



Application by INGR Solar (Little Crow) Limited for Little Crow Solar Park
The Examining Authority's written questions and requests for information (ExQ1)
Issued on Tuesday 27 April 2021

The following table sets out the Examining Authority's (ExA's) written questions and requests for information - ExQ1. 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 ExQ2.

Questions are set out using an issues-based framework derived from the Initial Assessment of Principal Issues provided as Annexe B to the Rule 6 letter of 23 March 2021. 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 (IPs) and other persons each question is directed to. The ExA would be grateful if all 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 1 (indicating that it is from ExQ1) and then has an issue number and a question number. For example, the first question on air quality and emissions issues is identified as Q1.1.1. 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 littlecrowsolarpark@planninginspectorate.gov.uk and include 'Little Crow Solar Park' in the subject line of your email.

Responses are due by Deadline 2: Monday 24 May 2021.

Abbreviations used:

PA2008	The Planning Act 2008	LIR	Local Impact Report
Art	Article	LPA	Local planning authority
BNG	Biodiversity net gain	MWp	Megawatt peak
BoR	Book of Reference	NSIP	Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project
CPO	Compulsory purchase order		
EIA Regulations	The Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017		
EM	Explanatory Memorandum	SoCG	Statement of Common Ground
ES	Environmental Statement	SoS	Secretary of State
ExA	Examining Authority		

The Examination Library

References in these questions set out in square brackets (eg [APP-010]) are to documents catalogued in the Examination Library. The Examination Library can be obtained from the following link:

<https://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/wp-content/ipc/uploads/projects/EN010101/EN010101-000374-Little%20Crow%20Solar%20Park%20-%20Examination%20Library.pdf>

It will be updated as the examination progresses.

Citation of Questions

Questions in this table should be cited as follows:

Question reference: issue reference: question number, eg ExQ1 1.1.1 – refers to question 1 in this table.

ExQ1: Tuesday 27 April 2021

Responses due by Deadline 2: Monday 24 May 2021

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
<p>1. General and Cross-topic Questions, including general matters relating to the Environmental Statement</p>		
<p>1.1.1</p>	<p>Anglian Water, Environment Agency, Historic England, Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust, Natural England, North Lincolnshire Council, Northern Powergrid and Public Health England</p>	<p>Background</p> <p>The Applicant intends to conclude Statements of Common Ground (SoCG) with you prior to the close of the Examination for the submitted application. In that regard the Applicant has submitted draft SoCG between you and it in which the Proposed Development has been described as being for a solar park with a 'maximum design capacity of up to 150MWp and a battery storage capacity of up to 90MW' [paragraph 2.1 of APP-112, APP-113, APP-114, APP-116, APP-117, APP-118, APP-119 and APP-120]. Various of the submitted application documents, including Chapter 4 of the ES [APP-061] refer to the Proposed Development having a generating capacity with a range of between 150 and 200 MWp.</p> <p>Question</p> <p>With respect to your particular matters of interest, please comment on what, if any, implications there would be if the generating capacity for the Proposed Development exceeded 150MWp but was no more than 200 MWp.</p>
<p>1.1.2</p>	<p>The Applicant</p>	<p>Please explain in non-technical terms what the following parts of paragraph 4.6.3 and accompanying footnote 3 in Chapter 4 of the Environmental Statement (ES) [APP-061] means:</p> <p><i>'... Being able to absorb and release energy, the battery energy storage system at Little Crow can be used to contribute towards the frequency balancing services, where the power is being generated or absorbed statically or dynamically depending on the system frequency. When there is not enough power, batteries are discharged to balance under frequency preventing black and brown outs. To balance over frequency batteries are charged to prevent dangerous spikes across electricity infrastructure.'</i></p>

