



Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project:

Fosse Green Energy Park

Response to The Examining Authority's written questions and request for information (ExQ3) issued on 23rd April 2026.

Prepared by Lincolnshire County Council

May 2026

Question no.	Question	LCC Response
GC.3.01	<p data-bbox="456 379 1388 443">The Secretary of State’s decision with respect to the Springwell Solar Farm</p> <p data-bbox="456 488 1384 587">The ExA is aware that the application for the Springwell Solar Farm was determined by the Secretary of State (SoS) on 8 April 2026 and that a Development Consent Order (DCO) has been made for that development.</p> <p data-bbox="506 632 1384 1018">a) All - the making of the Springwell Solar Farm DCO may have implications for the cases that have been made by the applicant, NKDC, LCC, other interested parties and other persons up until 8 April 2026. If you consider the making of the Springwell Solar Farm DCO has had any implications for the case you have made about the proposed development prior to that order’s making, written submissions should be made explaining how you consider your case has been affected. Following the making of the Springwell Solar Farm DCO, the ExA particularly wishes to be informed about any implications there might be for the consideration of the proposed development with respect to:</p> <ul data-bbox="551 1062 1357 1310" style="list-style-type: none"> • defining: the commencement of the proposed development; maintenance; and permitted preliminary works; • the imposition of requirements and the provisions of management plans and any other control documents, including the approach to decommissioning; • the relationship between the Springwell Solar Farm and the proposed Navenby substation; 	<p data-bbox="1415 379 2033 587">Lincolnshire County Council (LCC) acknowledges the Springwell Solar Farm decision issued on 8 April 2026. However, LCC does not agree with a number of the conclusions reached by the Secretary of State (SoS) and is currently taking legal advice.</p> <p data-bbox="1415 632 2020 839">In these circumstances, LCC is unable to comment further at this stage. LCC therefore wishes to reserve its position while this is under consideration and will endeavour to provide the ExA with a fuller response to question GC.3.01 by 22 May 2026.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the fees to be paid to the relevant local planning authority when discharging requirements imposed under the terms of the made DCO; and • any matters that might have been addressed through the applicant and other parties entering into an agreement under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (a draft copy of which having been appended to NKDC’s responses to ExQ2 [REP3-055]). <p>(If any party has included references to the making of the Springwell Solar Farm DCO in their Deadline 5 submissions then rather than repeating what they may have stated in those submissions in responding to this question you should simply make a cross reference to what you have stated in those Deadline 5 submissions.)</p>	
GC.3.06	<p>Annual maintenance schedules</p> <p>The Statements of Common Ground (SoCGs) between NKDC and LCC and the applicant (respectively [REP4-013] and [REP4-012]) indicate that the Councils retain concerns about the definition of “maintain” included in Article 2 of the dDCO and the implications this may have for the extent of activities during the operational phase.</p> <p>Comment on whether a requirement for the planned maintenance schedule identified in paragraph 2.3.3 of the Framework Operational Management Plan (FOEMP) [REP3-018] to be approved by the Councils would address those concerns.</p>	<p>LCC’s concerns surrounding the definition of maintain were reiterated within ISH4. LCC welcomed the applicant’s commitment to provide an annual report of the maintenance schedule as described with paragraph 2.3.3 of the FOEMP.</p> <p>As Waste Planning Authority it falls within LCC’s remit to plan for future waste streams. LCC’s concerns surrounding maintenance stem from the potential of cumulative waste arisings and the lack of recycling capacity for such streams. Currently, it is unknown when schemes plan to replace solar PV panels and multiple sites either NSIP or TCPA scale could undergo replacement schedules on a similar timescale.</p>

		<p>As such, concerns remain surrounding waste capacity and timings of replacement schedules.</p> <p>Therefore, the maintenance schedule does not alleviate LCCs concerns. LCC would suggest that 2.3.4 (f) should also include the proposed destination or fate of waste streams, i.e. recycling/landfill.</p> <p>LCC notes and appreciates the applicant’s indicative waste figures provided by the applicant within ES Chapter 14 and the SoCG with LCC.</p>
--	--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Draft Development Consent Order (dDCO)

Note All references to the numbering of Articles and Schedules (including Requirements) refer to those used in the version of the dDCO submitted at Deadline 3A [REP3A-004]

