

Lincolnshire Reservoir

Section 51 Advice Log Version: 1 July 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 Planning Inspectorate to the applicant Anglian Water and their consultants during the pre-application stage. It will be updated by The Planning 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 Planning Inspectorate's draft record of advice before it is published.

The applicant will use this advice log as the basis for demonstrating regard to s51 advice within the application.

Lincolnshire Reservoir s51 Advice Log - Index	
Date of meeting	Meeting overview
<u>05 October 2022</u>	Inception Meeting
<u>9 May 2023</u>	Project Update Meeting
<u>5 March 2024</u>	Project Update Meeting
<u>30 July 2024</u>	Project update Meeting
<u>6 December 2024</u>	Section 51 advice regarding the Programme Document
<u>23 July 2025</u>	Project Update Meeting
<u>23 October 2025</u>	Pre-application Prospectus update
<u>9 June 2026</u>	Project Update Meeting

Lincolnshire Reservoir - s51 Advice Library

Topic	Meeting date: 23 July 2025
Service Tier	<p>The Inspectorate conveyed that most solar projects are subscribed to its basic service tier and most reservoir projects are on its standard tier. The Inspectorate advised that the standard tier was appropriate for the Lincolnshire Reservoir project.</p> <p>The applicant queried the appropriateness of the tier given they were not fully engaging in the pre-application services presently. The Inspectorate advised the applicant that it could decide to change level of service to 'basic' and/or 'enhanced', however they must provide the Inspectorate with 3 months' notice. The Inspectorate noted, however, that the applicant should consider what is appropriate for its project and make this clear in its programme document. The Inspectorate advised that if the applicant does not subscribe to a tier then it will not consider the project as registered with the Inspectorate, which could lead to the project page being de-registered and/or removed from the National Infrastructure website.</p>
Invoicing Periods	<p>The Inspectorate explained that the applicant would be invoiced in six-month periods and that it was up to the applicant to determine how to utilise the service during each period. This would typically occur twice a year, in April and October.</p> <p>It advised that if fees were not paid, the Inspectorate will not provide the pre-application service. The applicant speculated whether it could voluntarily put the project on hold due to it not requiring services from the Inspectorate during the next invoicing period. The Inspectorate advised against this approach as the applicant must confirm a service tier to avoid the project being deregistered, which could cause confusion for stakeholders and the public, should the project be removed from the National Infrastructure website. The Inspectorate advised that the applicant could request going to 'basic' service tier level, providing reasoning for this decision and also reflecting this within their programme document. The Applicant should also consider the risks associated to the service provided at this level from the Inspectorate. Following a formal request of service tier change, 3 months in advance, the Inspectorate would decide if it deemed the decision appropriate for the project.</p>

<p>Programme Document</p>	<p>The Inspectorate advised the applicant to include any future project update meetings within its programme document to ensure adequate resource is available from the Inspectorate to provide effective advice at the meeting.</p> <p>The Inspectorate encouraged the applicant to refer to the Fens Reservoir project's programme document as a good example of the level of detail and structure the Inspectorate expects. The applicant noted that the Fens programme document was prepared for a project under the 'enhanced tier' so includes details on elements with the Inspectorate that would not be relevant to the Lincolnshire project, which is currently at an earlier stage in the process and on the 'standard' tier. The Inspectorate also advised the applicant to review the advice provided on the Fens Reservoir project's programme document for further guidance. The applicant was also encouraged to make their programme documents publicly available.</p>
<p>Temple Oaks Renewable Energy Park Project</p>	<p>The Inspectorate informed the applicant that the Temple Oaks Renewable Energy Park project has officially been withdrawn from the Inspectorate's pre-application service.</p>
<p>Weston Marsh to East Leicestershire Overhead Line (OHL) Project</p>	<p>The Inspectorate enquired whether the project had any interaction with National Grid's proposed Weston Marsh to East Leicestershire OHL Project, which had recently held an inception meeting. The applicant confirmed that early engagement had started with the Weston Mash team and that a shapefile had been requested to better understand the overlap. The applicant confirmed that at present it looked as though the pipeline could bisect the proposed OHL, although given the early stages of both projects, the location of this overlap is not yet certain. The applicant reassured the Inspectorate that once the pipeline route is confirmed, it will be able to consider what protective provisions may be necessary. It proposed to coordinate with National Grid to discuss how potential cumulative impacts might be minimised.</p>
<p>Crown Estate Land</p>	<p>The Inspectorate emphasised the importance of engaging with the Crown Estate early in the pre-application process to help avoid potential delays as experienced with the decided Heckington Fen Solar application. The applicant confirmed that the Crown Estate has been positively engaging with the applicant with the aim of negotiations being finalised prior to submission of the application.</p>