ExQ1: Tuesday 27 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: Monday 24 May 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
1.1.3	The Applicant	<p>If solar panel technology was to advance so that panels of a higher rating than the candidate panels of 420 watts could be used, what implications might that have for the land take and layout for the Proposed Development?</p> <p>(If the Applicant's answer to this question is covered in the explanatory note to be submitted at Deadline 1 in response to the first action point arising out of the holding of Issue Specific Hearing 1, then please provide a cross reference to the part of the aforementioned note that addresses the matter raised in this question.)</p>
1.1.4	The Applicant	<p>At paragraph 4.22.2 of Chapter 4 (Development Proposal) of the ES [APP-061] it is stated:</p> <p><i>'With regards to renewable energy, the principal methods of considering alternatives is through the site selection process ...'</i></p> <p>What is the source for that proposition?</p>
1.1.5	The Applicant	<p>If a point of connection to the electrical grid was not available within the Order Limits, would the site for the Proposed Development be a suitable location for a solar park of the intended generating capacity?</p> <p>(If the Applicant's answer to this question is covered in the explanatory note to be submitted at Deadline 1 in response to the first action point arising out of the holding of Issue Specific Hearing 1, then please provide a cross reference to the part of the aforementioned note that addresses the matter raised in this question.)</p>
1.1.6	The Applicant	<p>With respect to the generation of electricity, for generating technologies other than solar please provide estimates for the land take requirements for each technology for a generating capacity of between 150 and 200 MW.</p>
1.1.7	The Applicant	<p>Given that the National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy Infrastructure (EN-3) does not cover solar energy generation, for all of the electricity currently generated by renewable and non-renewable sources in England and Wales:</p>

ExQ1: Tuesday 27 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: Monday 24 May 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>a) On a daily basis what is the power output (expressed in a suitable wattage unit) for each of the technologies that are presently being used and what is the proportional split between each of those technologies?</p> <p>b) In percentage terms what would 150 to 200 MW of additional generating capacity represent as an increase to the existing daily generating capacity?</p>
1.1.8	The Applicant, North Lincolnshire Council and the owners and occupiers of Heron Lodge	Under a 'do nothing' scenario for the Proposed Development, where might 150 to 200 MW of electricity be generated as an alternative to the Proposed Development? Is there previously developed land in the area that could be used as an alternative to the Order Limits?
1.1.9	The Applicant	<p>With respect to the assessment of the cumulative and in-combination effects for the Proposed Development and other projects (developments) included in the constituent chapters of the ES:</p> <p>a) Chapter 10 (Agricultural Circumstances) of the ES [APP-067] does not include an assessment of the cumulative and in-combination effects with other projects, such an assessment should be submitted.</p> <p>b) Has the assessment of the cumulative and in-combination effects with other projects been restricted only to consideration of other solar energy schemes? If not, then please identify which other projects have been considered?</p> <p>c) If the assessment of the cumulative and in-combination effects with other projects has been restricted to the consideration of only solar energy schemes, does that approach meet the requirements of The Infrastructure Planning (Environmental</p>

ExQ1: Tuesday 27 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: Monday 24 May 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (the EIA Regulations) for the inclusion of information within an ES?</p> <p>d) If the assessment of the cumulative and in-combination effects is considered not to meet the requirements of the EIA Regulations, please explain how the ES as a whole or its constituent parts could be revised to address the deficiency.</p>
1.1.10	North Lincolnshire Council	With respect to the description of the likely effects on the environment stated in the submitted ES, and having regard to the requirements of Regulation 14(2)(b) and paragraph 5 of Schedule 4 of the EIA Regulations, are there any existing or proposed developments that it is considered should have been included in the Applicant's assessment of the cumulative and in-combination effects for the Proposed Development?
1.1.11	The Applicant	Please explain how significant major accidents and disasters have been defined in the ES (i.e. significance threshold) with reference to relevant significance criteria.
1.1.12	The Applicant	The assessment of major accidents and disaster does not consider potential impacts as result of chemical leakage from the Battery Energy Storage System. Please provide what mitigation would be provided to mitigate any potential chemical leakage from the Battery Energy Storage System and how any such mitigation would be secured through any made Development Consent Order.
1.1.13	The Applicant	With respect to the temporary construction compound (proposed Work No. 7), please provide a description of how the land required for the compound will be reinstated or utilised following construction of the Proposed Development and clarify if potential effects arising from the removal of the temporary construction compound have been considered in the ES.
1.1.14	The Applicant	With respect to the decommissioning for the Proposed Development, what would be the duration of those work?

