

North Humber to High Marnham - EN020034

National Grid Electricity Transmission

Section 51 Advice Log

Version: 27 April 2026

There is a statutory duty under [section 51 \(s51\) of the Planning Act 2008](#) for the Planning Inspectorate to record the advice that it gives in relation to an application or potential application, and to make this publicly available.

This document comprises a record of the advice that has been provided by the Inspectorate to the applicant (National Grid Electricity Transmission) and their consultants during the pre-application stage. It will be updated by the Inspectorate after every interaction with the applicant during which s51 has been provided. The applicant will always be given the opportunity to comment on the Inspectorate's draft record of advice before it is published.

The applicant will use this Advice Log as the basis for demonstrating regard to section 51 advice within the application.

| Project name s51 Advice Log - Index | |
|--|--|
| Date of meeting/advice | Meeting/advice overview |
| 16 May 2023 | <p><u>Inception Meeting:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduction to the project • Intended approach to land Acquisition and the use of Compulsory Acquisition Powers • Engagement with Local Authorities • Scoping and environmental surveys • Application anticipated submission date <p>A meeting note is available for this meeting on the Find a National Infrastructure Project Website and this can be viewed at: View meeting note (PDF, 109KB).</p> |
| 5 October 2023 | <p><u>Project Update Meeting:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project and Programme Updates • Non-statutory consultation • Environmental Impact Assessment scoping opinion • Digital Environmental Impact Assessment <p>A meeting note is available for this meeting on the Find a National Infrastructure Project Website and this can be viewed at: View meeting note (PDF, 110KB).</p> |
| 21 May 2024 | <p><u>Advice provided by email to the Applicant by the Inspectorate:</u></p> <p>The Inspectorate provided post scoping advice regarding s42 consultation to the Applicant. This advice has been published on the Find a National Infrastructure Project Website and this can be viewed at: View advice provided by email.</p> |
| 10 June 2024 | <p><u>Project Update Meeting:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project Update • Localised non-statutory consultation • Programme Update • Planning Inspectorate’s pre-application service and expression of interest <p>A meeting note is available for this meeting on the Find a National Infrastructure Project Website</p> |

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| | and this can be viewed at: View meeting note (PDF, 115KB). |
| 23 October 2024 | <p><u>Programme Document Feedback:</u></p> <p>The Inspectorate provided feedback on the initial version of the Programme Document to the Applicant. This advice has been published on the Find a National Infrastructure Project Website and this can be viewed at: View advice provided by email regarding the Programme Document.</p> |
| 21 January 2025 | <p><u>Project Update Meeting:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project update • Update following localised non-statutory consultation including South Wheatley to High Marnham corridor decision • Preparation for statutory consultation update • Substations update • Scoping • LPA engagement update • Programme update • Compulsory Acquisition Update • Any other business |
| 21 May 2025 | <p><u>Project Update Meeting:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Statutory Consultation • Programme update • Draft Document submission update • Compulsory Acquisition and Book of Reference Update • Hearing venues • Substations update • Local Government re-organisation in Lincolnshire and Nottinghamshire • Interrelationships with other Infrastructure Projects |
| 13 November 2025 | <p><u>Project Update Meeting:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft documents • Summary of lessons learned from other cases • Template use • Interrelationship with other NSIPs • The Crown Estate and associated British Ports • Hearing Venues |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p><u>21 November 2025</u></p> | <p><u>Advice provided by email to the Applicant by the Inspectorate:</u></p> <p>The Inspectorate provided advice to the applicant in relation to updates to our pre-application services and the pre-application prospectus.</p> |
| <p><u>11 February 2026</u></p> | <p><u>Project Update Meeting:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project update • Draft documents • Issues tracker updates • Interrelationship with other NSIPs • Unlicensed airfields • Any other business |
| <p><u>27 April 2026</u></p> | <p><u>Project Update Meeting:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project update • Draft documents • Land rights tracker update • Planning and Infrastructure Bill implementation • Any other business |

