



Application by RWE Renewables UK Solar and Storage Limited for Peartree Hill Solar Farm (EN010157)

The Examining Authority's (ExA's) second written questions and requests for information (ExQ2)

Issued on 24 September 2025

The following table sets out the ExA's second written questions and requests for information – ExQ2. If necessary, the examination timetable enables the ExA to issue a further round of written questions in due course. If this is done, the further round of questions will be referred to as ExQ3.

Questions are set out using an issues-based framework derived from the initial assessment of principal issues provided as **Annex C** to the [Rule 6 letter](#) dated 24 June 2025. Questions have been added to the framework of issues set out there as they have arisen from representations and to address the assessment of the application against relevant policies.

Column 2 of the table indicates which interested parties and any other persons each question is directed to. The ExA would be grateful if all parties/ persons named could answer all questions directed to them, providing a substantive response, or indicating that the question is not relevant to them for a reason. This does not prevent an answer being provided to a question by a person to whom it is not directed, should the question be relevant to their interests.

Each question has a unique reference number which starts with 2 (indicating that it is from ExQ2) and then has an issue number and a question number. For example, the first question on 'General and cross-topic' issues is identified as 2.1.1. When you are answering a question, please start your answer by quoting the unique reference number.

If you are responding to a small number of questions, answers in a letter will suffice. If you are answering a larger number of questions, it will assist the ExA if you use a table based on this one to set out your responses. An editable version of this table in Microsoft Word is available on request from the Case Team: please contact peartreehillsolarfarm@planninginspectorate.gov.uk and include 'Peartree Hill Solar Farm (EN010157)' in the subject line of your email.

Responses are due by deadline 3: Monday 6 October 2025



Abbreviations used:

A	article	HGV	Heavy goods vehicle
AIA	Arboricultural Impact Assessment	HRA	Habitats Regulations Assessment
AIL	abnormal indivisible load	IP	interested party
AMS	arboricultural method statement	LIR	local impact report
AP	affected person	LWS	local wildlife site
AQMA	air quality management area	m	metres
BESS	battery energy storage system	NE	Natural England
BNHIDB	Beverley and North Holderness Internal Drainage Board	NGET	National Grid Electricity Transmission plc
BNG	biodiversity net gain	NGTL	National Gas Transmission Limited
BoR	Book of Reference	NPS	National Policy Statement
CA	compulsory acquisition	NRIL	Network Rail Infrastructure Limited
DCO	Development Consent Order	NSIP	Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project
dDCO	draft Development Consent order	oBSMP	outline Battery Safety Management Plan
EA	Environment Agency	oCTMP	outline Construction Traffic Management Plan
EM	Explanatory Memorandum	oDEMP	outline Decommissioning Management Plan
ERYC	East Riding of Yorkshire Council	oLEMP	outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan
ES	Environmental Statement	oOEMP	outline Operational Environmental Management Plan
ExA	Examining Authority	oSMP	outline Soil Management Plan
FS	Funding Statement	oSWMP	outline Site Waste Management Plan
GHG	Greenhouse gas	PA2008	Planning Act 2008
HDD	horizontal directional drilling	PRoW	public right of way



PV	photovoltaic	SoS	secretary of state
R	requirement	SPA	Special Protection Area
RPA	root protection area	SU	statutory undertaker
RR	relevant representation	tCO₂e	tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent
s	section	TP	temporary possession
SAC	Special Area of Conservation	YWT	Yorkshire Wildlife Trust
Sch	schedule	Zol	Zone of Influence
SoR	Statement of Reasons		

The Examination Library

References in these questions set out in square brackets (for example [APP-010]) are to documents catalogued in the [Examination Library](#), which will be updated as the examination progresses.