ExQ1: Tuesday 27 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: Monday 24 May 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
1.1.15	The Applicant	Neither the ES nor the outline Construction Environmental Management (CEMP) Plan [APP-077] provide an estimate of the quantity of waste that would be produced during construction and decommissioning of the Proposed development. Please provide details of the quantity of waste likely to be produced for the construction and decommissioning phases for the Proposed Development and how this would be managed through provisions of the CEMP. With respect to the decommissioning of the solar panels please explain how it is expected these would be disposed of.
1.1.16	The Applicant	The ES provides a high-level evaluation of the likely effects as result of decommissioning of the Proposed Development. However, this primarily consists of a statement suggesting effects during the decommissioning phase would be similar to those identified in relation to construction of the Proposed Development and does not determine the significance of likely effects. Please provide more definitive information regarding the likely significant effects as a result of decommissioning the Proposed Development.
1.1.17	The Applicant	The Climate Change assessment in section 4.21 of Chapter 4 of the ES [APP-061] does not arrive at clear and definitive conclusions regarding the likely significance of effects. Please clearly state whether the effects identified in the assessment of climate change are likely to be significant.
1.1.18	The Applicant	Within the draft Section 106 agreement or unilateral undertaking to be entered into pursuant to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) [APP-121], reference is made to the community fund being used to fund facilities in the Parishes of Appleby and Broughton. Is there a Parish of Broughton, given there is a Broughton Town Council?
1.1.19	The Applicant	Please clarify whether the planning obligations contained in the draft Section 106 agreement/unilateral undertaking [APP-121] will be secured through either an agreement or a unilateral undertaking, given that the draft document is titled as a unilateral undertaking, while its text suggests that North Lincolnshire Council is an intended signatory.

ExQ1: Tuesday 27 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: Monday 24 May 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
1.1.20	The Applicant	What is the correct name for the District Network Operator, either Northern Powergrid or Northern Power Grid, as both have variously been used in the submitted application documentation?
2. Agriculture and Soils		
1.2.1	The Applicant	Please explain how grass beneath the arrays of solar panels that could be grazed by sheep would be cultivated, as referred to in for example paragraph 4.5.2 of Chapter 4 of the ES [APP-061].
1.2.2	The Applicant	Please advise how many sheep at any one time might be used to graze the Order Limits in association with the operation of the Proposed Development.
3. Air Quality		
1.3.1	Heron Lodge	At paragraph 12 of Relevant Representations RR-006, RR-008, RR-009, RR-014 and RR-015 it is contended that ' <i>The Air Quality and Carbon Assessment (Appendix 4.5) is equally questionable. Although the Assessment plan shows the correct Order Limits (see figure 1.1) the narrative of the Assessment indicates that the Assessment, is like the Noise Impact Assessment, based on erroneous Order Limits</i> '. Please explain why you consider that the extent of the Order Limits that have been assessed by the Applicant for the purposes of assessing air effects in the submitted Air Quality and Carbon Assessment [APP-081] is based on 'erroneous' Order Limits for the Proposed Development.
1.3.2	The Applicant	Please explain what consideration has been given to air quality and dust generation in connection with the use of the access track that passes to the north of Heron Lodge during the construction, operational and decommissioning phases for the Proposed Development in the submitted Air Quality and Carbon Assessment [APP-081].
1.3.3	The Applicant	In terms of the calculation of the 'carbon offset' referred to in the Air Quality and Carbon Assessment [APP-081], please explain what consideration has been given to the

ExQ1: Tuesday 27 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: Monday 24 May 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		generation of carbon dioxide in the manufacture and disposal of the solar panels that would form part of the Proposed Development.
4. Amenity and Recreation		
1.4.1	Applicant	Please provide a map or maps showing the network of all definitive footpaths within a 5km radius of the centre of the Order Limits.
1.4.2	The Applicant and North Lincolnshire Council	Please provide any counts or survey data that may be undertaken/gathered relating to the use of definitive footpath 214. The Applicant and the Council should agree amongst one another who is best placed to answer this question.
1.4.3	Applicant	Please submit a map showing the route of the 'Opencast Way' walking route.
1.4.4	North Lincolnshire Council	Please advise what status the woodland to the east of the Order Limits has, ie is that land publicly owned or is land to which the public have the right to access it using definitive footpath 214 or other rights of way or permissive routes?
1.4.5	North Lincolnshire Council	Please advise whether the Council is aware of any permissive path routes crossing and/or running around the perimeter of the Order Limits. Should the Council be aware of any such permissive routes, please identify those on a map of an appropriate scale.
5. Biodiversity, Ecology and the Natural Environment		
1.5.1	Natural England and Lincolnshire Wildlife Trust	The Applicant's baseline ecological surveys were carried between 2017 and 2019. Are you content that the baseline ecological survey results remain reliable for the purposes of the consideration of the Proposed Development?
1.5.2	Natural England	With respect to the Applicant's assessment of the effects of the Proposed Development on ecology and nature conservation explained in Chapter 7 of the ES [APP-064], please