North Humber to High Marnham - s51 Advice Library

| Topic | Meeting date: 16 May 2023 |
|---|--|
| Inception Meeting Note | A meeting note is available for this meeting on the Find a National Infrastructure Project Website and this can be viewed at: View meeting note (PDF, 109KB). |
| Land Acquisition and the use of Compulsory Acquisition Powers in the dDCO | <p>The Applicant indicated that its intension is to seek to acquire ownership, and/or rights, over land by voluntary agreement, and will only seek compulsory acquisition powers where this cannot be achieved. It was confirmed that the project would involve Crown Estate land at and adjacent to the River Ouse.</p> <p>The Inspectorate asked the Applicant to keep it updated on the extent of land required for compulsory acquisition throughout the course of the pre-application stage.</p> |
| Scoping request and timescales for the submission GIS Shapefile | The Applicant advised the Inspectorate that work is ongoing on ornithology surveys and the Scoping Report. Information on environmental matters, heritage, traffic impacts and landscape has been shared with local authorities for comment to help inform the Scoping Report, which is due to be submitted to the Inspectorate in late July 2023. The Inspectorate reminded the Applicant of the need to submit the GIS shapefile at least 10 days before submitting the Scoping Report. |
| Timing of next meeting between the Applicant and the Inspectorate | The Inspectorate suggested that the next meeting should be following the publication of the Scoping Opinion would be beneficial, in order to discuss feedback from that document. |
| Topic | Meeting date: 5 October 2023 |
| Project Update Meeting Note | A meeting note is available for this meeting on the Find a National Infrastructure Project Website and this can be viewed at: View meeting note (PDF, 110KB). |
| Consultation | <p>The Applicant gave an overview of the tasks it's currently engaging in, including meetings with stakeholders in relation to land surveys, environmental matters and local government.</p> <p>The Applicant anticipates consulting on the Statement of Community Consultation in Spring / Summer 2024 and statutory consultation on their proposals in Autumn 2024.</p> <p>The Inspectorate asked if feedback had been received from any of the local authorities. The Applicant explained that it had not received formal feedback during the non-statutory</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| | <p>consultation period, however, a late feedback response had been received from one host LPA, North Lincolnshire Council and the Applicant are reviewing this feedback. The Applicant advised they were continuing to engage and work with the host LPAs.</p> |
| <p>Environmental Impact Assessment scoping opinion</p> | <p>Following the issue of the EIA scoping opinion on 29 September 2023, the Applicant asked for clarification on the following points.</p> <p>The removal of existing pylons for line swap overs are listed under the decommissioning phase in the scoping opinion, however the Applicant consider this to fall under the construction phase. The Inspectorate explained that the guidance given in the scoping opinion is produced on the information available to the Inspectorate at that time. The Applicant can disagree with the opinion and is able to make changes, as long as this is explained in the environmental statement and robust evidence is provided to justify this approach.</p> <p>The Applicant asked what weight should be given to the appended information and advice sent by consultation bodies with regard to the scoping opinion. The Inspectorate advised that the scoping opinion has been informed by the consultee responses but is not necessarily a full reflection of the views of the consultees. The Applicant should have regard to them and consider these views during ongoing consultation exercises.</p> |
| <p>Digital Environmental Impact Assessment</p> | <p>The Applicant is considering utilising digital EIA elements as a supplemental consultation tool and asked if the Inspectorate is planning on admitting these as application documents? The Inspectorate confirmed it is in the early stages of considering how these can be used and request that the Applicant provide updates on this aspect. Any digital submission would need to be in addition to a pdf version of the environmental statement, to allow all stakeholder to be able to access the information.</p> |
| <p>Topic</p> | <p>Advice date: 21 May 2024</p> |
| <p>Post Scoping advice regarding s42 consultation – Transitional Provisions resulting from The Infrastructure Planning (Miscellaneous</p> | <p>The Inspectorate provided the following advice to the Applicant by email:</p> <p>The Infrastructure Planning (Miscellaneous Provisions (MP)) Regulations 2024 came into force on 30 April 2024 and amend the Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure (APFP)) Regulations 2009. The transitional provisions at Regulation 4 of the MP Regulations 2024 confirm that the recently amended APFP Regulations do not apply to any proposed application for an order</p> |

