection.

Archaeology

The issues flagged in LCCs response to Deadline 1 remain outstanding.

REP2-014 Framework CEMP

Table 2: Cultural Heritage, section CH-C1e makes reference to 'no-dig solutions' for preservation in situ areas. LCC considered this will need to be informed by sufficient understanding of the surviving archaeology to ensure such measures will not damage or destroy the archaeology to be protected.

The full extent of any preservation in situ areas or areas identified for further archaeological work will need to be fenced off to ensure that there are no groundworks, plant movement, storage or any other developmental works which may cause damage to the currently surviving archaeology.

These measures will need to be included in an agreed Archaeological Management Plan and an Archaeological Clerk of Works will be responsible for ensuring these measures are put in place and maintained.

REP2-016 Framework OEMP

Table 4: Cultural Heritage, section CH-02 states that *'The detailed OEMP will include an action plan detailing the required mitigation in the event that unforeseen activities associated with maintenance and replacement of components, including potential for replacement piles in different location, threaten the preservation of known buried archaeological remains. If potential for archaeological impacts is identified, appropriate mitigation measures would be agreed with the local authority.'*

These measures will need to be included in an agreed Archaeological Management Plan and an Archaeological Clerk of Works will be responsible for ensuring these measures are put in place and maintained. The Archaeological Clerk of Works will need to be included in the operational site team to ensure that any proposed work which may impact on currently surviving archaeology across the Order Limits are mitigated effectively as required through the lifetime of the scheme.

REP2-018 Framework DEMP

Table 2: Cultural Heritage section CH-D1 states 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. However, if such impacts are identified when methods for the removal of all infrastructure are confirmed, appropriate measures will be agreed within the detailed DEMP. If deemed necessary, an Archaeological Clerk of Works and Archaeological Management Plan can be agreed.'*

LCC does not agree. The effects of decommissioning works are not known for buried archaeology including the removal of the supporting structure of the proposed solar arrays, what measures will be used to deal with areas of compaction from infrastructure, and what ground impacts will occur in restoring the solar array areas to agricultural use after decades without cultivation, how that soil would be restructured and recultivated and whether there would be compaction counter measures which would cause deep disturbance.

Evaluation has shown that archaeology survives 30cm from the current ground surface, the use of typical restoration measures such as ripping and rotavating would destroy without identification or recording archaeology which will have survived the lifetime of the scheme.

Given that the decommissioning impacts including arable reversion across the scheme are not known maximum impacts should be assumed until they are, particularly as these future impacts may not be known until after the construction phase. Reasonable levels of evaluation and mitigation therefore need to take these future unknown developmental impacts into account as this situation allows the potential for currently surviving archaeology across the Order Limits to survive the construction and maintenance phases only to be destroyed by works at the end of the scheme's lifetime.

All Management Plans should include adequate measures to deal with developmental impacts which could damage or destroy currently surviving archaeology. These measures include archaeological mitigation such as preservation in situ areas to ensure they will be protected through to the end of the lifetime of the scheme, and for sufficient evaluation to inform reasonable fit for purpose mitigation for those areas where the archaeological potential has not been determined which will be subject to developmental ground impacts. The Management Plans should therefore be agreed with Lincolnshire County Council. An Archaeological Clerk of Works will also be necessary and the Archaeological Management Plan will need to include any mitigation required during the decommissioning process and subsequent reversion to arable land.

Landscape

AAH Consultants, on behalf of Lincolnshire County Council (LCC) and North Kesteven District Council (NKDC), have reviewed the comments received from the Applicant in response to the

Local Authorities' Local Impact Reports (LIRs) submitted by LCC and NKDC on Landscape and Visual elements of the Fosse Green Energy Application.

Fosse Green Energy, which is proposed on 1,368 hectares of land within the administrative area of North Kesteven District Council, located approximately 9km south and south west of Lincoln City Centre, for the development of PV panels, substation, BESS, cable connection corridor, and associated infrastructure.