Index

1. General and cross-topic.....	5
2. Draft Development Consent Order (dDCO) and other consents.....	5
3. Compulsory acquisition (CA), temporary possession (TP) and related matters.....	9
4. Need, site selection and alternatives.....	11
5. Air quality.....	11
6. Biodiversity (including Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA)).....	11
7. Climate.....	12
8. Cultural heritage.....	13
9. Land, soil and groundwater.....	13
10. Landscape and visual (including good design).....	14
11. Noise and vibration.....	15
12. Population.....	16
13. Transport and access.....	16
14. Cumulative.....	18

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
1. General and cross-topic		
2.1.1	The applicant	Planning history The ExA notes your response to ExQ1.1.5 [REP1-073]. However, the question was intended to understand whether, in your view, the proposed development would have any effect on/ implications for the implementation of or ongoing use of any of the projects/ applications listed (the ExA notes that East Riding of Yorkshire Council (ERYC) considers not [REP1-094]). Please address this and also consider whether Table 2 of the Planning Statement [REP2-073] requires any updates noting the table at section 5.2 of ERYC's Local Impact Report (LIR) [REP1-086].
2.1.2	The applicant	Statement of common ground (SoCG) The ExA notes that no SoCG has been submitted in respect of the Humberside Fire and Rescue Service. Please explain the reason for this and specify when a SoCG can be expected.
2.1.3	East Riding of Yorkshire Council (ERYC)	Local Impact Report (LIR) The ExA notes that Appendix 1, as cited in the LIR [REP1-086], is missing from the LIR. The applicant has provided details of this towards the end of [REP2-037]. Do you intend to resubmit the LIR in full or can the ExA rely on the information provided in [REP2-037]?
2.1.4	The applicant	Supply chains and tackling modern slavery/ forced labour The Examining Authority (ExA) notes the response to ExQ1.1.3 [REP1-073] (which is also cited in [REP2-038]) in respect of this matter. However, for completeness, should the relevant information also be included in the Commitments Register [REP2-125] and relevant management documents, such as the outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) [REP2-138] and the outline Operational Environmental Management Plan (oOEMP) [REP2-138]?
2. Draft Development Consent Order (dDCO) and other consents		
Note: Questions/ comments relate to dDCO revision 6 [REP2-062] (clean)/ [REP2-063] (tracked)		
General		
2.2.1	The applicant	Contents page

ExQ2: 24 September 2025

Responses due by deadline 3: Monday 6 October 2025

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		Whilst your response to ExQ1.2.1 [REP1-073] suggested the change had been actioned, it does not appear to have been. Please address this by adding an 's' to '45. Trees subject to tree preservation orders'.
2.2.2	The applicant	Explanatory note Please provide an update regarding ExQ1.2.6(b).
2.2.3	The applicant, ERYC	Requirements The ExA notes the difference of opinion of the parties in response to ExQ1.2.7 (and in [REP2-038] regarding whether there is a need for a requirement relating to biodiversity net gain (BNG). Please liaise on the matter and provide an update at the next deadline or an update to the SoCG [REP1-076] in this respect (noting that Natural England (NE) appears to indicate that a requirement in this regard is not necessary [REP1-093]).
2.2.4	ERYC	Requirements The ExA notes your response to ExQ1.2.7 [REP1-094] and that you make no reference to any need for a requirement relating to an employment and skills plan. Please confirm your position on this, having regard to Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (NPS EN-1) paragraph 5.13.12 and the applicant's response to ExQ1.2.7 in this regard [REP1-073].
Questions/ comments relating to articles (A)		
2.2.5	The applicant	A2 "permitted preliminary works" - the ExA notes your response to ExQ1.2.9 [REP1-094]. However, it would appear to the ExA that as currently written, this article, along with requirement 13 (Archaeology) would allow for certain 'permitted preliminary works' to commence (such as the diversion or laying of apparatus, contamination remediation and the making of boreholes) which could affect archaeology, prior to a written scheme of investigation (WSI) being submitted and approved. The ExA also notes that in the Oaklands Farm Solar Park Order 2025 cited by the applicant, the relevant requirement relating to archaeology appears to prevent any 'site preparation works' (the definitions of which are similar to those of the 'permitted preliminary works' in the dDCO) from commencing prior to the submission and approval of a WSI. Please address this matter further.
2.2.6	The applicant	A2 "environmental statement" – the ExA's understanding is that the environmental statement addendum cited in (b) is intended to be temporary, with the information/ amendments contained