ExQ1: Tuesday 27 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: Monday 24 May 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		advise whether Natural England is content with the receptors that have been identified as being of 'District Importance', 'Site Importance and 'Negligible Importance' to the ecological environment?
1.5.3	The Applicant	The Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey report [APP-091] states that the survey was in part updated in 2019. Please explain which parts of the survey were updated in 2019 and what the differences in the survey results were compared with the results obtained following the 2017 survey.
1.5.4	The Applicant	The ExA notes some of the species surveys may have been undertaken before the Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management (CIEEM) Guidelines for Ecological Impact Assessment in the UK and Ireland (2018) had been published. Can the Applicant clarify if the updated 2018 CIEEM guidelines affect the conclusions reached in Chapter 7 of the ES [APP-064].
1.5.5	The Applicant	Table 7.2 of Chapter 7 of the ES [APP-064] refers to the British Trust for Ornithology (BTO) Common Birds Census (CBC) method in relation to the Breeding Bird Survey [APP-093]. However, the CBC ran from 1962-2000 and has now been superseded by the BTO/Joint Nature Conservation Committee/Royal Society for the Protection of Birds Breeding Bird Survey approach. Please clarify whether the updated survey approach recommended by the BTO would affect the conclusions reached in Chapter 7 of the ES.
1.5.6	The Applicant	Reference has been made to biodiversity net gain (BNG) in paragraphs 7.3.18 and 7.6.66 of Chapter 7 of the ES [APP-064]. However, based on the information presented in the ES and the Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan [APP-097], it is unclear to what extent BNG will be delivered by the Proposed Development. Please: a) Explain how it is intended that BNG will be delivered b) Identify the predicted value of BNG

ExQ1: Tuesday 27 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: Monday 24 May 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>c) Explain the methodology used in the calculation of BNG and provide the workings for that calculation</p>
1.5.7	The Applicant	<p>Please advise whether the Proposed Development would have any impact on the adjoining forestry operations and/or affect access to the adjoining woodland during either its construction or operational phases.</p>
1.5.8	The Applicant	<p>Please provide maps showing the full extent of the Order Limits relative to the whole of areas subject to each of the following designations (ie one map per designation):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a) The Humber Estuary Special Area of Conservation (SAC)b) The Humber Estuary Special Protection Area (SPA)c) The Humber Estuary Ramsar site. <p>Please also submit the citations for the SAC, SPA and Ramsar site.</p>
1.5.9	The Applicant	<p>Paragraph 7.4.5 of Chapter 7 of the ES [APP-064] states that due to the distance and difference in habitat characteristics between the Order Limits and SPA impacts on qualifying features of this designated site are unlikely to be significant. However, the Breeding Bird Survey (BBS) [APP-093] and Wintering Bird Survey (WBS) [APP-092] record populations of Lapwing within the Order Limits. Please provide a clarification as to the impact of the Proposed Development for the qualifying features of the SPA.</p>
1.5.10	The Applicant	<p>Section 7.9 of Chapter 7 of the ES [APP-091] identifies potential cumulative effects on farmland birds that utilise land within the Order Limits, the proposed Conesby Solar Farm and Raventhorpe Solar Farm sites. However, no definitive conclusion is provided regarding the potential significance of this cumulative effect. Please provide a definitive conclusion, and justification for reaching that conclusion, on the potential significance of the cumulative effect for farmland birds.</p>

ExQ1: Tuesday 27 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: Monday 24 May 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
1.5.11	The Applicant	Please explain how the provision of the silt fencing/temporary drainage channels and a buffer zone of at least 6 metres to be established from the top of ditch banks, referred to in paragraphs 7.6.22 and 7.6.88 in Chapter 7 of the ES [APP-064] would be secured by any made Development Consent Order as neither of those measures have not been referred to in the outline CEMP [APP-077], the outline Construction Environmental Management Plan for Biodiversity [APP-096] or the Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan [APP-097]
1.5.12	The Applicant	With respect to the pond 100 metres to the west of the Order Limits referred to in in paragraph 7.4.52 of Chapter 7 of the ES [APP-064], please provide evidence of the information provided by the Environmental Manager for British Steel that the potential Hydrogen (pH) level for this pond would make the presence of Great Crested Newts unlikely.
6. Draft Development Consent Order (DCO)		
1.6.1	The Applicant	<p>Background</p> <p>In Article 2 (Interpretation) of the draft Development Consent Order (dDCO) [APP-045] includes a definition for 'commence/commencement/commenced' that would exclude the undertaking of any 'site preparation works' associated with the Authorised Development. The Explanatory Memorandum (EM) [APP-046] at paragraph 5.3(ii) explains that under the intended definition for commencement that would allow for the undertaking of pre-construction surveys, monitoring and site investigations.</p> <p>Questions</p> <p>a) Would the undertaking of pre-construction surveys, monitoring and site investigations be the only activities intended to be subject to the exclusion referred to in the proposed definition for commence/commencement/commenced?</p>