AAH comments on the Applicant's response to Local Impact Reports are as follows:

Lincolnshire County Council: Landscape and Visual

9.16 - There is disagreement between LCC and the applicant about the effects of the proposal on local and regional landscape character with AAH judging that there is a general understating of magnitude (scale and permanence) within the assessment. The applicant judges that the mitigation planting 'would allow the solar PV infrastructure to integrate into the landscape framework such that the changes to the landscape character at a regional and district level would not be significant'. This reliance on mitigation planting to protect landscape character is of concern and places great importance on the LEMP which must be robust enough to guarantee successful establishing of the proposed planting. As a minimum, the applicant will need to commit to regular monitoring and re-placement planting during establishment (15 years) and during the ongoing operation of the project (60 years).

The applicant argues that the Secretary of State has confirmed that the 60-year consent lifespan is 'temporary and reversible for the majority of the land'. LCC remain concerned that for 'the majority' of the land, in this case, it will not be possible to return to the original land use (agriculture) – particularly if concrete foundations and other obstructions are left abandoned in the land at decommissioning. Again - the phrase 'removal of above ground infrastructure' is used by the applicant.

9.17 – LCC are concerned about the effects of the development on the Principal site and the LLCAs 03: Tunman Hill and LLCA 06: Thurlby Fenland. These are assessed as Moderate adverse (not significant) during operation, however, LCC believe there will be direct and long terms effects that will be significant. Once again, heavy reliance is placed on the 'establishment and maturation' of mitigation planting.

9.18 – The applicant's response suggests perceived changes would be limited 'to a small geographic extent and therefore only a subtle alteration to the landscape character'. This might be the case if only individual LCTs and LLCAs were affected, but LCC have concerns about the cumulative understating of several LCTs and LLCAs (LCT 4a: Wooded Vales, LLCA 03: Tunman Hill, LLCA 08: Thurlby Fenland etc) which if considered together will result in adverse effects that are extensive.

9.19 – LCC remain concerned that for key PRoWs full visual integration is not achievable due to the scale and proximity of the development. As the applicant points out 'substantial alterations to views are inevitable'. Of specific concern is that the LVIA did not consider all key PRoWs with oversight regarding the 'the Stepping Out Walks' (13.26) which are of most value to local residents. The LVIA is more focused on long distance routes like "the Viking Way" will be used

seasonally and by visitors to the area which are assessed as having a higher value. The GVL3 guidance suggests that promoted walks of all kinds should be assessed as having a higher value (p114 - indicators of value).

9.20 – LCC notes that the Bassingham and Villages Circular Trail is another locally promoted route that was not explicitly recognised in the LVIA. It is also noted that views that have been assessed as Minor Adverse (Not significant) by year 15 will ‘substantially reduce’ but not eliminate views of the Solar PV. LCC’s position is that if there are still views of the Solar PVs at 15 years, then this should be assessed as significant.

9.21 – LCC remain concerned that cumulative effects of this project, when combined with other NSIP and infrastructure projects, is understated. The scale and extent of these developments combined is likely to result in transformative and fundamental change across the region.

9.22 – RVAA – LCC remain concerned about the properties that are expected to experience significant adverse effects.

9.23 – As previously stated, LCC sees the LEMP as a critical element of the proposal, and without robust and detailed planting proposals, and long-term maintenance plans, potentially, the LVIA will have no accuracy in reality. It is essential that the applicant commits to long term maintenance and this is a condition of the DCO.

Ecology

Framework Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (Revision 5) (REP2-021)

LCC notes the updates made in REP2-021 and has the following comments to make:

- The Council welcomes the clarification provided at 5.3.3 which confirms that all habitats will be managed for the lifetime of the development and that any necessary replacement planting will be undertaken.
- The Council welcomes the commitment at 7.1.9 to sharing monitoring reports with the host authorities and Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust.
- The Council has provided the Applicant with suggested wording for a draft Terms of Reference for the proposed Ecological Advisory Group (7.1.9) which should be included in the Framework LEMP.