DCO.3.02	<p>Article 2 – interpretation</p> <p>a) Applicant – Clarify what purpose the definition for “commissioning” would serve, given, unlike “date of final commissioning”, it is a term that is not relied upon elsewhere in the dDCO? If it is considered that a definition for commissioning needs to be included in Article 2, should Work Nos 4, 5A, 5B and 6 be added to Work No.1, given those works would need to be fully operational (and thus tested and commissioned) prior to the proposed development being capable of generating and exporting electricity on a commercial basis?</p> <p>b) All – There is a definition for the date of final commissioning and Requirements 5, 9, 13, 17 and 20 include provisions tied to that date. Similarly the proposed protective provisions in favour of Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue (LFR), included in Part 3 of Schedule</p>	<p>LCC requested to be informed of the date of final commissioning by the applicant and welcomes the inclusion of paragraph 2.2.3 within the FCEMP. LCC will defer to NKDCs opinion on this question and whether they wish to be notified of the date of final commissioning.</p>
----------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<p>14 are tied to the date of final commissioning. An additional paragraph has been added to the Framework Construction Environmental Management Plan (FCEMP) [paragraph 2.2.3 in REP4-008] stating that the applicant will inform LCC of the date of final commissioning once it has occurred. However, the relevant planning authority for Requirements 5, 9, 13 and 20 is NKDC and there is no provision within any of the requirements included in Schedule 2 for date of final commissioning to be notified to NKDC.</p> <p>To allow for the effective monitoring and/or enforcement of Requirements 5, 9, 13, 17 and 20, a notification mechanism (either as a standalone requirement or an amendment to an existing requirement(s)) must be added to Schedule 2. Submit wording for the required notification mechanism.</p> <p>Note for the applicant and other all parties</p> <p>With respect to the scope/definition for “permitted preliminary works” included in Article 2, the ExA notes the applicant’s intention to submit a “Permitted Preliminary Works Environment Management Plan” (PPWEMP) no later than Deadline 5 [response to ExQ2 DCO.2.08 and DCO.2.09 in REP3-045]. Following the PPWEMP’s submission it may be necessary for the ExA to seek further information relating to that plan’s contents and/or the definition for permitted preliminary works included in Article 2 from the applicant and/or other interested parties.</p>	
DCO.3.04	<p>Requirement 17 (Permissive paths)</p> <p>The ExA notes the applicant’s concern about ensuring that the permissive paths do not become treated as public rights of way at the end of the operational lifetime of the proposed development. However, it is unclear why the exclusion of “up to seven days” as set out in paragraph 6.1.2 of</p>	<p>To protect against future claims (from user based claims through long use over time), a landowner would need to show that there is sufficient evidence to show that they had demonstrated a lack of intention to dedicate. Installing and maintaining signage along the</p>

	<p>the Framework Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (FLEMP) [REP3-028] has now been included.</p> <p>In responding to ExQ1 [REP2-043], LCC advised “provided that there is sufficient signage to show that use of the route is by permission, there is no need to restrict access for a day. The efficacy and legal impact of a one day closure is not likely to have any impact on a user based claim, unless there is sufficient other actions taken by the landowner to disabuse the public of the notion that they are exercising a public right.”</p> <p>a) Applicant: Explain why up to seven days in any calendar year has been identified as an exclusion for public use of the permissive paths.</p> <p>b) LCC: Explain whether appropriate signage to show that use of the permissive paths is by permission would be sufficient to protect against possible claims for public rights in the future, or what other mechanisms would be required.</p>	<p>route that makes it clear that this is a permitted path and not a public right of way is one way of doing this and is effective because it evinces to the people using the route that there is no intention to dedicate a right of way. Another way of protecting against a claim for public rights is to make a landowner deposit and declaration under Section 31(6) Highways Act 1980 and Section 15A(1) Commons Act 2006.</p>
DCO.3.09	<p>Schedule 14 (Protective Provisions) minor drafting amendments</p> <p>With respect to minor drafting amendments to the proposed protective provisions included in Schedule 14, the parties should refer to the ExA’s schedule of proposed changes to the dDCO [PD-022]. The applicant and other interested parties should identify any typographic and/or formatting errors that require correction within the dDCO not included in the ExA’s schedule of proposed changes to the dDCO.</p>	<p>LCC notes the minor amendments suggested with regard to Schedule 14, Part 3 (Protection of Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue) within PD-022.</p> <p>Having reviewed the dDCO, LCC has not identified any further typographical/formatting errors.</p>
DCO.3.14	<p>Schedule 15 (Procedure for the discharge of requirements)</p> <p>a) All - with respect to paragraph 5 (Fees) should the discharge fees quoted in the made DCO for the Springwell Solar be used in paragraph 5(2)? If so, is a further adjustment required to take account of the annual indexation increase for planning application</p>	<p>As stated within previous submissions LCC consider the fees quoted within paragraph 5(2) should be in line with the Town and Country Planning (Fees for Applications, Deemed Applications, Requests and Site Visits) (England) (Amendment)</p>