ExQ1: Tuesday 27 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: Monday 24 May 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>b) If the answer to part a) of this question is no, please explain what other activities are intended to come within the exclusion for the proposed definition for commence/commencement/commenced.</p> <p>c) For the purposes of clarity, should any activities to be excluded from the proposed definition for commence/commencement/commenced be expressly defined in Article 2 of the dDCO?</p>
1.6.2	The Applicant	With respect to Article 14 (Certification of plans etc) in the dDCO [APP-045] the Applicant is requested to ensure that plans and documents listed in this Article are kept up to date whenever an updated version of the dDCO is submitted as an Examination document.
1.6.3	The Applicant	Please explain why Article 19 (Application of landlord and tenant law) in the dDCO [APP-045] is necessary.
1.6.4	The Applicant and Northern Powergrid/Power Grid	<p>With respect to the decommissioning of the Proposed Development Requirement 4 of the dDCO [APP-045] refers to the proposed substation not being decommissioned. The Outline Decommissioning Strategy [APP-078] advises that the substation would not be decommissioned because it would be the property of District Network Operator (Northern Powergrid).</p> <p>What purpose would the District Network Operator have for a retained substation following the decommissioning of the rest of the Proposed Development?</p>
1.6.5	The Applicant and North Lincolnshire Council	With respect to Requirement 9 (outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [CEMP]) of the dDCO [APP-045]:

ExQ1: Tuesday 27 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: Monday 24 May 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>a) In Requirement 9(2)(b) what does 'adjoining highway' mean, should the reference be to the public highway? Would the precision of this part of the Requirement be aided by referring to specific road names and/or numbers?</p> <p>b) In Requirement 9(2)(c), what would be the purpose of undertaking, a '... condition survey of any road ...', as there is no requirement to do anything further to respond to the results of the condition survey? Is Requirement 9(2)(c) necessary and/or incomplete?</p>
1.6.6	The Applicant	<p>With respect to Requirement 10 (outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan) of the dDCO [APP-045]:</p> <p>a) Is there any duplication with Requirement 6?</p> <p>b) In Requirement 6(2)(b) what does 'gapping up' mean, could an alternative form of wording be used or should gapping up be defined in the Interpretation section set out under Article 2 or Requirement 1 of Part 1 of Schedule 2?</p>
1.6.7	The Applicant and North Lincolnshire Council	<p>With respect to Requirement 11 (Construction hours) of the dDCO [APP-045]:</p> <p>a) Is there a need for construction hours to be stated in a freestanding Requirement or is this a matter that could be included within the Construction Environmental Management Plan subject to Requirement 8?</p> <p>b) If Requirement 11 is to be retained as a freestanding requirement in any made DCO, should the tailpiece phrase '... unless otherwise agreed by the local planning authority' be deleted?</p>
1.6.8	The Applicant	<p>With respect to Requirement 13 (Archaeology) of the dDCO [APP-045]:</p>