Applicant's Response to the Examining Authority's First Written Questions (Revision 1) (REP2-029) and Written Summaries of Oral Submissions Issue Specific Hearing 1 (Appendix D – Action Point 8) (Revision 1) (REP1-046)

The Council has reviewed REP2-029 (ENC.1.12) and Appendix D – Action Point 8 of REP1-046 and has the following comments to make:

The Applicant identifies that mitigation for ground-nesting birds requires:

- A minimum of 64 ha of permanent grassland.
- A minimum of 181 ha of managed arable land to be managed to provide for the requirements of skylark, lapwing and other ground-nesting species.

These areas are secured through the Framework LEMP and their purpose is to mitigate for the loss of existing arable nesting habitat and ensure no likely significant effect on ground-nesting bird populations. The Council agrees that the areas identified are appropriate and necessary and that their scale is justified.

The Applicant also states that:

- None of the areas identified as bird mitigation have been included solely for BNG delivery.
- Permanent grassland established for bird mitigation contributes positively to BNG calculations, due to conversion from intensive arable use.
- Managed arable mitigation areas have negligible influence on BNG calculations because they will continue to be managed as arable land.
- Reducing these areas would create new significant ecological effects, particularly on skylark and lapwing.

The Council agrees with the Applicant's reasoning that the biodiversity uplift results from good design practice and the provision of necessary mitigation, rather than from identifying separate land solely for BNG.

The Council is concerned about the potential for cumulative impacts on ground nesting bird species arising from the number of similar developments across the County. The Council believes that each development should ensure that it provides adequate mitigation for its own impacts on ground nesting birds to avoid the potential for cumulative impacts as far as possible.

The Council considers that a reduction in the size or quality of the identified bird mitigation areas would be unacceptable, as it would risk compromising the provision of effective mitigation for ground-nesting birds. Such a reduction would also be likely to negatively impact the predicted BNG outcomes, particularly given the contribution that habitat enhancement associated with the bird mitigation areas makes to the Applicant's BNG calculations.

The Council therefore agrees with the Applicant's approach to defining land requirements for both ground-nesting bird mitigation and BNG and is of the opinion that the areas identified are necessary, appropriate, and proportionate.

Waste

Framework Construction Environmental Management Plan [REP2-014]

LCC notes there are no changes within the document relating to waste matters. Waste stream forecasts would be included in the SWMP. However, LCC will need to see full construction waste arisings forecasts as soon as possible so that they can be taken into account as part of cumulative arisings in the DCO decision.

Framework Operational Environmental Management Plan [REP2-016]

As above, LCC notes there are no changes within the document relating to waste. However, LCC will need to see full operational waste arisings forecasts as soon as possible so that they can be taken into account as part of cumulative arisings in the DCO decision.

Framework Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan [REP2-018]

Again, there are no changes relating to waste. It would however be helpful to see waste arisings forecasts within the DEMP, but LCC notes that Table 14-26 of ES Chapter 14 (APP-039) does give those cumulative tonnages so that they can be taken into account of in the DCO decision.

Applicant's Response to the Examining Authority's First Written Questions [REP2-029]

GC.1.16 re waste management asks both Applicant and LCC whether ES adequately addresses impact of operational wastes.

LCC would note that the Applicant says yes but LCC (REP2-043) said arisings forecasts are needed in order to demonstrate impacts. These are still missing/incomplete (or need signposting where they are). LCC would also note in our Teams conversation with the Applicant on 4th March around the draft SoCG, they suggested they'll be providing those figures soon, but they don't seem to have arrived yet.

Applicant's Response to Written Representations [REP2-030]

LCC continues to be concerned regarding the capacity at recycling facilities, particularly for PV panels and cumulatively alongside other projects.

Applicant's Response to Local Impact Reports [REP2-031]

Despite various arisings forecasts in a number of sections of this document, LCC continues to be concerned (as per item 18.23) regarding the capacity at recycling facilities, particularly for PV panels and cumulatively alongside other projects.

Traffic and transport

The Construction Traffic Management Plan now has the wording LCC requested within paragraphs 1.3.2 and 7.1.3 : technical approval by LCC is required prior to any works in highway.