	<p>fees introduced by The Town and Country Planning (Fees for Applications, Deemed Applications, Requests and Site Visits) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2023, given an annual indexation increase recently took effect on 1 April 2026?</p> <p>b) Applicant – with respect to the fees to be paid for discharging requirements, the ExA notes your response to ExQ2 DCO.2.31 [REP3-045], in which you have expressed the view that the fees cited in paragraph 5 of Schedule 15 should not be increased annually in line with the consumer price index because:</p> <p><i>“...the Proposed Development must be commenced within five years from the date that the Order comes into force. The majority of the Requirements set out in Schedule 2 will be discharged prior to or during the construction period, which is anticipated to take place between 2031 and 2033. The only Requirement which will be discharged at a later date is Requirement 20 which provides for approval of the Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan. Further, the fees due will not be affected by inflation in the same way in which, for example, costs of construction would be. ...”.</i></p> <p>However, within the five year commencement period (Requirement 2) there could still be an appreciable inflationary effect with resourcing implications for the planning authorities, as has been recognised within the fee regulations applying to applications submitted under the provisions of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended). Accordingly, the ExA considers wording for an indexing mechanism should be submitted, on a without prejudice basis, for consideration by the ExA.</p>	<p>Regulations 2023 which were increased in April 2025. This approach is consistent with the Springwell Solar Farm.</p> <p>LCC considers the approach for these fees to be index linked would be appropriate and would be in line with the regulations on which the fee schedule is based.</p>
<p>Ecology and Nature Conservation (ENC)</p>		