ExQ1: Tuesday 27 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: Monday 24 May 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>a) In Requirement 13(1) would the wording be clearer if 'Not to commence ...' was deleted and replaced with 'The authorised development shall not be commenced ...'?</p> <p>b) In Requirement 13(2) would the wording be clearer if 'Not to permit digging in ...' was deleted and replaced with 'No digging shall be undertaken within'?</p> <p>c) In Requirement 13(4) should the reference to an earlier clause of this Requirement be to (3) rather than (2)?</p>
1.6.9	The Applicant and North Lincolnshire Council	<p>Requirement 14 (Protected species) of the dDCO [APP-045], please review the draft wording for completeness and:</p> <p>a) Is there a need for the provisions of Requirement 14(2) to be contained in a freestanding sub-paragraph or could the inclusion of 'any site preparation works' within what is meant by commencement simply be stated as 'No work, including site preparation works, shall be commenced in any phase until a final pre-construction survey has been carried out for that phase ...'?</p> <p>b) In Requirement 14(3), in the event of a survey finding a protected species to be present, why prior to a mitigation scheme being submitted for approval by North Lincolnshire Council would it be necessary for a pre-consultation to be undertaken with the Council as well as Natural England?</p>
1.6.10	The Applicant	<p>With respect to Requirement 15 (Temporary diversion to public footpath) of the dDCO [APP-045]:</p> <p>a) In the interests of precision and drafting consistency in Requirement 15(1) could 'Not to commence any phase of the authorised development or any decommissioning...' be deleted and replaced with 'The authorised development must not be commenced in any phase or any decommissioning be undertaken ...'?</p>

ExQ1: Tuesday 27 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: Monday 24 May 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		b) In Requirement 15(2)(a) does the reference to 'length' relate to distance, time or both?
1.6.11	The Applicant and North Lincolnshire Council	<p>With respect to the 'Procedure for Discharge of Requirements' set out in Part 2 of Schedule 2 of the dDCO [APP-045] please provide explanations within an updated version of the EM [APP-046] and make any amendments to the dDCO, as necessary, to address the following matters:</p> <p>a) Identify all of the organisations that would constitute a 'discharging authority' for the purposes of Part 2 Schedule 2 of any made DCO;</p> <p>b) Whether the heading for Part 2 of Schedule 2 is correctly titled, given that during the course of Issue Specific Hearing 1 it was explained that some consents from discharging authorities would concern Articles within any made DCO and not just Requirements contained in Part 1 of Schedule 2 of the dDCO.</p> <p>c) Why in Paragraph 21(1)(c) are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">i. Appeals concerning the use of sections 60 and 61 of the Control of Pollution Act 1974 being referred to, when there is an appeal mechanism available under that legislation via the Magistrates Court system?ii. If an appeal was to be dismissed, what implications might that decision have for the resolution of the matter if it was then to be remitted to the Magistrates Court as a contravention of sections 60 or 61?
1.6.12	North Lincolnshire Council	<p>With respect to the provisions of the dDCO [APP-045], please advise:</p> <p>a) Whether there are any Articles or Requirements that the Council considers should be included within or removed from the dDCO and if so explain why that is the case. If it</p>

ExQ1: Tuesday 27 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: Monday 24 May 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		<p>is considered there are any omissions, please submit wording for any suggested additions to the Articles and/or Requirements.</p> <p>b) Whether the Council has any detailed drafting concerns relating to any part of the dDCO. If there are any such concerns, please provide suggested revisions to the Applicant's drafting to APP-045, together with any explanations as necessary.</p>
7. Historic Environment		
1.7.1	The Applicant	Please advise what mitigation measures would be in place during the decommissioning of the Proposed Development to safeguard any buried archaeological resources within the Order Limits.
8. Landscape and Visual Effects		
1.8.1	The Applicant	Given that the assessment viewpoint photographs were taken in the summer, when hedges and trees were in leaf, the Applicant is requested to submit photomontages representative of the winter months.
1.8.2	North Lincolnshire Council	Does the Council have any comments to make about the adequacy of the proposed landscape and visual mitigation measures for the effects of the Proposed Development during its operational and construction phases?
1.8.3	North Lincolnshire Council	As part of the decommissioning of the Proposed Development, please provide the Council's views on how the land within the Order Limits might be restored. In particular, please comment on whether the intended screen planting along the route of definitive footpath 214 should be retained having regard to any visual effects for the users of the footpath and the biodiversity value provided by any retained screen planting.
1.8.4	The Applicant and North Lincolnshire Council	The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment references "Users of publicly accessible paths" and "Users of the transport network" as visual receptors [paragraphs 6.3.43 to