Project Webpage	<p>The Inspectorate requested that the applicant provide a specific month and year for its DCO submission so the project webpage can be updated accordingly. It explained that this is a corporate requirement to ensure consistency across projects and to support effective resourcing. The Inspectorate also asked the applicant to review the project description on the National Infrastructure website to ensure it aligns with the description used in the applicant’s programme document.</p> <p>The applicant explained that given the significant timeframe before application submission and the complexity of the project, providing a month for submission would indicate a false degree of accuracy. The applicant noted that providing a month for submission in over 3 years time would likely be inaccurate and it would be more accurate to suggest Q4 2028/Q1 2029 at this early stage, The Inspectorate acknowledged the challenges, but noted that it would still be preferred to state a month and that it was asking all applicants to provide this information.</p>
Scoping Opinion timescales	<p>The Inspectorate acknowledged that the scoping request would not be submitted in the near future. However, it advised the applicant to keep the Inspectorate informed as the anticipated submission date for scoping becomes clearer. This will ensure the Inspectorate can allocate appropriate resources.</p>
Pre-application Service Feedback	<p>The applicant asked about the outcome of the feedback it had submitted regarding the Inspectorate’s pre-application service. The Inspectorate explained that the feedback is currently being compiled and, once complete, will be shared with the relevant parties. The timescale for when this will be communicated remains tentative.</p>
Post-Meeting Programme Document Feedback	<p>When sufficient information is available, the Inspectorate advises that an updated programme document incorporating the information set out in Ref Nos. 4, 6, 8, 9, 10 and 12 of our section 51 advice on the 10 July 2024 programme document (issued 6 December 2024).</p> <p>The programme document refers to Water Framework Directive (WFD) meetings and assessment. The programme document should include a draft programme for the preparation of the WFD assessment report. If there is a potential need for derogations under the WFD Regulations, it would assist if relevant details can be included in the draft programme including meetings scheduled and the development of Principal Areas of Disagreement Summary</p>

	<p>Statements. The applicant should make effort to agree the draft programme with the relevant statutory body.</p> <p>Paragraph 2.3.20 of the programme document refers to an internal issues tracker. It would be helpful to know to what extent the applicant intends to share this document with the Inspectorate during the pre-application period to inform understanding of environmental issues, and if that will form the basis of the Principal Main Issues for Examination.</p>
--	---

Lincolnshire Reservoir - s51 Advice Library

Topic	Advice date: 23 October 2025
--------------	-------------------------------------

Email Advice	<p>IMPORTANT INFORMATION ABOUT UPDATES TO OUR PRE-APPLICATION SERVICES</p> <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. 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 templates, irrespective of the service tier they have subscribed to • 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>Please note that as stated in the Pre-application Prospectus a public version of the pre-application programme document must be published on the applicant’s website. Updates to the pre-application programme document should be communicated by the applicant proactively, with a clear description of the potential impacts on the requested services of the Inspectorate, relevant statutory bodies, local</p>
---------------------	--

	<p>authorities and other stakeholders provided. As a minimum, it is expected for an updated programme document to be provided to the Inspectorate at least 10 working days before each programmed interaction with us.</p>
Lincolnshire Reservoir - s51 Advice Library	
Topic	Meeting date: 9 June 2026
<p>Programme Update – product design</p>	<p>The Inspectorate advised that design alternatives are examined in detail during the examination stage; therefore, it is essential that all reasonable alternatives are robustly and comprehensively assessed prior to submission of the Development Consent Order (DCO) application.</p> <p>The Inspectorate also advised the applicant to familiarise themselves with, and have regard to, the relevant advice on good design throughout the design development process, in particular the guidance set out in Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects: Advice on Good Design - GOV.UK.</p>
<p>Existing 132kV overhead line diversion</p>	<p>The Inspectorate advised that, should the thresholds change as the project progresses, the application must clearly set out the reasoning as to whether the existing 132kV overhead line diversion should or should not be considered a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project. The applicant was also advised to ensure compliance with the relevant regulations and requirements applicable to different types of development under the Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009). In addition, the applicant should remain mindful of any forthcoming regulatory changes.</p>
<p>Consultation 3 (CON3)</p>	<p>The Inspectorate reminded the applicant of the consultation requirements and the forthcoming changes to those requirements. The applicant confirmed that it will adapt its approach accordingly.</p>
<p>CON3 and Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Scoping</p>	<p>Regarding the applicant’s proposal for a 3 week overlap with its CON3 and EIA scoping, the Inspectorate advised that it would be preferable to separate the consultations, noting the potential risk of confusion between the 2 processes, and for consultation bodies to respond to the wrong consultation. It is important for the Inspectorate to receive responses to the EIA scoping consultation from the prescribed bodies in line with the statutory timescales so that these can be properly</p>

	<p>considered prior to adoption of a scoping opinion. The Inspectorate advised the applicant to have procedure in place to identify and forward any responses it received relating to scoping. The Inspectorate may receive responses to the scoping consultation from parties that are not prescribed bodies, which would require clarification to those parties. The Inspectorate noted the applicant's programme may require it to proceed with the overlap and advised that its proposals to manage this should help to minimise the identified risks.</p>
<p>EIA Scoping</p>	<p>Regarding the applicant's confirmation that at the point of submission of its request for an EIA scoping opinion optionality would remain in respect of several components of the proposed development, the Inspectorate advised that this is common for NSIP projects and would provide an opportunity for the prescribed consultees to give advice on the options proposed. The Inspectorate advised that the EIA scoping request should clearly explain the options and associated parameters, and how it is proposed to narrow optionality as part of the EIA. It advised that where there is a lot of optionality this may affect the Inspectorate's ability to agree to scope matter out of the environmental statement (ES).</p> <p>The Inspectorate provided advice to the applicant on the practicalities for the submission of the EIA scoping request including the requirement for a GIS shapefile 10 working days' in advance of the request. Information is available in the Inspectorate's advice note seven: environmental impact assessment: process, preliminary environmental information and environmental statements.</p>
<p>Next steps</p>	<p>The Inspectorate advised that it would be helpful to receive meeting slides, an issues tracker and any questions in advance of future project update meetings, to enable it to identify and prepare the advice the applicant may require. It also noted that updates on RAPID gateway discussions, as well as engagement with Natural England and the Environment Agency, would be beneficial.</p> <p>The Inspectorate further advised the applicant of the 3 month notice period required for any change in tier level.</p> <p>The Inspectorate and the applicant agreed that the next project update meeting will take place in early February 2027.</p>