<p>ENC.3.02</p>	<p>Ecological Advisory Group</p> <p>The changes made to the FLEMP [REP3-028] and the applicant’s response to Deadline 3 and Deadline 3A submissions (page 11 in [REP4-018]) indicate that the councils would not have a role on the ecological advisory group (or similar). The FLEMP (paragraph 7.1.9) describes the key function of the group as reviewing monitoring data on habitats and species to inform future management plans. Monitoring reports would be sent to the councils and the Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust for information.</p> <p>In responding to ExQ2 ENC.2.09 in [REP3-055], NKDC has referred to the approaches taken for the Springwell and Beacon Fen schemes. NKDC’s submission includes an extract from the draft Outline LEMP for Springwell which identifies that a representative from NKDC and LCC would be on the ecological steering group. NKDC’s submission also includes the dDCO for Beacon Fen (submitted at Deadline 8) and Requirement 7 of that dDCO requires that the ecological steering group would include representatives from each of the relevant planning authorities.</p> <p>a) Applicant - Explain the rationale for excluding representatives from NKDC and LCC on the ecological advisory group and what role is envisaged for the councils in terms of monitoring and advising on any corrective action required to ensure that the mitigation and enhancement measures secured through the LEMP would be achieved.</p> <p>b) Applicant - Paragraph 7.1.9 of the FLEMP sets out that the terms of reference for the ecological advisory group (or similar) would be agreed as part of the agenda for the first group meeting. Based on the current drafting of the FLEMP, the councils would not be members of the group and so would have no input into the group’s terms of reference. The ExA is of the view that at least draft terms of reference for the ecological advisory group (or similar) should be included in the FLEMP. This should include</p>	<p>The Council does not agree with the Applicant’s proposed approach to the Ecological Advisory Group (EAG).</p> <p>The Council considers that the primary purpose of the EAG should be to facilitate regular and ongoing communication between the Applicant/Developer and the host Local Authorities on ecological matters post-consent. Meetings of the group should enable the Applicant/Developer to report on the status of the delivery of ecological mitigation and enhancement measures, including Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG), to the host Local Authorities, and to allow agreement to be reached on any corrective measures required where targets are not being met. The EAG should therefore provide a mechanism for robust monitoring of progress against commitments to deliver BNG, as secured under Requirement 8 of the draft DCO.</p> <p>In addition, EAG meetings would provide opportunities to identify and secure synergies between the Applicant/Developer’s mitigation and enhancement measures and those being delivered either by other developers or through strategic nature conservation initiatives, such as the forthcoming Greater Lincolnshire Local Nature Recovery Strategy.</p>
-----------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<p>confirmation of when it would be established and how long it would be in place.</p> <p>c) NKDC and LCC - comment on the applicant's approach to the ecological advisory group.</p>	<p>The Council considers that, for the EAG to function effectively, its membership must include representatives of the host Local Authorities. The Council also considers that the draft Terms of Reference should be provided within the FLEMP and should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the remit of the group; • the membership of the group; • confirmation of when the group will be established and the how long it will be in place for; • details of the frequency of meetings; and • details of how the group will be funded. <p>This approach is consistent with the recently issued Springwell Solar Farm DCO and with the approach taken during the examination of the Beacon Fen Energy Park. The Council provided the Applicant with a draft Terms of Reference which address the above points on 27/02/2026.</p>
ENC.3.03	<p>Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)</p> <p>Paragraph 2.6.2 of the FLEMP [REP3-028] states that the applicant has committed to deliver a minimum of 30% biodiversity net gain in habitat units, 50% biodiversity net gain in hedgerow units and 10% biodiversity net gain in watercourse units using DEFRA's Statutory Biodiversity Metric (Version 1.0.4). That is consistent with statements in paragraph 1.4.6 of the BNG Report [REP3-024]. Requirement 8 of the dDCO [REP3A-004] requires the BNG percentages to be based on the metric used to</p>	<p>LCC will defer to NKDC regarding this question as per ecology and BNG information sharing agreements.</p>

	<p>calculate those percentages specified in the BNG Report. Paragraph 2.9.2 of the BNG Report states that the calculation will be updated as part of the detailed design stage for the proposed development.</p> <p>Comment on whether there is a need to add wording to the FLEMP, the BNG Report and/or Requirement 8 to establish that the achievement of the BNG percentages specified in Requirement 8 would be based on the metric extant at the time the LEMP would be submitted for approval. If so, provide suggested wording.</p>	
ENC.3.05	<p>NPS EN-1 and the approach to BNG</p> <p>NKDC and LCC consider that if the full benefit of the BNG claimed is to be given weight/positive weight, the methodology and guidance for calculating BNG should be followed [REP4-021] and [REP4-020]. As highlighted by the councils, the BNG Report [REP3-024] does not currently meet the Statutory Biodiversity Metric trading rules because of the loss of a plastic-lined agricultural reservoir classified as “Lake – Reservoir” habitat.</p> <p>Comment on whether the applicant’s approach to assessing BNG conflicts with the requirements of NPS EN1 such as those set out in paragraphs 4.6.2, 4.6.6, 4.6.7, and 5.4.19.</p>	LCC will defer to NKDC regarding this question as per ecology and BNG information sharing agreements.
Farming and Soils (FS)		
FS.3.01	<p>Framework Soil Management Plan – operation and decommissioning</p> <p>In [REP3A-037] reference is made to the Framework Soil Management Plan (FSMP) [REP4-010] not addressing the proposed development’s operational and decommissioning phases.</p>	LCC would defer to NKDC and their appointed agricultural consultant for this matter.

