



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

Customer Services: 0303 444 5000  
e-mail: [FosseGreenEnergy@planninginspectorate.gov.uk](mailto:FosseGreenEnergy@planninginspectorate.gov.uk)

---

Applicant

Our Ref: EN010154

Date: 06 May 2026

---

Dear Sirs

## The Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010 – rule 17

### Application by Fosse Green Energy Limited for an order granting development consent for the Fosse Green Energy

#### Request for further information

We are writing under rule 17 of the Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010 further to various submissions you have made at Deadline 5 and seek further information/clarification with respect to the following matters:

#### 1) Permitted Preliminary Works Environmental Management Plan (PPWEMP) [REP5-026]

- a) Under the first potential impact (ECO-PPW1) referred to in Table 3 (Ecology and Nature Conservation) a list of “*General matters*” have been identified as mitigation/enhancement measures. Under various of the following potential impacts the phrases “*In addition to the best practice measures listed above, ...*” or “*In addition to the good practice measures listed above, ...*” have been used. However, while a list of general mitigation/enhancement matters has been included under item (a) for potential impact ECO-PPW1 neither best practice nor good practice measures have been listed or do they constitute the list of matters general?

The wording within Table 3 requires amending so that either lists of best/good practice measures are included or consistent phraseology is used, because currently there is a lack of clarity about what the intended best/good practice measures being referred to would be.

- b) Section 2.3 covers working hours. Points a and b in paragraph 2.3.1 cover Saturdays. The working hours in the Framework Construction Environmental Management Plan (FCEMP) [REP5-011] and the Framework Operational

Environmental Management Plan (FOEMP) [REP5-013] also split Saturday working into 09.00 to 13.00 and 13.00 to 18.00. However, both identify specific exclusions for the morning and afternoon periods. The PPWEMP does not. While all the activities listed in paragraph 2.3.1 of the FCEMP and paragraph 2.10.1 in the FOEMP may not be relevant to the permitted preliminary works, others may be, for example HGV deliveries and works likely to generate substantial levels of noise. The wording of paragraph 2.3.1 in the PPWEMP should be reviewed to consider whether any exclusions should apply to the activities which would take place on Saturdays. If not, an explanation should be provided.

- c) Section 3.14 covers abortive works. To provide certainty, this section should include a timescale for undertaking any necessary restoration works.

## 2) Hedgerow Plan

The applicant's Deadline 5 Cover Letter [[REP5-001](#)] and the Guide to the Application (Rev 7) [[REP5-003](#)] refer to an amended Hedgerow Plan (Rev 4).

However, that amended Hedgerow Plan was not included in the Deadline 5 submissions. The amended Hedgerow Plan should be submitted as soon as possible and no later than Deadline 5A (12 May 2026).

## 3) Generating output for the proposed development

In responding to your Deadline 3A comments [e-page 54 in [REP3A-025](#)] Philip Heard contends [paragraph B13 in [REP5-047](#)] that a load factor of 15.4% (rather than the stated 10%) has been applied when calculating the proposed development's 60 year generating output of 19,438,499 megawatt hours (MWh), as referred to in Chapter 6 of the Environmental Statement (ES) (Climate Change) [paragraph 6.4.67 in [REP3-006](#)].

Table 5-2 (Effective overplanting ratio by year) in section 5.3 of the Solar Technology Technical Guide [[REP3-036](#)] indicates that the effective capacity for the proposed development would be 373.55 megawatt peak (MWp) in the first year of generation (when rated using standard test conditions) degrading to 327.75MWp in year 30. It appears to the examining authority (ExA) in calculating the 60 year generating output for the proposed development, if:

- the effective installed capacity of 373.55MWp for year 1 is used and
- multiplied by the number of hours in non-leap years (8,760) and
- divided by a load factor of 10% and
- multiplied by 60 years

the lifetime output would be of the order of 19,634,000MWh.

The lifetime output calculated by the ExA is similar to the 19,438,499MWh quoted in Chapter 6 of the ES [[REP3-006](#)]. However, if the ExA has calculated the 60 year output figure in similar way to the applicant, then it appears neither calculation has taken account of the degradation in performance that would arise during the 30 year

lifetime of each set of installed solar modules, around 15% per 30 year period, as explained in [REP3-036].

Accordingly, the applicant is requested to:

- a) Provide a fully worked calculation demonstrating how the generating output of 19,438,499MWh referred to in Chapter 6 of the ES [REP3-006] has been derived. If the figure of 19,438,499MWh is incorrect for any reason, the applicant should explain why that is the case and it should submit a fully worked corrected version for this calculation.
- b) Comment on Philip Heard's contention that an incorrect load factor has been applied when calculating the proposed development's generating output.

Responses to the above requests for further information should be submitted at examination deadline 5A (12 May 2026).

Yours sincerely

*Grahame Gould*

**Grahame Gould**  
**Lead member of the panel of Examining Inspectors**

This communication does not constitute legal advice.

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