| | |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| Provisions (MP)) Regulations 2024 | <p>granting development consent where the applicant has started to consult under Section 42 of the Planning Act 2008 before 30 April 2024.</p> <p>The Inspectorate is contacting you as it understands that consultation under Section 42 for the North Humber to High Marnham Project had not commenced prior to 30 April 2024. The Inspectorate would like to inform you that as the scoping opinion request for the North Humber to High Marnham Project was received prior to 30 April 2024, the list of consultation bodies notified and consulted by the Planning Inspectorate before adopting the scoping opinion (as set out in the 'Regulation 11 list' provided to the Applicant as per Regulation 11(1)b of the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)) Regulations 2017), will not reflect the recent amendments to the APFP Regulations.</p> <p>The Applicant is therefore advised to review the transitional provisions in Regulation 4 of the MP Regulations 2024, together with the amendments to the APFP Regulations, and consider whether any new or different consultation bodies should be included in the consultations for the project. Please be aware that it is the responsibility of the Applicant to ensure their consultation fully accords with the requirements of the Planning Act 2008 and associated regulations and guidance. The Regulation 11 list has been compiled by the Planning Inspectorate on behalf of the Secretary of State in its duty to notify the consultation bodies in accordance with Regulation 11(1)(a) of the EIA Regulations and, whilst it can inform the Applicant's own consultation, it should not be relied upon for that purpose.</p> |
| Topic | Meeting date: 10 June 2024 |
| Project Update Meeting Note | A meeting note is available for this meeting on the Find a National Infrastructure Project Website and this can be viewed at: View meeting note (PDF, 115KB). |
| Programme Update | <p>Localised non-statutory consultation between 9 July and 6 August 2024.</p> <p>Statutory consultation is expected between February and April 2025. The application for a Development Consent Order is anticipated to be submitted in summer 2026.</p> <p>The Inspectorate is mindful that, in some instances, key stakeholders struggle to provide adequate feedback for an applicant to be able to stick to its pre-application programme and advised that it may be beneficial to provide these parties with the key issues that have arisen through consultation</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>with the community, to allow them to focus their resources on providing pertinent feedback.</p> <p>The Inspectorate advised that early engagement with landowners should be undertaken, to enable agreements to be put in place ahead of examination, where feasible.</p> |
| Consultation | <p>The Applicant gave an update on the non-statutory consultation which was carried out between 1 June - 27 July 2023. A review of consultation feedback received during this period has informed a review and backcheck of the Corridor Preliminary Routeing and Siting Study (CPRSS). An assessment of a potential alternative corridor between South Wheatley and High Marnham (previously communicated as section 10 & section 11 of the route) is being undertaken. This shall be known as the 'eastern corridor'. The Applicant intends to undertake a localised non-statutory consultation on the possible alternative eastern corridor between 9 July and 6 August 2024. Consultation feedback from both the non-statutory consultation 2023 and localised non-statutory consultation 2024, together with further environmental and technical assessments and survey work will inform an overall decision on the preferred corridor between South Wheatley and High Marnham.</p> |
| Planning Inspectorate's pre-application service and expression of interest | <p>The Applicant is in the process of reviewing the advice and guidance provided, considering how this may relate its application, and requested advice on which tier of the Inspectorate's pre-application service would likely be most suitable.</p> <p>The Inspectorate advised that the applicant needs to make this decision, based on the nature of the scheme and the benefit it may derive from a higher tier pre-application service. For example, a more complicated scheme may not be suitable for the fast-track service, due to the complexity of the data needed to produce the application documents. Insufficient data can lead to a longer examination. The experience gained from utilising a higher tier service, could also help inform which tier was suitable for the applicant's other proposed developments.</p> |
| Topic | Meeting date: 23 October 2024 |
| Programme Document - Feedback | <p>The following feedback was provided by the case team to the Applicant by email:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good demonstration of compliance with the Planning Act 2008: Pre-application stage for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects Guidance. The Applicant will be aware that one of the mandatory components of the new pre-application service (for all |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>service tiers), as set out in the Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects: 2024 Pre-application Prospectus, is demonstrating regard to advice. As such this should be clearly reflected in the application documents.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Applicant must ensure that the Programme Document (PD) is hosted and maintained on the Applicant’s website. • Whilst the PD sets out that the Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC) will be developed ahead of Statutory Consultation, it would be helpful if the dates were listed in the table setting out the submission timeframe. • Whilst the Inspectorate acknowledges that key milestones are some time in the future ie statutory consultation in Quarter 1 2025, draft document review in Q4 2025, and submission in Q2 2026, it would be helpful if these timeframes could be narrowed, and the updated PD published, in due course. • It is not clear from the PD whether the Applicant has allowed time for a further period of targeted/full consultation, after the statutory consultation has been undertaken. Given the linear nature of the project the Inspectorate advises the Applicant to consider whether a further consultation period prior to submission would be necessary and if so, add possible timescales to the PD. • It would be helpful if the PD could provide approximate timescales for future project update meetings with the Inspectorate. It would also be helpful to list any meetings with key stakeholders to enable those parties to deploy resources effectively. |
| Topic | Meeting date: 21 January 2025 |
| <p>Non-Statutory Consultation Feedback in relation to Interrelationships with other projects / proposed development along corridor</p> | <p>The Inspectorate enquired about the consideration being given and associated feedback provided as part of the consultation to other projects along parts of the corridor that was the focus of the latest consultation.</p> <p>The applicant indicated it was aware of a number of other projects within the corridor of their project and continues to monitor these and engage with third party developers as appropriate. Where consultation feedback has commented on interactions with other developments or raised concerns regarding the potential for cumulative effects, this is being considered and will be assessed as appropriate through the EIA process.</p> |
| <p>Draft Documents</p> | <p>The Inspectorate advised that the applicant should consider finalising its consultation programme (Adequacy of</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| | <p>Consultation Milestone (AoCM)), including any subsequent targeted consultation following the statutory consultation, before submitting draft documents for review. Submitting more advanced versions of documents can support more meaningful advice from the Inspectorate.</p> |
| <p>Consultees for the non-statutory consultation of July / August 2024 (routeing options)</p> | <p>The applicant carried out a localised non-statutory consultation on the routeing options within a targeted consultation zone. This localised consultation zone and therefore the consultees within it were not identical to the earlier non-statutory public consultation, with some not being consulted on this occasion, and other new parties being consulted for the first time.</p> <p>The applicant advised that this approach has been taken to ensure the affected communities and relevant consultees affected by each corridor were provided with equal consultation opportunities. The same parameters were applied to identifying the consultation zones for both the non-statutory consultation 2023 and localised non-statutory consultation 2024 and consultation strategies were shared and consulted on with the host local planning authorities in advance of consultation.</p> <p>The Inspectorate advised that the applicant should clearly explain its approach to identifying the consultees for the non-statutory consultation in the AoCM and Consultation Report.</p> |
| <p>Consultation Overlap</p> | <p>The Inspectorate advised that in situations where the applicant is aware of other projects carrying out consultation in the same vicinity, it should try to minimise consultation overlap. This will assist the local communities (to reduce misunderstanding over discrete projects) and will also be beneficial for the resources of local authorities. It is also important for the applicant to be aware of other project timescales, and seek to avoid examination overlap, where possible.</p> |
| <p>S46 Notification</p> | <p>The applicant advised that it plans to commence an 8 week statutory consultation between February and April 2025 and that all host local authorities have been consulted on the draft SoCC.</p> <p>The Inspectorate advised that the s46 notification must be provided either before, or on the date on which the statutory consultation commences.</p> |
| <p>Route Corridor</p> | <p>The Inspectorate asked if the route optionality would be a topic for statutory consultation.</p> <p>The applicant confirmed that the corridor would not be the subject of statutory consultation as they will present a preferred route alignment. The applicant explained that the</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>preferred corridor had been identified and consulted on during non-statutory consultation 2023, with the potential alternative corridor consulted on during localised non-statutory consultation 2024. Following this an overall corridor decision has been made and a preferred route alignment identified. This would be described in the statutory consultation documents. There will be opportunity to provide feedback on and request changes to the preferred route alignment during statutory consultation. The applicant will also continue to review previous work, including the selection of the preferred corridor.</p> |
| <p>Substations</p> | <p>The applicant confirmed that the project will connect to two new substations, at Birkhill Wood and High Marnham. These substations had previously not been part of the proposed development and are progressing under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) (TCPA). However, the applicant now intends to include the substations in the DCO application and will be presented in the statutory consultation materials.</p> <p>There have also been consultation exercises undertaken in relation to the substations outside of the DCO consultations.</p> <p>There will be powers sought to build the substations under the TCPA, but they will remain as a component of the DCO as a precautionary measure.</p> <p>If one, or both, of the applications for the substations are granted prior to the application for a DCO and land rights secured, then they could be removed. Works at the substations to allow connection would remain in the DCO in any event.</p> <p>The applicant will continue to keep the Inspectorate updated to provide clarity under various scenarios.</p> <p>The Inspectorate understands the applicant's position and acknowledges that this approach is not unique to this project.</p> |
| <p>Substations in context of scoping opinion</p> | <p>The Inspectorate advised that it is not uncommon for project descriptions to change between scoping and submission. Scoping is not mandatory; however, the EIA Regulations do require an Environmental Statement (ES) to be 'based on' the most recent scoping opinion. On the basis that the applicant does not intend to re-scope, the Inspectorate advises that the ES should detail how the project description and the scope of the assessment has changed and provide evidence of agreement with key consultees. If additional project components are included, we would anticipate that the assessment would incorporate additional elements as opposed to not including elements that were required within the scoping opinion. However, if there are requirements in</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>the scoping opinion that have not been addressed then the applicant should provide clear justification for this and evidence of any agreement with the relevant stakeholders.</p> <p>At acceptance, the Inspectorate would consider whether the ES is based on the adopted scoping opinion where the development is broadly as was previously described and would check that there is adequate information to understand the environmental effects of any additional features or changes. The Inspectorate cannot comment on the adequacy of an ES prior to submissions of an application.</p> |
| <p>Potential delays to the examination process</p> | <p>The applicant asked if the Inspectorate could provide any comfort towards a short (circa 3 months) pre-examination period.</p> <p>The Inspectorate advised that the length of pre-examination period is determined by factors outside of the Inspectorate's control. The following were cited as having the potential to avoid a prolonged pre-examination period:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sticking to the application submission date. • Presenting a high-quality application, reducing any need for post acceptance s51 advice. • Progressing land agreements and protective provisions ahead of the submission of the application. • Minimising the likelihood of a change request, especially one which may trigger the compulsory aquation regulations. <p>As such, whilst the Inspectorate cannot commit to a set pre-examination period, as some matters are outside of its control, the pre-examination period will not be unnecessarily prolonged.</p> <p>The Inspectorate highlighted the recent webinar held in relation to good design for NSIPs. This builds on the good design advice page. The applicant should demonstrate its regard to these in its design documents submitted with the DCO application.</p> |
| <p>Mitigation hierarchy</p> | <p>Whilst EN-1 also sets out that there is a critical national priority (CNP) for the provision of nationally significant low carbon infrastructure, it is important that the applicant clearly demonstrates how the mitigation hierarchy has been applied, and relevant Statutory Nature Conservation Bodies agreement with the approaches taken, in the application documents.</p> |