	<p>In response, the applicant in [REP4-018] states that “post construction”, as covered in section 6 of the FSMP, is the operational phase and that the FDEMP is intended to capture all mitigation measures for the decommissioning phase, including those in relation to soils, with mitigation related to soils during decommissioning presented in Table 7 of the FDEMP [REP3-020].</p> <p>However, section 6 of the FSMP appears to be focussed on describing the use of soils and does not address, for example, soil protection measures during maintenance or replacement activities. Table 7 of the FDEMP identifies the mitigation/enhancement measure as being the SMP.</p> <p>Comment on whether the FSMP should provide a more explicit framework for the management measures that would be adopted to manage the soil resource during the proposed development’s operation and decommissioning and if so, what should be included, for example measures to deal with soil compaction in areas under the proposed solar stations and the BESS.</p>	
FS.3.03	<p>Framework Soil Management Plan</p> <p>Given the importance of the SMP for avoiding soil deterioration, comment on whether there are other matters which should be included in the FSMP [REP4-010] to provide a clear framework for inclusion within a detailed SMP.</p>	LCC would defer to NKDC and their appointed agricultural consultant.
Historic Environment (HE)		
HE.3.02	<p>SoCG - archaeology</p> <p>In the applicant’s Deadline 3A submissions’ covering letter [REP3A-001] it is stated that the applicant, LCC and Historic England “<i>are in agreement that the Framework Written Scheme of Investigation, together with the</i></p>	LCC agrees that the mechanism of an agreed Framework WSI and Requirement 11 of the DCO can adequately deal with the archaeological risk through the lifetime of the scheme.

	<p><i>subsequent work and activities secured under Requirement 11 of Schedule 2 to the draft Development Consent Order [REP2-005], can adequately manage the risk of discovering as yet unknown buried remains, with a suite of mitigation options available to avoid or adequately minimise adverse effects during construction, operation (including maintenance) and decommissioning of the Proposed Development.”</i></p> <p>However, in commenting on Deadline 3 and 3A documentation, LCC states that it is currently reviewing the latest version of the Framework Written Scheme of Investigation and will respond in detail at Deadline 5 [REP4-020].</p> <p>Provide an update on the matters identified as “under discussion” in the SoCG [REP4-012], including whether they have been resolved, will likely be resolved before the close of examination (this should include an explanation of what further work would be required from the applicant including likely timescales for completion if relevant), or if they are matters which cannot be agreed.</p>	<p>However as with ecological and environmental matters within the PINS process there should be an agreed Archaeological Management Plan for the lifetime of the scheme and an Archaeological Clerk of Works to oversee and provide advice on managing archaeological impacts from development works. This is necessary to ensure that potential archaeological impacts are dealt with appropriately as site-specific developmental impacts are decided and that agreed archaeological protection measures are enforced.</p> <p>The provision of an agreed Archaeological Management Plan and an Archaeological Clerk of Works should therefore be included in the Framework WSI.</p>
HE.3.03	<p>SoCG – built heritage assets</p> <p>The SoCG between the applicant and LCC [REP4-012] indicates that LCC maintains that for a limited number of designated heritage assets, the ES “... may understate the effect of the development on their significance through changes to their setting ...”. Heritage assets specifically identified by LCC are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hall Close, Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM) • Morton Manor, listed building • Morton Grange, listed building <p>In responding to the applicant’s Heritage Technical Note, LCC states that the heritage assets where it has remaining concerns are reflected in the</p>	<p>a) LCC confirms that its remaining concerns relate to Hall Close (SM); Corner Farmhouse (Grade II); Morton Manor (Grade II) and Morton Grange (Grade II). For these assets, we maintain that the ES understates effects on significance arising from changes to setting. In particular;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hall Close: There is clear intervisibility with the fields to the south proposed for solar development. These fields form part of a coherent medieval landscape setting and their change would result in harm to the monument’s significance.

	<p>locations identified ‘above’ to assist the ExA when undertaking its further Unaccompanied Site Inspection (USI) [REP4-020]. LCC identified locations for the USI in [REP3-049]. In addition to the locations listed above, [REP3-049] also included Corner Farmhouse.</p> <p>a) LCC: Confirm whether the remaining concerns about built heritage assets relate to Hall Close SAM and Morton Manor, Morton Grange and Corner Farmhouse listed buildings.</p> <p>b) LCC + Applicant: This matter is identified as “<i>under discussion</i>” in the SoCG [4.4B.6 in REP4-012]. Provide an update on this matter including whether it has been resolved, is likely to be resolved before the close of examination (this should include an explanation of what further work would be required from the applicant including likely timescales for completion if relevant), or if it is a matter which cannot be agreed.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Morton Manor and Morton Grange: Development to the east in the direction of Househam Wood would alter their rural agricultural setting and result in harm to significance. • Corner Farmhouse: Adjacent fields contribute to its setting and approach; their retention as open land (within the order limits) is important to preserving significance. It is important that the proposed retention as grassland is secured within the DCO and would request clarity as to where this is secured. <p>LCC notes that while setting is not designated, it contributes to the significance of these assets and harm to that setting results in harm to significance.</p> <p>b) SoCG update: this matter remains under discussion and is not yet resolved. Two issues remain:</p> <p>1. There remains a difference of professional judgement. LCC considers the ES understates the contribution of surrounding agricultural land to significance, particularly at Hall Close. This is unlikely to be fully resolved as solar development is proposed within fields to the south of the monument, notably Heritage Field Nos. 111 and 112 (approximately 200m south),</p>
--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