ExQ1: Tuesday 27 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: Monday 24 May 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		6.3.46 of PDA-006]. The assessment of the impact of the Proposed Development is confined to users of footpaths and motorists. Other non-motorised users such as cyclists and equestrians are not referenced. What is the potential for effects on cyclist and equestrian receptors?
1.8.5	The Applicant	On several occasions the assessment of landscape and visual effects in Chapter 6 of the ES [PDA-006] distinguishes between 'effects within the development site and its immediate locality and surroundings' and 'effects beyond the immediate vicinity of the development site/site environs' (e.g. 6.4.11 to 6.4.14). The Applicant is requested to clarify precisely what is meant by the distinction that has been drawn, with reference to the formal study area that has been identified for the Proposed Development.
1.8.6	The Applicant	The construction and decommissioning visual effects are described relative to operational effects, e.g. moderate temporary visual effect "over and above" the permanent visual effects described for operation [Table 6.7 PDA-006]. For clarity, please confirm what the level of significance for the construction and decommissioning phase effects are considered to be relative to the baseline.
1.8.7	The Applicant	The proposed visual mitigation measures include 'Sowing of wildflower seed along the margins between the footpath and the hedgerows/security fence boundaries' [paragraph 6.5.2 of PDA-006]. Please clarify how it is proposed that mitigation would be secured. Appendix 6.5 'Detailed Landscape Proposals' [APP-090] shows the proposed landscape mitigation, however, wildflower verges are not clearly depicted. Please provide an updated version of Appendix 6.5 showing all the proposed visual mitigation.
1.8.8	The Applicant	At paragraph 6.4.44 of Chapter 6 of the ES [PDA-006], an assessment of visual effects on the residential receptor Spring Wood Cottage concludes with a moderate effect which is judged to be not significant. The ES states that there is a small gap in the intervening vegetation that 'could potentially be mitigated with a section of new hedgerow planting which would reduce the potential magnitude to very low and the resulting effect to moderate/minor which is not significant' (paragraph 6.4.44). It is not clear if the Applicant

ExQ1: Tuesday 27 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: Monday 24 May 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		is committed to providing that mitigation and how its provision would be secured. The Applicant is requested to clarify this matter.
1.8.9	The Applicant	The Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) (ES Appendix 7.8) [APP-097] includes a monitoring methodology (Management Prescription 14, p.32). However, the monitoring methodology is focused on specific plant species and it is not clear whether the landscape screening function of the mitigation planting will also be monitored. Please clarify whether it is intended that the landscape screening function of the mitigation planting would also be monitored.
1.8.10	The Applicant	At paragraph 13 of Relevant Representations RR-006, RR-008, RR-009, RR-014 and RR-015 reference is made to the use of the access track for the Proposed Development having a visual impact for the owners and occupiers of Heron Lodge. Please comment on the nature and significance of any visual effects for the owners and occupiers of Heron Lodge that would be associated with the use of access track during the construction, operational and decommissioning phases for the Proposed Development.
9.	Noise	
1.9.1	Heron Lodge	At paragraph 10 of Relevant Representations RR-006, RR-008, RR-009, RR-014 and RR-015 it is contended that 'The Noise Impact Assessment (ES Appendix 4.9) appears to be of no value because it was conducted in respect of a site significantly smaller than the development site as defined by the Order Limits ...'. Please explain why you consider that the extent of the Order Limits that have been assessed by the Applicant for the purposes of assessing noise effects in the submitted Noise Impact Assessment [APP-085] are 'significantly smaller' than the Order Limits for the Proposed Development.
1.9.2	The Applicant	Please explain what noise effects during the construction, operational and decommissioning phases for the Proposed Development associated with the use of the access track that passes to the north of Heron Lodge have been assessed in the Noise Impact Assessment [APP-085]. In responding to this question please make comparisons between the daily vehicular activity generated by the current use of the access track and

ExQ1: Tuesday 27 April 2021**Responses due by Deadline 2: Monday 24 May 2021**

ExQ1	Question to:	Question:
		the expected use during the construction, operational and decommissioning phases for the Proposed Development.
1.9.3	The Applicant	In section 2 of the Noise Impact Assessment [APP-085] noise Receivers 1 to 4 have been referred to. Please provide the full name for each of those receivers.
1.9.4	The Applicant	Please explain why 'Receiver 3' has been considered to be a representative location for the assessment of the construction and decommissioning noise effects for the Proposed Development.
10. Transportation and Traffic		
1.10.1	The Applicant	Please provide baseline traffic count data for the section of the A18 and the B1208 which it is proposed would form part of the construction route shown in Figure 9.1 in Chapter 9 of the ES (Transport and Access) [APP-066]
11. Water and Flooding		
1.11.1	The Applicant	Has the Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy [APP-072] considered the North and North East Lincolnshire Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) (2011)?