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		within it to be transposed into the main ES documents which would then be submitted during the course of the examination as tracked and clean versions. On this basis, is (b) necessary?
2.2.7	The applicant	A33(10) – the ExA notes the changes made to this article in response to ExQ1.2.26. However, it was the intention of the ExA for the article to be worded: ‘The undertaker may not compulsorily acquire, acquire new rights over or impose restrictive covenants over, the land referred to in paragraph (1)(a)(i) under this Order.’, to preclude the acquisition of both land and rights.
2.2.8	The applicant	A44(1) – the ExA notes your response to ExQ1.1.28. However, by specifying trees ‘near the Order limits’ (that is, near to the red line boundary), would this have the effect of precluding any necessary tree works within the Order land but not ‘near’ to the Order limits, given the extent of the Order land. Please give further consideration as to whether more appropriate wording should be ‘[...] any tree or shrub within or encroaching on land within the Order limits [...]’.
2.2.9	The applicant	A45(1) – should this also be made subject to ‘[...] any tree within or encroaching on land within the Order limits [...]’?
Questions/ comments relating to Schedule (Sch) 2, Part 1 - requirements (R); and Sch 2, Part 2 – procedure for discharge of requirements		
2.2.10	The applicant	R15 – a) should there be a comma between the words ‘local planning authority’ and ‘no later than’ in R15(2); and b) notwithstanding this, and notwithstanding the response in [REP2-038] in please further address ERYC’s comment relating to R15 in response to ExQ1.10.6 [REP1-094], which raise a similar matter to the ExA’s ExQ1.2.48(a), noting that the ExA is not wholly convinced that R15(2) would adequately address the matter as suggested by the applicant.
2.2.11	ERYC	Sch 2, Part 2, 21(2) – ERYC requested that the cited period of ten business days in a previous version of the dDCO be extended to allow a total of 21 days from receipt of a valid application for further information to be requested. The applicant has amended this to ‘15 business days’. Are you satisfied with this?
Questions/ comments relating to other schedules		
2.2.12	The applicant	Sch 1, Work No. 1 – the ExA notes the changes made in respect of ExQ1.2.56. However, should this rather read as ‘and associated development within the meaning of section 115(2) of the 2008

ExQ2: 24 September 2025**Responses due by deadline 3: Monday 6 October 2025**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		Act in connection with Works Nos. <u>1B to 1F</u> comprising-‘ (instead of reference to ‘Work Nos. <u>1A and 1F</u> ’)?
2.2.13	The applicant	Sch 1, Work No. 4(a)(ii) – remove the dash in ‘switch-gear’.
2.2.14	The applicant	Sch 1, Work No. 6(b) – notwithstanding your response to ExQ1.2.62(b), please provide a more detailed response, addressing NPS EN-5 paragraphs 2.9.59 to 2.9.64, 2.10.14, 2.10.15 and 2.11.17 in depth and in turn.
2.2.15	The applicant	Sch 1, Work No. 6(h) – your response to ExQ1.2.63 does not appear to clarify what ‘structures and buildings’ are envisaged, nor their permanency. The ExA is thus unclear what these would be. In addition, noting your response, it is unclear to the ExA where in ES Chapter 3: Proposed Development Description [REP2-075] the parameters of such structures and buildings are highlighted. There is also no reference to any aspect of Work No. 6 in the Design Parameters Document [REP2-012]. It is thus unclear on what basis an assessment, such as from a landscape and visual perspective, has been undertaken. Please respond to these points.
2.2.16	The applicant	Sch 4 – the entry for ‘A1035’ makes reference to ‘SW/02a/01 to SW/02a/02’ on sheet 2A of the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans. However, on this plan [REP2-051] the references are SW/2a/01 and SW/2a/02. Please ensure consistency between references on plans and within the dDCO.
2.2.17	The applicant	Sch 5, Part 2 – a) the ExA notes your response to ExQ1.2.66 [REP1-073]. However, please review the information given in ES Chapter 13 paragraph 13.9.1 [APP-049], noting that the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans [REP2-051], the outline Rights of Way and Access Management Plan Table 3-1 [REP2-144] and Sch 5, Part 2 of the dDCO refer to measures the three cited footpaths would be subject to; and b) remove the additional spaces between the words ‘Temporarily’ and ‘restricted’ for Riston Footpath No. 2 and Wawne Footpath No. 1.
2.2.18	The applicant	Sch 6 - the entry for ‘A1035’ makes reference to ‘A/02a/01 and A/02a/02’ on sheet 2A of the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans. However, on this plan [REP2-051] the references are A/2a/01 and A/2a/02. Please ensure consistency between references on plans and within the dDCO.