		<p>and Field No. 066 (approximately 380m south-west) (AS-022; APP-075).</p> <p>2. The applicant identifies land around key assets listed above as retained (e.g. setbacks for permanent grassland/biodiversity). LCC agrees this land contributes positively to setting. However, its long-term retention is not secured, creating future uncertainty. LCC seeks DCO secured protection to ensure these areas remain free from solar development for the lifetime of the scheme. This could be resolved within the examination if secured through the DCO. It would reduce uncertainty and ensure mitigation is effective, although it would not remove all harm.</p>
Population Effects (PE)		
PE.3.03	<p>BESS safety</p> <p>A number of statements have been made in sections 2 and 3 of ES Appendix 14-G (Unplanned Emissions Assessment) [APP-176] about potential emissions in the event of a BESS fire. For example, paragraph 2.1.7 states that only hydrogen fluoride would likely be present at concentrations of concern at distances of more than a few tens of metres from the fire. That is based on a report that included gas sample measurements from batteries subjected to external and internal ignition tests for BESS with a capacity of up to 100 kilowatt hours (Kwh). BESS of 100Kwh are markedly smaller than the proposed BESS, which would have a capacity of 480 megawatt hours. The distance of “tens of metres” is also referred to in the applicant’s Health and Wellbeing Summary Statement (paragraph 3.9.22 of [REP3-047]).</p>	<p>LCC consulted Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue and received the following response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LFR would want the assurance that the gas sample measurements are acceptable based on the exact specifications, i.e. 480 mega watts, what does the plume look like? Does the ‘tens of metres’ still stand, or will the cloud be bigger? • How does this differ, if at all, if the exact specification of the units are now known...<i>potential</i> emissions, do we know

	<p>Comment on the reasonableness of the assumptions presented in the Unplanned Emissions Assessment [APP-176] on which the assessment and findings are based, including their applicability to the scale of BESS proposed.</p>	<p>the full components being used and so can we now have <i>actual</i> emissions?</p>
<p>PE.3.05</p>	<p>BESS safety – health effects</p> <p>Paragraph 3.9.26 of the Health and Wellbeing Summary Statement [REP3-047] refers to the information presented in ES Appendix 14-G (Unplanned Emissions Assessment) [APP-176]. Paragraph 3.9.26 states “<i>The assessment identified that safe human health thresholds relating to the inhalation of fumes from a BESS fire would be met 200m from the BESS. There are no residential receptors within this distance from the BESS infrastructure proposed, whether a distributed or centralised BESS is brought forward</i>”.</p> <p>However, paragraph 2.3.5 in the FBSMP [REP3-030] states that the distributed BESS enclosures would be sited a minimum of 150m from residential structures offsite. Table 4 in [APP-176] identifies 150 to 200 metres as the indicative distance to achieve acute exposure guideline level (AEGL) -1 value for 100% of metrological conditions, based on 3 kilograms of hydrogen fluoride (HF) from a single cabinet fire. Paragraph 4.1.5 in [APP-176] identifies that “... <i>the specification reached in detailed design will be required (by a requirement to the DCO) to be consistent with the parameters assumed in this study (i.e., 1kg to 3kg of HF from a single cabinet fire)</i>...”</p> <p>Comment on the implications of the minimum distance of 150 metres referred to in the FBSMP for the consideration of health effects set out in the Health and Wellbeing Summary Statement.</p>	<p>LCC consulted Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue and received the following response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LFR would like assurance again if they have had reports suggesting that the 150m is sufficient? • If so why the discrepancy from 200m to 150m? • OR by stating <i>enclosure</i>, does that mean the perimeter of the whole compound site and then is the BESS cabinet a further distance within that compound site...what I’m asking is; is the enclosure the external perimeter fence, or the cabinet itself can I get clarity? <p>Basically with both items, there is a difference in the numbers suggested so based on either lower mega watts or greater distance initially, can we have the assurance with the increase in mega watts and less distance that everyone stays safe.</p>