General Planning Matters

Development Consent Order (Revision 3) [REP2-006]

As stated within LCCs response to ExQ2 DCO.2.27, LCC would consider it incredibly helpful should the applicant notify the Council of the date of final commissioning, once it has occurred. LCC consider this should be secured through the appropriate management plan, whether this be the CEMP or OEMP.

Framework Operational Environmental Management Plan [REP2-016]

LCC welcomes the inclusion of paragraph 6.1.4 within the foEMP. Which partly addresses LCCs concerns surrounding potential early cessation. However, as stated within ISH4, LCC currently considers that Requirement 13, in conjunction with the Framework OEMP, does not

currently provide a suitable mechanism to trigger early decommissioning if the project ceases to permanently generate energy before the end of the 60 year period for which consent is sought. LCC would suggest that the applicant considers the wording used in the Framework OEMP in the Springwell Solar Farm project which it considers provides an appropriate grace period and mechanism to address such a scenario.

LCC would also request that the Applicant reviews the final sentence of the current iteration of paragraph 6.1.4 of the Framework OEMP which may require re-drafting for clarity.

Applicants Response to LIR [REP2-031]

LCC notes the applicant's responses with regard to section 7 (Site Selection and Alternatives), of LCC's LIR and has nothing further to add, other than to reiterate the concluding comment at 7.19, whereby we state that the ExA will need to be satisfied that the site selection process is robust and line with the EIA regulations and policy requirements, rather than being a retrofit exercise to align with willing landowner aspirations, which was deemed to be an important consideration at stages 1 and 5 of the site selection process.

Grid connection

LCC acknowledges the applicant's position with regard to the grid connection to the proposed Navenby substation, reference 8.1 to 8.10. But would reiterate its position that LCC consider there should be a requirement imposed to restrict the commencement of development including preliminary works until such a time that planning permission has been secured for Navenby substation, this is to prevent negative environmental effects from occurring without the benefits derived from generation which would be relied upon for the grant of any consent being secured.

BESS capacity

LCC appreciates the clarity provided by the applicant through ISH1 [REP2-032], ExQ1 [REP-029] and the Solar Technology Technical Guide [REP2-033]. LCC has nothing further to add with regard to BESS capacity, PV panel generation capacity and their relationship to the grid connection capacity following the applicant's explanation provided in the aforementioned documents/hearing, reference 8.11 to 8.14.

Soils and agricultural land

With reference to section 15.23, notwithstanding the Council's reservations over the use of the term '*temporary*' to describe this 60-year development proposal, LCC considers that the applicant has not adequately explained why the "*temporary, reversible loss of one or more soil functions or soil functions or soil volumes, or temporary, reversible loss of soil-related features...*" as set out in Table 3 (Guidance on Identifying Magnitude of Impact on Soil Resource and Soil Function) of the IEMA guidance (A New Perspective on Land and Soils in Environmental Impact Assessment), which would result in a 'Minor' magnitude of impact, and which in turn, combined with High Sensitivity (relating to ALC grade 3a soils), would result in a 'Significant' effect as set out in paragraph 15.22 of LCC's LIR [REP1-053], is not applicable to the areas affected by the solar array. LCC note that the ExA have posed a related question in regard to the sensitivity assignment of ALC grade 3a land at FS.2.01 of ExQ2.

With reference to the comments related to paragraph 15.28, the applicant states that *'If any existing field drainage systems found on the Principal Site are damaged during construction and will also result in a negative impact offsite, they will be required as far as reasonably practicable to their existing operational capacity to ensure flood risk is not increased. Remediation and maintenance of encountered land drains during construction are secured within the Framework Construction Environment Management Plan [REP1-031]'* (underlining our emphasis). LCC consider that there needs to be more concrete reassurance that if field drains are damaged during construction that they will be repaired in full, to ensure that the land can continue to fulfil its agricultural function, as well as for flood risk purposes. LCC suggest that this reinforcement of emphasis could be included in the fCEMP.

Framework Employment, Skills and Supply Chain Plan

LCC notes the applicant's response with reference to LIR Ref. 16.8. LCC would draw the ExAs attention to its response to ExQ2 PE.2.05. LCC would consider it necessary to secure the commitments proposed within the Framework Employment Skills and Supply Chain Plan (fESSCP).