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
2.2.19	The applicant	Sch 7, Part 1 – amend reference to ‘TTM/02/a/01’ so it reads ‘TTM/02a/01’ to reflect the reference on the Traffic Measures Plan.
2.2.20	The applicant	Sch 13 and EM paragraph 5.1.35 [REP2-064] – the ExA notes your response to ExQ1.2.75 [REP2-057]. However, the hedgerow numbering within Table 2 of the Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) [REP2-127] does not appear to correlate with the hedgerow numbering in Sch 13 (or on the Tree Preservation Order and Hedgerow Plan [PDA-007]). This makes cross referencing difficult and thus the ExA does not consider that the matter raised under ExQ1.2.75 has been suitably addressed. Please address the matter further.
3. Compulsory acquisition (CA), temporary possession (TP) and related matters		
2.3.1	The applicant	Rights sought/ inconsistencies The ExA notes your response to ExQ1.3.3 [REP1-073]. However, please address the following apparent inconsistencies: a) rights shown as being sought in Plot 2-8 in Part 3 of the Book of Reference (BoR) [REP2-151] compared to rights shown as being sought over this plot in Parts 1 and 2; and b) rights shown as being sought in Plot 4-10 in Part 2 of the BoR compared with the rights shown as being sought over this plot in Parts 1 and 3 of the BoR.
2.3.2	The applicant	Rights sought/ inconsistencies There appear to be inconsistencies between relevant schedules of the dDCO and the Land Plans [including REP2-052]/ Statement of Reasons [REP2-066]/ BoR [REP2-068]/ Land and Rights Negotiations Tracker [REP2-070] insofar as powers sought over Plots 1-10, 1-12, 2-7, 2-8, 2-12b, 4-4, 4-5, 4-8, 4-9, 4-10. Please clarify the powers sought and update relevant documents as necessary.
2.3.3	The applicant	Figiam Common The ExA notes that you highlight an error in the Planning Statement [REP2-073] regarding horizontal directional drilling (HDD) under Figiam Common, in response to ExQ1.3.9(a). Should the Planning Statement be updated to address this error?
2.3.4	The applicant	Community accessible land

ExQ2: 24 September 2025**Responses due by deadline 3: Monday 6 October 2025**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		The ExA notes your response to ExQ1.13.14(b). However, the ExA remains uncertain as to whether all three areas of land shown as being under consideration for community accessible land (on sheets 3, 8 and 12 of the Indicative Environmental Masterplan [REP2-091]), would be used for such a purpose. Please clarify this and also clarify, should any area not be used for such a purpose, the areas shown as being under consideration for community accessible land would still serve another purpose associated with the proposed development.
2.3.5	The applicant	Funding for decommissioning The ExA notes your response to ExQ1.3.16. However, please provide your view as to whether arrangements for funding for decommissioning and restoration works (that is, those under R15 of the dDCO) should be made subject to a separate requirement of the dDCO, in the interests of certainty.
2.3.6	The applicant	BoR and Land Plans Should the key in the Land Plans [REP2-052] fully reflect the information provided in Table 5-1 of the BoR (that is, should the key reflect that land proposed to be permanently acquired may also be used temporarily)?
2.3.7	The applicant	Funding Statement (FS) FS paragraph 7.1.1 [APP-024] cites that 183 plots would be subject to CA of land or rights and 16 plots would be subject to TP. These figures should be updated to accord with any changes which have occurred after the submission of the FS (note also the inconsistency matters outlined in ExQ2.3.1/2.3.2 above).
2.3.8	Leonards Property on behalf of TS Caley, MC Caley, TH Caley & Sons Ltd	Plot 2-6 The ExA notes your representation [REP2-157]. However, the sole landowner of Plot 2-6 is identified in the BoR [REP2-068] as Caroline Mary Caley. Please confirm: a) Whether this person is one of the persons you list as representing; and b) The reasons for your objection, noting that the applicant's Land and Rights Negotiations Tracker [REP2-070] indicates landowner agreement in respect of this plot.
2.3.9	The applicant	Clarification Please provide any updates in light of ExQ2.3.8, as necessary.