<p>PE.3.07</p>	<p>Tourist Accommodation</p> <p>LCC maintains its concerns about the effects of the proposed development on tourist accommodation, both individually and cumulatively with other schemes [REP3-048].</p> <p>In terms of cumulative effects, the assessment in Chapter 12 of the ES (Socio Economics and Land Use) [AS-016] states that as it was anticipated that there would be no effect on the hotel, bed and breakfast, and inns accommodation sector from the proposed development, it would not make a meaningful contribution to any cumulative effect which may occur from other developments in the area.</p> <p>Table 12-25 in Chapter 12 of the ES presents the temporary accommodation capacity in a 30-minute rush hour drive time radius of the Order Limits (considered to be the worst-case scenario in paragraph 12.4.5 of [AS-016]). Table 12-25 shows that there would be limited spare capacity with the proposed development and a deficit in room availability during some months. That suggests that even a small increase in demand could lead to a shortage, which the proposed development would contribute to.</p> <p>Comment on whether there should be: a commitment to undertake monitoring of tourism accommodation usage by construction workers; and the implementation of management measures if required. If so, provide details of what that would involve and how it could be secured.</p>	<p>LCC consider the suggested monitoring of overnight accommodation usage by construction workers is a sensible approach, that will hopefully ensure any capacity, or other uptake issues, are identified before becoming much larger, more significant ones. LCC consider this monitoring should be secured either as a requirement within the DCO or within an appropriate management plan.</p> <p>LCC consider the monitoring itself, should as a minimum include the occupancy rates of accommodation within the 60 minute travel to work area in the period before booking and at the time of booking and regularly thereafter to establish if occupancy levels are becoming critical.</p> <p>While critical occupancy would not be an issue if the applicant already has a block booking in place, it will flag for the Council where action may be required on a wider basis. Should consent be forthcoming monitoring the occupancy rate of accommodation between consent and the point of booking will be of importance to establish patterns (particularly in preferred providers) and ensure that booking patterns or needs can be accommodated, particularly in those months where it is already known that there is little to no capacity when the needs of other schemes are taken into account.</p>
----------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Transport and Traffic (TT)

TT.3.01

Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (FCTMP) – condition surveys

The ExA notes the changes made to the FCTMP [REP3-032] 3 in response to the clarification sought by the ExA through the asking of ExQ2 TT.2.05. While that change to the FCTMP confirms that any defects to highway assets/verges during the construction of the proposed development would be made good, it does not explicitly identify who would have the responsibility for undertaking the reinstatement works.

Comment on whether the FCTMP should be amended to identify the body responsible for any reinstatement works. The same point applies to the change made to the Framework Public Rights of Way Management Plan [page 22 in REP3-026].

Responsibility for reinstatement works would fall to the Developer’s Contractor.

Water Environment, including Hydrology and Flood Risk (WE)

WE.3.01

Assessment of effects - water run-off, operational phase

All: In responding to ExQ1 WE.1.05(b) concerning the monitoring of water run-off from the proposed solar panels, the applicant in [REP2-029] stated that this would be picked up as part of the monitoring identified in section 6.9 of the FSMP. The second bullet point in paragraph 6.9’1 of the FSMP [REP4-010] addresses monitoring of soil conditions and refers to the “created green space areas”. Comment on whether the wording of the second bullet point in paragraph 6.9.1 of the FSMP is sufficiently clear to ensure that the monitoring would apply to the areas under the solar panels? If not suggest appropriate wording.

LCC notes that 6.9.1 of FSMP also includes “A programme of post-construction monitoring of re-vegetation and retained vegetation needs to be undertaken, likely on a seasonal basis and/or as prescribed by the Landscape Specialist during the construction phase.”

This is considered appropriate for the FSMP, the detail SMP is secured by Requirement 15 of the DCO.