| Topic | Meeting date: 21 May 2025 |
|---|---|
| Adequacy of Consultation Milestone | <p>The Inspectorate advised the applicant, when preparing its Adequacy of Consultation Milestone document, to be aware of the pre-application guidance which explains that the document should be a brief summary statement of the elements of consultation that have been carried out, including the views from local authorities; it should not be a large document.</p> |
| Adequacy of Consultation Milestone - Timing | <p>The applicant noted there may be opportunity to submit the Adequacy of Consultation Milestone (AoCM) earlier than the three months suggested in the Pre-Application Prospectus depending on any further requirement for additional consultation which is still under consideration by the Applicant. The Inspectorate advised the applicant to consider submitting the Adequacy of Consultation Milestone (AoCM) and draft documents for review after all consultation had been completed to ensure that more advanced versions of the documents were available to facilitate the provision of more insightful and comprehensive comments to the applicant in respect to the application documents.</p> |
| Draft documents – submission method | <p>The applicant enquired about the methods of submission to be followed for the draft document review. It is noted by the Inspectorate that draft documents are not likely to be submitted for review until 2026 and that the requirements may be subject to change, and it indicated that it could provide more certainty over the position as it develops over the time leading up to the submission of documents.</p> <p>The Inspectorate indicated that file sharing was an option currently, but that there would be some requirements that would be needed to be met in relation to log in details and the use of authentication software, as well as a trial run ahead of the formal submission of the documents.</p> |
| Draft documents - timescales | <p>The Inspectorate noted the desire by the applicant to ensure that they provided as comprehensive and complete documents for review as part of the draft documents review whilst ensuring they have sufficient time following receipt of the Inspectorate’s feedback to make any necessary updates and that this was a factor in their suggested programming.</p> <p>The Inspectorate reminded the applicant that the pre-application prospectus set out that a six-week turnaround period for the provision of draft document feedback rather than the currently indicated four-weeks included in the programme document. Whilst the Inspectorate will endeavour to deliver review feedback as quickly as practical,</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>it cannot commit to doing so within four weeks and as such the programme document should be updated accordingly. .</p> |
| <p>Habitat Regulation Assessment and other draft document review documents</p> | <p>The applicant made the Inspectorate aware that there was a likelihood that not all information would be available in time for inclusion in the version of documents submitted at the point of the draft document review. The Inspectorate noted this and advised the applicant that the best value can be attained from draft documents review taking place with documents that are as mature as possible. The Inspectorate advised the applicant to make it clear what information was missing in the draft documents when submitted. It also advised the applicant to highlight specific areas on which they would be seeking feedback.</p> |
| <p>Engagement with stakeholders and persons with an interest in land</p> | <p>The Inspectorate enquired about engagement with local stakeholders including the developers of projects in proximity to the North Humber to High Marnham project and local authorities. The Inspectorate also enquired about the level of engagement from parties with interests in land, for example in areas with unregistered and potentially unknown land rights. The applicant confirmed that engagement had continued with local authorities and that there had been a good level of engagement with persons with an interest in land, particularly as a response to the posting of site notices in areas with unknown or unregistered land interests. The Inspectorate advised the applicant to use the detailed land rights tracker which is available in the prospectus to help keep track of land subject to compulsory acquisition.</p> <p>The Inspectorate asked for an update regarding progress with Crown land interests. The applicant confirmed that it was in the process of engaging with the crown and shall provide an update in the next meeting. The Inspectorate advised of the importance of progressing this matter ahead of the submission of the application.</p> |
| <p>Interrelationships with other Infrastructure Projects</p> | <p>The Inspectorate raised the matter of interrelationships between this project and projects located near the indicated route. The Steeple Renewables Project, which is currently in the acceptance stage and One Earth Solar Farm which is currently in the pre-examination stage are two projects that the Applicant confirmed they are engaging with regarding interactions between projects.</p> <p>The Inspectorate enquired if the applicant had considered the use of an Interrelationships report or a section of an existing document to set out how this scheme and nearby schemes relate to each other. It was suggested by the Inspectorate that the applicant may wish to consider this and take a view on whether this would be beneficial for their</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| | project. It was noted that this had been requested on some recent examinations, for example on the Cottam Solar Project, Gate Burton Energy Park and West Burton Solar Project, Morgan Offshore Wind Project: Generation Assets and the Morecambe Offshore Windfarm Generation Assets. |
| Possible Local Government reorganisation in Lincolnshire and Nottinghamshire | The Inspectorate raised to the attention of the applicant the English Devolution White Paper and the currently under discussion future local government re-organisation in two-tier counties such as Lincolnshire and Nottinghamshire. The applicant was advised that they may wish to consider the implications for their scheme in the run up and following any potential reorganisation to local government structures, and as considered appropriate are accounted for in their application documentation. Although the examination may take place prior to a possible reorganisation, the timescales of development according to the current programme may overlap with the second round of changes expected to take effect on 1 April 2028, on the currently envisaged date. |
| Provision of information on the latest position on associated or nearby proposals | The applicant provided the Inspectorate with an update with respect to associated or relevant proposed developments located near to the North Humber to High Marnham project. The applicant was encouraged by the Inspectorate to ensure the latest information is available to a future appointed Examining Authority or other Examining Authorities for other schemes as more information becomes available. |
| Submission Date | The applicant confirmed that the application for a Development Consent Order is anticipated to be submitted in summer 2026. The Inspectorate advised that it would be helpful if the applicant could narrow down a specific month for the submission of the application, to aid with resourcing. |
| Linear advice page | The Inspectorate advised the applicant of the importance of demonstrating regard with the recently published linear advice page, as well as the good design advice, when preparing its application. |
| Topic | Meeting date: 13 November 2025 |
| Draft Documents | The Inspectorate advised that the applicant should provide clarity on the type of documents intended for submission as part of the draft document review. The applicant confirmed that all documents typically expected at this stage are planned to be included. The Inspectorate noted that the more comprehensive the draft documents, the more detailed advice can be provided. The Inspectorate further advised that a cover letter should accompany the draft documents. This should identify any |