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
2.3.10	Environment Agency, Network Rail Infrastructure Limited, National Gas Transmission plc, National Grid Electricity Transmission plc, Northern Powergrid (Yorkshire) plc, Yorkshire Water Services, Beverley and North Holderness Internal Drainage Board	Protective provisions Please review the applicant's deadline 2 (including change request) submissions and: a) identify any outstanding key concerns or impediments with regard to reaching agreement with the applicant on CA/ TP matters and protective provisions; and b) clarify whether you are confident of reaching agreement with the applicant before the close of the examination, and if not, any implications for this?
2.3.11	The applicant	Crown Land Please provide an update regarding Crown land and s135(1) and 135(2) of PA2008.
4. Need, site selection and alternatives		
2.4.1	Robertson James Wade	The ExA notes your representation [REP2-155]. However, the applicant sets out in its Grid Connection Statement at paragraph 2.1.2 [APP-152] (and in other documents) that it has received a grid connection offer for connection to the existing 132kV Creyke Beck substation. Accordingly, it is not relying on the 400kV part of Creyke Beck substation. Does this alleviate your concern in this regard?
2.4.2	The applicant	The applicant might wish to confirm the above/ respond to [REP2-155] to further clarify the matter.
5. Air quality		
No further questions at this time		
6. Biodiversity (including Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA))		
2.6.1	The applicant	Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD) crossings of the River Hull The ExA notes ongoing discussions with the EA as outlined in the SoCG [REP1-077], regarding the commitment to complete HDD crossings of the River Hull between April to September in order to avoid noise and vibration impacts during the peak lamprey migration period, and for this to be

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		secured through the CEMP. Please provide an update regarding this matter, including whether amendments to the oCEMP [REP2-138] in relation to this matter are proposed.
2.6.2	The applicant	Mitigation areas – disturbance The ExA notes concerns in ERYC's LIR [REP1-086] regarding the potential for disturbance to wildlife in and around mitigation areas 9 and 11, due to the proposed presence of permissive paths/ recreational activity within the vicinity and the applicant's response [REP2-037]. Please provide an update regarding this matter, including whether any potential disturbance could be overcome through the rerouting of areas, or the use of additional mitigation, for example.
2.6.3	The applicant	HRA Please confirm that, with regards to noise disturbance, specifically paragraph 7.3.5 of the HRA [REP2-071] whether the assessment is based on guidance that is supported by NE, in response to concerns raised in ERYC's LIR [REP1-086].
2.6.4	The applicant	HRA NE's deadline 2 submission [REP2-154] updates its position following the submission of the applicant's updated HRA [REP1-015] (superseded by [REP2-071], Grid Connection Bird Survey Report [REP1-072] and the outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) [REP1-056] (superseded by [REP2-032] and subsequently by [REP2-140]). NE identifies remaining concerns at item numbers NE1a, NE1b, NE1c, NE1d, NE1e, NE1g, NE2a and NE5. Please provide an update on each of these matters, including amended versions of the HRA, oLEMP, oCEMP and ES Chapter 7 as appropriate.
2.6.5	The applicant	HRA Noting concerns and outstanding matters in relation to biodiversity/ HRA matters, please respond in detail to the points raised in ERYC's LIR [REP1-086] and the matters remaining under discussion in the draft SoCG [REP2-042].
2.6.6	NE	HRA An update to the HRA [REP2-071] was provided to reflect the Change Request. Please confirm if you agree with the applicant's conclusions regarding the effects of the Change Request on European sites from all phases of the proposed development, including in-combination effects.
7. Climate		

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
2.7.1	The applicant	Carbon reduction plans The ExA notes your response to ExQ1.7.7 and an update to the oDEMP. However, please further justify your response regarding the oOEMP [REP1-052], noting that ES Chapter 8 paragraph 8.7.9 and Table 8-13 [APP-044] identify that the highest percentage of emissions would occur during operation.
2.7.2	The applicant	Greenhouse gas technical note Please clarify: a) whether the inclusion of paragraph 1.3.4 in Appendix 3 of [REP1-073] is a typo or if there is missing information; b) regarding Table 3, what 'Solar – utility' refers to; c) regarding Table 3, how the 'GHG Intensity' single figure and the figures which follow in brackets relate to each other; and d) whether any information can be provided in respect of the GHG intensity figure(s) for the proposed development compared with the GHG intensity figure(s) of other recently consented solar farms.
8. Cultural heritage		
2.8.1	ERYC	Church of St. Margaret Please confirm whether you are content with the applicant's response [REP2-038] to concerns detailed in your response to ExQ1 [REP1-094] regarding the need to consider the impact of the proposed development in relation to the Church of St. Margaret, a grade II* listed building.
2.8.2	ERYC	Abbey Cottage Please confirm whether you are content with the applicant's response [REP2-037] to concerns detailed in the LIR [REP1-086] regarding the need to consider the impact of the proposed development in relation to Abbey Cottage, a grade II listed building.
9. Land, soil and groundwater		
2.9.1	The applicant	Infrastructure height surrounding BESS