LCC welcomes the inclusion of Requirement 19 within the dDCO, but would note that the requirement only ensures the submission of a SSECP. This raises potential concern as the framework document uses phraseology such as, 'could be pursued' and 'potential for'. Whilst LCC acknowledges that this is an outline document that would be refined and agreed through Requirement 19, LCC are of the view that a clear delivery mechanism with secured funding must be established, to ensure delivery of the initiatives as described within the fESSCP. Similar contributions have been secured as part of the Heckington Fen Solar Farm and Springwell Solar Farm.

Temporary Workforce

LIR ref 16.9, LCC would again draw the ExAs attention to its ExQ2 responses, particularly PE.2.06. The applicant's response addresses LCCs concerns in part, however, there still seems to be a lack of appreciation (with or without detailed workforce numbers) that even when booking out larger hotels in the larger settlements that this will have impacts. Such impacts are not just restricted to healthcare facilities. See LCCs response to ExQ2 for further detail.

Minerals and Waste

LCC acknowledge the applicant's response with regard to site selection, LIR ref 18.9 and has nothing further to add.

With reference to the comments on paragraph 18.10 (Adequacy of baseline information), LCC continues to have concerns regarding this topic in terms of mineral deposits and safeguarding. The applicant's response to this point does not address LCC's concerns. LCC would refer back to its initial comments, that the reference to the presence of economically viable sand and gravel deposits being 'negligible to limited' has been derived from only a select number of

boreholes spaced at relatively low density. LCC erroneously referred to SK86SE60 as showing a sand and gravel deposit of 6.75 in its LIR, but the applicant has correctly pointed out this should be a reference instead to borehole SK86SE28. Whilst LCC accept that a large part of the application area falls outside of the MSA areas, the western fringe of the proposed site does intersect with the sand and gravel MSA. In light of the council's comments regarding the sand and gravel reserve position in the county below, the ExA may want to satisfy themselves that there is sufficient evidence to conclude that the presence of economically viable sand and gravel deposits within the boundary is negligible to limited.

With regards to LIR reference 18.11 -18.12, and the conflict between long term temporary development and LCCs mineral safeguarding policy, LCC would draw attention to its response to ExQ1 GC.1.18, which highlights the current and future plan periods, current landbanks and the indication of industry interest within this area from the call to sites request. Please see the Site Assessment Report undertaken as part of the Regulation 18 consultation which identifies the 'preferred' sites proposed for allocation and those discounted at that stage¹. Even though some of the nominated sites in this area were discounted at Regulation 18 stage from being taken forward in the current plan, these and other areas could potentially be put forward for consideration in a later plan. Sterilisation of the resource, albeit until the 2090s, could impact on the future extraction of sand and gravel resources within the vicinity. Contrary to the comment made by the applicant that the landbanks in Lincolnshire are large, for sand and gravel the landbank at the end of 2024 was only 8.01 years, just above the 7-year minimum required by the NPPF (reference the latest Local Aggregates Assessment (LAA) dated January 2026 (reporting 2024 data)². Whilst the Council may have a landbank in the immediate term, and are in the process of assessing sites for allocation in the MWLP update, additional resources will need to be identified for future LMWLPs during the extended 60 year life of the proposed Fosse Green Solar Farm.

LCC acknowledge the applicant's response to LIR reference 18.13 and have nothing further to add at this stage with regard to the removal of cables upon decommissioning.

Cumulative Impacts

LCC acknowledge the comments in response to section 19 of LCCs LIR. LCC notes the applicants stance on cumulative impacts from solar developments within Lincolnshire. LCC will continue to raise concern over the impact to Lincolnshire as a county from the significant amount of NSIP scale projects proposed within Lincolnshire County Councils administrative boundary.