| | |
|---|--|
| | sections that are incomplete to ensure comments are not made on areas the applicant intends to complete later. |
| Summary of lessons learned from other cases | <p>The Inspectorate advised that the applicant should consider drawing on lessons learned from previously examined applications across National Grid's portfolio of projects, such as Norwich and Tilbury, when developing the approach for this application and the development of draft documents for review. This will help identify what has worked well and what mitigation might be capable of being applied to similar issues.</p> <p>The Inspectorate recommended that these changes and lessons should be summarised in a cover letter accompanying the draft documents. The cover letter should highlight any changes to approach and reference the cases that informed those changes.</p> |
| Programme Document | <p>The Inspectorate advised the applicant that it could continue to use its current template and structure for the Programme Document given the advanced stage of the project at pre-application. The Inspectorate's updated 2024 Pre-application Prospectus has introduced a new Programme Document template for projects entering pre-application from November 2025.</p> <p>The Inspectorate advised that the November version of the applicant's Programme Document continues to contain the expected content as set out at paragraph 10 of the government's guidance on the pre-application stage. However, it would be helpful to the Inspectorate and other parties if the main issues section could contain high level content on any agreements reached with relevant statutory parties in relation to the applicant's proposed methodology as well as any survey outputs and / or proposed mitigation, as well as identifying any historic environment assets or other sensitive receptors such as airfields that are proposed to be assessed. This assists the Inspectorate to have a good understanding of the landscape features, receptors and constraints along the proposed development corridor, and whether there are any outstanding issues that might require resolution before the application is submitted and thus what useful advice the Inspectorate might be able to provide under s51 of the Planning Act 2008. This content is also particularly relevant in the absence of an Issues Tracker.</p> |
| Interrelationship with other NSIPs | The applicant provided the Inspectorate with an update on interrelationships between the North Humber to High Marnham project and nearby projects that are subject to development consent order applications. The Inspectorate indicated that providing an interrelationship document |