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		As outlined in the EA's response to ExQ1 [REP1-095] please provide the height of infrastructure in the areas surrounding BESS infrastructure in metres above Ordnance Datum within the flood risk assessment.
2.9.2	ERYC	Soils assessment methodology Please confirm whether you are satisfied with the applicant's response [REP2-037] and updated documents relating to concerns raised in the LIR [REP-086] regarding ES Chapter 10 [REP2-077].
10. Landscape and visual (including good design)		
2.10.1	ERYC	Residential visual amenity a) Are you satisfied with the applicant's response on page 17 of [REP2-037] to your concern in LIR paragraph 7.64 of [REP1-086] relating to the Residential Visual Amenity Assessment (RVAA) [APP-132] and potential for cumulative effects for residents of Woodhouse and Meaux Decoy Farm as a result of Carr Farm Solar Farm; and b) Regarding paragraph 7.64 of your LIR [REP1-086] relating to the RVAA [APP-132] and potential for cumulative effects as a result of Carr Farm Solar Farm, the ExA notes there are two properties named 'Carr House Farm', the closest of which to the site of Carr Farm Solar Farm being Carr House Farm (Weel), with Carr House Farm (Long Riston) being remote from it. While the RVAA identifies potential for a significant visual effect for the residents of Carr House Farm (Long Riston), this is not the case for Carr House Farm (Weel). The applicant also notes this to be the case in [REP2-037]. Please thus clarify your concern in this regard.
2.10.2	The applicant	Residential visual amenity An area of the proposed solar array was reduced in size in field B4 to the north of Carr House Farm as part of the first change request [PD-007]. Please clarify whether the distance of 190 metres as cited in the first row of Table A11.5-2 (page 19) of the RVAA [APP-132] remains accurate.
2.10.3	ERYC	Effects The applicant addresses [REP2-037] matters raised in your LIR at paragraph 7.47 (landscape character area) and 7.55 (lighting). Please confirm whether you are satisfied with the response, and if not, explain why.
2.10.4	ERYC	Mitigation

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		The applicant has responded [REP2-037] to the LIR (including paragraphs 7.185, 7.189, 7.295) in respect of ERYC's suggestion for additional planting along the southern boundary of field F13 to address effects for users of 'Swine PROW' (which the ExA understands refers to footpath SWINF07). The applicant notes there is already a hedge in this location and in other fields and due to this, and distances involved, views of the proposed development from this PROW, and one to the south (which the ExA understands to be WAWNB10) would be limited. Please confirm whether this alleviates your concerns, and if not, explain why.
2.10.5	ERYC	Mitigation The applicant has responded to ERYC's other suggestions in the LIR relating to additional mitigation planting (including at paragraphs 7.63, 7.251, 7.293, and 7.298 of the LIR) to further reduce adverse visual effects. Please confirm whether you are satisfied with the response, and if not, explain why.
2.10.6	The applicant	Design ERYC's LIR [REP1-086] suggests the use of an Environmental Colour Assessment with regard to colour selection for components of the proposed development. Would the applicant be willing to adopt this approach and make provision for this within relevant documents, such as the Design Parameters Document [REP2-012] and R3 of the dDCO?
2.10.7	The applicant	Parameters/ layout plans The ExA notes your response to ExQ1.10.11 and updates to the Indicative Layout and Cross Section Plan [REP1-004]. However, please clarify: a) whether the number and sizes of 'spares containers' should be defined in the Design Parameters Document [REP2-012] and shown on the Indicative Operational Layout Plan [REP2-088]; b) which other application documents make reference to 'spares containers'; and c) whether the locations of the seven switchgears, as cited in the Design Parameters Document, should be shown on the Indicative Operational Layout Plan?
11. Noise and vibration		
2.11.1	ERYC	Noise mitigation measures Please confirm that you are content with the applicant's response [REP2-037] to the LIR [REP1-086], regarding whether there is a need for more robust mitigation measures in relation to residential