Development Consent Order

With regard to section 22 of LCCs LIR, LCC have the following comments:

Broadness of the definition of maintain; LCC continues to make reference to the broadness of the definition of 'maintain'. The latest position was stated within ISH4 and summarised within

¹ [Minerals and Waste Local Plan: Preferred approach consultation | Let's Talk Lincolnshire](#)

² [Local aggregate assessment 2024](#)

(<https://www.lincolnshire.gov.uk/downloads/file/10712/local-aggregate-assessment-2024>)

LCCs post hearing submissions. LCC notes the definition of maintain is very broad in conjunction with the power under Article 5, LCC welcomes the Applicant's commitment to provide an annual report of the maintenance schedule. The Applicant's intention to produce an indicative set of maintenance schedules is also welcomed. LCC considers a mechanism should be secured, whether on the face of the DCO, for example by restricting maintenance to replacement of a certain percentage of modules each year, or within the framework plans, to ensure that the broadness of the maintenance definition under Article 2 does not extend beyond what has been assessed in the Environmental Statement. LCC welcomes the Applicant's intention to provide maximum parameters and will review the Applicant's proposed mechanism in due course and provide comments accordingly.

LCC raised concern within its LIR with regard to Article 8 and 10 stating that as currently written these Articles would give the developer the right to undertake works with no further approvals from the Council. The Council suggested wording in its LIR and in response to ExQ1, TT.1.27. The applicant has now incorporated this wording into the fCEMP at paragraphs 1.3.2 and 7.1.3 which satisfies LCCs concerns.

LCC notes the applicants comments with regard to Article 12, Temporary Prohibition or Restriction of Use of Streets and Public Rights of Way. There are some points of detail that LCC would wish to see clarified/added to the fPRoWMP and further recommendations are set out below:

LCC has a system in place for ensuring the PRoW closures through the Development Consent Order process are fed in to OneNetwork and that publicity is undertaken. LCC therefore request that closures are notified to the authority in advance, to facilitate this process. LCC suggests that additional text is included in the fPRoWMP to require this.

LCC would also wish to see commitments in the fPRoWMP to notify the Council in advance prior to any changes being made on site, to ensure that any temporary closures are kept to the minimum time frame required for works to be undertaken, to ensure that any temporary diversions are agreed with the Council in advance, particularly with regard to path surfacing and signage, and that adequate and satisfactory reinstatement of the original paths are undertaken at the end of the construction works.

Inclusion of the measures outlined above in the fPRoWMP would in part address the concerns we raised in our LIR [REP1-053] regarding the powers in Article 12 in the dDCO [REP2-006]. LCC would welcome further discussions with the applicant regarding this matter.

With regard to Article 39, document reference APP-016, LCC note the applicants response and welcome the inclusion of an annual maintenance schedule to be included within the foEMP, LCC have nothing further to add. Please see LCCs response to ExQ2, DCO.2.05.

LCC has reviewed the dDCO in light of the applicants comments on Article 40, trees subject to tree preservation orders. LCC notes that the suggested wording contained within its LIR has been included in the dDCO and as such have no further comments to make.

LCCs response to ExQ2 DCO 2.07 sets out its latest position with regard to Article 46, Procedure in relation to certain approvals etc. As suggested within the Councils LIR, LCC would seek a 10-week determination timeframe, in line with the timescales for determining discharge of requirements in Schedule 15. LCC notes the applicants response to this point within REP2-031, but, would highlight that there are several made Orders which include a 10-week timeframe for articles regarding 'procedure in relation to certain approvals etc' West Burton Solar Project, Gate Burton Energy Park and Cottam Solar Project for example.

LCCs Concern with regard to Schedule 2 (Requirements): Requirement 20 and the potential for a period of extended outage, have been addressed, in part, within the fOEMP. Please see comments above with regard to paragraph 6.1.4 added to the fOEMP at deadline 2

With regard to LCCs position on the need for an additional requirement relating to Navenby substation and the grid connection please see comments on section 8 above.

With regard to the fees as set out within Schedule 15, LCC has set out its position within ISH4 and subsequent summary and ExQ2, DCO.2.31. LCC considers that the fees should be in line with the Town and Country Planning (Fees for Applications, Deemed Applications, Requests and Site Visits) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2023 which were increased in April 2025. This approach is consistent with the Springwell Solar Farm dDCO.

Yours faithfully,

[Redacted Signature]

For [Redacted Name]
Head of Planning