| | |
|---|---|
| | <p>outlining challenges and communications with other NSIPs for review as part of the pre-application service may be of value for this project.</p> <p>The Inspectorate advised that applicant may wish to consider the inclusion in such an interrelationships report, projects to be consented via the Town and Country Planning regime as well as Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIPs) that are seen to be relevant for the application for North Humber to High Marnham. The Inspectorate referenced solar cases around Gainsborough and in offshore wind cases in the Irish Sea. The Inspectorate referenced the Morgan Offshore Wind Project: Generation Assets as a case where developments which were both NSIP and non NSIP schemes had been included in a report setting out the interrelationships with other infrastructure projects. It was pointed out that lessons from that case may help inform the approach for the North Humber to High Marnham project.</p> |
| The Crown Estate and associated British Ports | The Inspectorate advised that the applicant must not forget to ensure all necessary rights and approvals are obtained from The Crown Estate at the appropriate stage. Securing these agreements early will help avoid delays later in the process and ensure compliance with statutory requirements. |
| Hearing Venues | The Inspectorate advised that, due to the high volume of applications within the relevant local authorities, some NSIP examinations have needed to be delayed owing to a lack of venue availability for hearings. Applicants should start planning and securing suitable venues at the earliest opportunity, where feasible. |
| Topic | Advice date: 21 November 2025 |
| Important information about updates to our pre-application services | <p>Following a 6-month review of our services, our Pre-application Prospectus has been updated: 2024 Pre-application Prospectus. The update log at the bottom of the page summarises the changes and clarifications that have been applied.</p> <p>As an applicant with a live project at the pre-application stage of the process, please familiarise yourself with the update and consider how it might affect your pre-application programme and interaction with our services.</p> <p>Please note in particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the establishment of land and rights negotiations tracking as a primary service feature – this means it is now expected for all applicants to develop and share a land and right negotiations tracker in 1 of 2 available |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>templates, irrespective of the service tier they have subscribed to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> clarified expectations of applicants when preparing to interact with the Inspectorate at meetings – including clarified rights for the Inspectorate to delay or refuse service where pre-meeting expectations are not upheld e.g. an updated programme document or issues tracker is not provided, on time, to inform a meeting agenda <p>This communication has been recorded as section 51 advice in the project’s advice log.</p> |
| Topic | Meeting date: 11 February 2026 |
| Land and Rights | <p>The Inspectorate advised that the Land and Rights Tracker at pre-application is intended to provide an overview of the extent of land required, the progress made (to date) with voluntary agreements, and identifying any issues or risks ahead of the examination. This will help the Inspectorate to provide any meaningful s51 advice on the issues raised. The applicant said it plans to include a dashboard to provide a clear overview of progress, when it shares its tracker at the next meeting.</p> |
| Draft documents and application submission | <p>The Inspectorate said the applicant could use SharePoint or email for sending its draft documents for review. However, the Inspectorate is developing an applications portal as part of its wider website improvements, which will be in use by the intended application submission date of September 2026. The Inspectorate would provide relevant details about how to use the new portal, before submission.</p> <p>When sending draft documents for review, the applicant should set out in a covering letter or notes to individual documents, a summary of any intentionally omitted content (specifying where / which sections of the documents are awaiting substantive updates). This will allow the Inspectorate’s team to understand the reasons for the omissions and general state of preparedness of the documents, when undertaking its review. The Inspectorate added that the more comprehensive the draft documents are, the more detailed s51 advice can be given.</p> <p>The Inspectorate added that it is also helpful to examinations if applicants could signpost to cases where any previously accepted approaches or mitigation and/or standards from relevant made DCOs are being relied upon, as well as any particular lessons learned on applications.</p> |