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		properties where the noise impact/ rating level of the proposed development is predicted to be in excess of +10dB taking into account mitigation.
2.11.2	The applicant	In relation to Change 9 of the Change Request [REP2-149], it is predicted that there would be short-term, temporary adverse noise impacts on properties at Field House Farm during construction, which are assessed as not significant. The ExA notes that limited justification has been provided to support this conclusion. Please provide further details regarding how this conclusion has been reached and, where necessary, supply further details of noise impacts on these receptors, including the results of any relevant monitoring.
12. Population		
No further questions at this time		
13. Transport and access		
2.13.1	ERYC	Use of Park Lane during construction The applicant has responded (on pages 19 and 20 of [REP2-037] and pages 71 to 74 of [REP2-038]) to your concerns regarding the use of Park Lane during construction (and has committed to the restriction of the use of this route around school drop off and pick up times (oCTMP paragraph 6.1.8 [REP2-142])). You will also note the observations in the note of the ExA's unaccompanied site inspection (USI2 [EV1-002])). Please: a) Confirm whether the applicant's response addresses your concerns, and if not, the reasons for this; b) If it does not address your concerns, clarify, with supporting evidence your views on the severity of any impact/ effect, noting that the LIR states at paragraph 7.74 that '[...] the use of Park Lane could have significant impact [...]' whereas paragraph 7.114 states 'It is considered it would have a negative impact on highway safety and residential amenity [...]', and is thus not clear on the matter; and c) Provide your view, noting NPS EN-1 paragraph 5.14.21, as to whether there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety?
2.13.2	ERYC	Personal injury data

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		Further to your LIR, are you satisfied with the updates in ES Appendix 14.4 [REP2-027] and ES Chapter 14 [REP2-017] (carried forward into [REP2-081]) in respect of updated personal injury data?
2.13.3	ERYC	Agreements, notices, licences and details Regarding concerns in LIR paragraphs 7.110 to 7.112 [REP1-086] around the necessity for s278 and/ or s184 agreements and the concern regarding the waiver of some clauses of the New Roads Street Works Act 1991, the applicant responded to this on pages 32 to 35 of document [REP2-037]. Please clarify whether the response alleviates your concerns and, if not, the reasons for this.
2.13.4	The applicant	Access Please clarify your response to [RR-025] on page 369 of [REP1-071] noting that there do not appear to be, according to relevant plans (such as [REP2-091] and Appendix B of [REP2-142]), any proposed internal access tracks in areas E13 and E14 and no private track located between these specific fields.
2.13.5	The applicant	Access Regarding fields E15, E16 and E17, please clarify: a) how these fields would be accessed for construction purposes; and b) how these fields would be accessed for maintenance purposes (including replacement of parts), noting that there does not appear to be any internal access tracks on relevant plans linking these fields with, for example, internal access tracks within fields E9 to E12?
2.13.6	The applicant	Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP) oCTMP appendices B and C [REP2-142] do not appear to reflect Change 9 of the recent change request. Please address this.
2.13.7	The applicant	HGVs Regarding Link No.7, ES Chapter 14 paragraph 14.9.12 [REP2-081] refers to '39 daily HGV movements'. Please clarify the actual number of daily HGVs?
2.13.8	The applicant	Clarification ES Chapter 14, Table 14-26, Link No. 7, paragraph 3 [REP2-081] refers to 'Carr Lane'. Should this instead refer to 'private farm track'?

ExQ2: 24 September 2025**Responses due by deadline 3: Monday 6 October 2025**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
14.	Cumulative	
2.14.1	The applicant	Inter-project cumulative effects ERYC (LIR paragraph 7.61 [REP1-086]) highlights contradictions in the overlap of construction periods in ES Chapter 15 Table 15-8 [REP2-018]. Please address this and any implications this may have for the assessment.
2.14.2	The applicant	Intra-project combined effects The ExA notes your response to ExQ1.14.7 [REP1-073]. However, please review your response in light of ExQ2.2.17 above.