



Planning Inspectorate

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

Customer 0303 444 5000
Services:
e-mail: LighthouseGreen@planninginspectorate.gov.uk

To the applicant

Case ref: EN0110025

(By email only)

Date: 19 October 2026

Dear Colin,

Planning Act 2008 – section 89(3)

Application by LGF Projects Limited for an order granting development consent for the Lighthouse Green Fuels Project

I write to you as the Lead Member of the Examining Authority (ExA) for this application to advise you of procedural decisions made by the ExA in relation to how the application is to be examined.

In order to ensure that the examination can progress efficiently when it starts, the ExA requests that the applicant addresses several significant matters, which are set out below.

Report to inform habitat regulations assessment (HRA)

The HRA report submitted with the application concludes at Paragraph 11.2.12 that: *'...it cannot be concluded beyond reasonable scientific doubt that the Proposed Development, in combination with other plans and projects, would not adversely affect the integrity of the Teesmouth and Cleveland Coast SPA (Marine Component GB) and Teesmouth and Cleveland Coast Ramsar site. Further measures, controls or assessment would therefore be required to rule out adverse effects on site integrity arising from overlapping capital dredging activities. This could require agreement and co-ordination with nearby projects to ensure a temporal disconnect between dredging activities. This would only be required should the construction programme progress so that capital dredging activities overlap, which is currently considered unlikely'.*

However, no further information is provided about how such measures or controls would be secured to ensure the identified potential in-combination effect does not occur, and a derogations case has also not been provided. Additional information is therefore needed on:

- a) Discussions with the other relevant project(s) and the port operator
- b) The respective capital dredging periods of relevant project(s) and how they can be managed so as not to overlap
- c) The proposed drafting for any necessary timing control mechanism to be secured in the draft Development Consent Order (DCO) and/or deemed marine licence

The ExA requests that this is contained within a revised HRA report that is provided before the relevant representation (RR) period is opened, so that Natural England, the Marine Management Organisation and other consultees can consider the most up-to-date position in their RRs. Further, the ExA advises that if agreement on such controls cannot be secured with other project(s) and the port operator before the Preliminary Meeting (PM) then the applicant should provide a without prejudice derogations case to inform the examination at least two weeks before the PM.

Other HRA matters

The HRA report at Paragraphs 10.1.14 and 10.1.15 describe the potential in-combination effects of overlapping dredging and dredge spoil disposal activities as “moderate”. The applicant should clarify this terminology because it appears to reflect an Environmental Impact Assessment classification and does not clearly express the finding against the HRA test of adverse effect on site integrity.

Table 7.1 of the HRA report only identifies hydrodynamic change during operation. It is unclear whether construction effects from quay construction and dredging were considered at the screening stage. However, Paragraphs 9.2.85 to 9.2.88 assess these effects at the Appropriate Assessment (AA) stage. Clarification is required regarding the screening conclusions for construction-phase hydrodynamic change to ensure consistency between the screening and AA sections.

The revised HRA report requested above should also address both of these matters.

Environmental statement (ES)

ES Chapter 10 Terrestrial ecology

The ES finds that off-site compensatory habitat replacement is required. However, the Framework Landscape and Biodiversity Mitigation and Enhancement Strategy at Paragraph 4.3.11 states: *‘At the time of writing, the detailed design and specification of the proposed compensatory habitat have not yet been finalised. Consequently, the assessment presented within this report is based on the information currently available’*.

The applicant should secure the off-site mitigation as soon as possible and provide an update at least two weeks before the PM that demonstrates significant progress in this regard.

Further, the ES sets out that additional non-breeding bird surveys will be undertaken from August to October 2026 to account for the autumn passage period that was missed in 2025 and the results of these surveys will be provided in November 2026 during the DCO examination period. The results of these surveys and an explanation of any implications

for the findings of the ES (and any other application documents) should be provided as soon as possible and at least two weeks before the PM.

ES Chapter 22 Cumulative and combined effects

The assessment of cumulative effects considers the proposed development in combination with other individual developments but does not appear to consider all of the developments collectively. The applicant should provide a more comprehensive cumulative effects assessment at least two weeks before the PM.

Funding statement

The Funding statement includes a letter of support from Alfanar Company CJSC as the applicant's parent company, which states that annual revenue in 2025 was £4.2 billion with current assets worth £2.8 billion. However, no annual accounts, statements or other equivalent information has been provided to evidence such revenue and assets. The ExA requests the applicant to submit this information in a revised funding statement at least two weeks before the PM takes place.

Explanatory memorandum (EM)

It is unclear from the EM submitted with the application whether Articles 2(3), 10, 12, 19, 29, 30, 31, 33, 34, 35, 44, 46, 47 are either based on model provisions or have any precedence in other made DCOs. If the wording in these articles is new or novel it should be identified in the EM. The ExA therefore requests that a revised EM is provided before the opening of the RR period, so that consultees can be suitably informed and fully consider the wording in the DCO in their RRs.

Conclusion

The additional information requested by the ExA above will help greatly in ensuring an efficient and effective examination. It is important to note that in the absence of the requested information, the ExA could postpone or adjourn the PM until such a time that it has been provided.

Yours sincerely

Jonathan Manning

Lead Member of the Examining Authority

This communication does not constitute legal advice.

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

<https://national-infrastructure-consenting.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/>