| | |
|----------------------|---|
| | The Inspectorate also stated that it did not consider any potential industrial action would affect its services. |
| Issues Tracker | In developing the Issues Tracker at pre-application, the applicant was advised to clearly denote any areas of current disagreement or undecided matters as 'red' or 'amber' when applying the RAG rating. This will help to clearly separate those main principal issues that are subject to ongoing stakeholder engagement and agreement, from those that have been resolved (for example where relevant parties have agreed the applicant's approach to (and scope of) its surveys, data gathering and assessments). Applicants should also include the anticipated timescale for concluding any unresolved issues with the relevant statutory parties, within its Issues Tracker. |
| Unlicensed airfields | The Inspectorate advised the applicant to review any relevant Examining Authority questions from recent examinations where the assessment and mitigation of impacts to airfields has been relevant (such as the 'Botley West Solar' and the 'Norwich to Tilbury Overhead Connection' applications). The applicant said that it was reviewing such material while carrying out its assessments and consultation with nearby unlicensed airfield operators as well as with the General Aviation Awareness Council. The applicant aims to produce Statements of Common Grounds with any affected parties. |
| Programme Document | The Inspectorate has reviewed the latest version of the programme document, which appears to have been updated in line with the comments provided previously by the Inspectorate. The applicant will need to upload the latest version of the Programme Document on its website, as soon as practicable. |
| AOB | <p>The Inspectorate commented that the applicant's draft Document Deliverables List looked comprehensive and in line with the expected indexing of application documents. The applicant was referred to the Inspectorate's published 'Advice on the Preparation and Submission of Application Documents' which was updated in December 2025, along with the application indexing spreadsheet. However, the applications portal was being developed; any expected or significant changes to the ordering of application documents from the new portal as well as file sizes would be shared at the next project update meeting.</p> <p>The Inspectorate also commented on the applicant's list of potential venues and advised on suitability and accessibility. The Inspectorate also commented that the applicant's plan to submit an overarching glossary and abbreviations documents was acceptable.</p> |

| Topic | Meeting date: 27 April 2026 |
|--|--|
| Draft document submission | <p>The Inspectorate advised that the maximum file size for documents is 1GB, but applicants should consider the file sizes, background mapping and plan layer rendering of certain documents, to ensure relevant landmark features are denoted in relation to the proposed development and usability is ensured (such as the ability to open multiple plans at the same time on screen). Please see the post-acceptance s51 advice issued for Fosse Green Energy [s51 advice following acceptance letter].</p> <p>Additionally, in order to ensure that examination documents are accessible to all stakeholders, the Inspectorate advised that for the submission of the application, the document title field should be completed for all documents, as this allows for utilisation by assistive software, such as a screen reader.</p> <p>The Inspectorate also advised that any comments from the relevant local authorities (including neighbouring authorities) should be appended to the Adequacy of Consultation Milestone (AoCR) statement. This will help to evidence any concerns with consultation and could help identify the need for any further targeted consultation.</p> |
| Planning and Infrastructure Act implementation | <p>The applicant asked for an update on the progress of the implementation of the Planning and Infrastructure Act (PIA 2005) and what impacts this may have on the proposed development.</p> <p>The Inspectorate advised the most up to date information is the policy paper published on 23 March 2026, entitled Streamlining infrastructure planning implementation plan.</p> <p>The Inspectorate highlighted that this document states that ‘DCO applications prepared against the current pre-application and acceptance legislative regime and guidance and submitted for acceptance after the relevant PIA 2025 amendments commence, will be assessed under the new pre-application and acceptance test regime, save for any transitional provisions’.</p> <p>Further advice shall be issued by the government in due course, but at this point the Inspectorate is unable to provide further advice on the timeline for implementation of PIA 2025.</p> |
| Survey data | <p>The Inspectorate advised that the Environmental Statement (ES) should be as complete as possible at the point of application and that it is the applicant’s risk to</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>submit where surveys are incomplete. It advised the applicant to set out any survey limitations and resulting assumptions made within the ES and to seek agreement with relevant consultation bodies that the survey coverage baseline has been established sufficiently for examination.</p> |
| <p>Multi-centre hearings and learning from other cases where this has been used.</p> | <p>The applicant asked the Inspectorate about the experience with split location and simultaneous hearings as undertaken as part of the Norwich to Tilbury examination.</p> <p>Post meeting advice: It is recognised that this can be a resource intensive approach to examination but that this may be an option where the needs of the case justify such an approach. Whilst this approach does provide some benefits in terms of proximity of hearings to parties for linear scheme there are also resulting challenges for attendance of parties at examination events. This would be a matter for an appointed Examining Authority to decide, and the Inspectorate is not able at this time to provide guidance on this point.</p> |