



Application by Cottam Solar Project Ltd for an Order Granting Development Consent for Cottam Solar Project

The Examining Authority's first written questions and requests for information (ExQ1)

Issued on 31 October 2023

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

Questions are set out using an issues-based framework derived from the Initial Assessment of Principal Issues provided as Annex D to the Rule 6 letter of 10 July 2023. The questions have arisen from the ExA's consideration of the application documents and representations. The answers to them will help the ExA to consider the application against relevant legislation and policy.

Column 2 of the table indicates who each question is directed to. Please could each party answer all questions directed to them, providing a substantive response, or indicating why a question is not relevant to them. This does not prevent an answer to any question being provided by any party if it is relevant to their interests.

References in these questions set out in square brackets (eg [APP-010]) are to documents catalogued in the Examination Library, which provides a link to each document: <http://infrastructure.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/document/EN010133-000507>.

When you are answering a question, please start your answer by quoting the question reference number.

If you are responding to a small number of questions, then answers in an email or letter will suffice. If you are answering a larger number of questions, it will assist the ExA if you use a table based on the one below to set out your responses. An editable version of this table in Microsoft Word is available on request from the case team: please email CottamSolarProject@planninginspectorate.gov.uk and include 'Cottam Solar Project' in the subject line of your email.

Responses are due by Deadline 2 on Tuesday 21 November 2023



Abbreviations used

AN	<i>Advice Note</i>	ExA	<i>Examining Authority</i>
ALC	<i>Agricultural Land Classification</i>	ha	<i>Hectare</i>
BMV	<i>Best and Most Versatile land</i>	HDD	<i>Horizontal Directional Drilling</i>
BNG	<i>Biodiversity Net Gain</i>	HRA	<i>Habitats Regulation Assessment</i>
BoR	<i>Book of Reference</i>	IAQM	<i>Institute of Air Quality Management</i>
CA	<i>Compulsory Acquisition</i>	IDB	<i>Internal Drainage Board</i>
CEMP	<i>Construction Environmental Management Plan</i>	IPs	<i>Interested Parties</i>
DCO	<i>Development Consent Order</i>	ISH	<i>Issue Specific Hearing</i>
dDCO	<i>Draft Development Consent Order</i>	km	<i>Kilometre</i>
DEMP	<i>Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan</i>	LCC	<i>Lincolnshire County Council</i>
dNPS	<i>Draft National Policy Statement</i>	LEMP	<i>Landscape and Ecological Management Plan</i>
EIA	<i>Environmental Impact Assessment</i>	LIR	<i>Local Impact Report</i>
EM	<i>Explanatory Memorandum</i>	LPA	<i>Local Planning Authority</i>
ES	<i>Environmental Statement</i>	LVIA	<i>Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment</i>
		MW	<i>Megawatt</i>



NPS	<i>National Policy Statement</i>	RR	<i>Relevant Representation</i>
NSIP	<i>Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project</i>	RVAA	<i>Residential Visual Amenity Assessment</i>
oCEMP	<i>Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan</i>	SM	<i>Scheduled Monument</i>
oLEMP	<i>Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan</i>	SoR	<i>Statement of Reasons</i>
OEMP	<i>Operational Environmental Management Plan</i>	SoS	<i>Secretary of State</i>
PoC	<i>Point of Connection</i>	SuDS	<i>Sustainable Drainage Systems</i>
PRoW	<i>Public Right of Way</i>	WLDC	<i>West Lindsey District Council</i>
PV	<i>Photovoltaic</i>	WR	<i>Written Representation</i>
		ZTV	<i>Zone of Theoretical Visibility</i>



Index

1.	The draft Development Consent Order and other consents.....	5
2.	General and cross-topic matters.....	10
3.	The need case, electricity generated and climate change	15
4.	Other projects and cumulative effects	16
5.	Landscape and visual, glint and glare, good design.....	17
6.	Biodiversity and the Habitats Regulations Assessment.....	19
7.	The water environment	22
8.	Soils and agriculture	25
9.	The historic environment.....	28
10.	Transport and access, highways and public rights of way	32
11.	Noise, vibration, air quality, and nuisance	35
12.	Socio-economics, tourism, and recreation	39
13.	Other planning matters	43
14.	Compulsory Acquisition and related matters	50

Ref:	Question to:	Question:
1. The draft Development Consent Order and other consents		
1.1.1	Applicant	<p>The ExA notes the Applicant's view [REP-051] that the definition of 'authorised development' has precedent in both the Longfield Solar Farm DCO and the Little Crow DCO. However, the wording used in those made Orders is different to that included in the Applicant's dDCO.</p> <p>The definition adopted by the Applicant indicates there may be other development, in addition to that included in Schedule 1, which would be authorised by the Order. Please can the Applicant identify this and explain why it cannot be included in Schedule 1.</p> <p>The ExA considers the wording adopted in all of the made Solar DCOs provides greater certainty as to what is being consented. In order to remove ambiguity and in the interests of consistency, the Applicant is asked to amend the definition so that it aligns with the approach adopted in the made solar DCOs.</p>
1.1.2	Applicant	<p>In response to ISH1 action point 2 [REP-051], the Applicant states that made it clear in ES Chapter 2: Process and Methodology and ES Chapter 4: Scheme Description that the Applicant was not seeking a temporary or time limited consent and the EIA was undertaken on that basis.</p> <p>Please can the Applicant signpost where this is made clear in the abovementioned documents?</p>
1.1.3	Applicant	<p>Article 3(2) (Development consent etc granted by this Order) – Please can the Applicant explain why it considers the amount of flexibility being sought is necessary and proportionate for this particular project.</p>
1.1.4	Applicant	<p>Article 4 (Operation of generating station) - The term 'generating station' is not defined in Article 2. The Applicant is asked to include a suitable definition.</p>
1.1.5	Applicant	<p>Article 6 (Application and modification of statutory provisions) -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The Explanatory Memorandum (EM) [APP-017] explains in general the reasons for the disapplication and modification of the statutory provisions listed. However, it is unclear why it is necessary to exclude each specific provision for this particular development. Please can the Applicant explain why it is necessary to exclude <i>each</i> specific provision (e.g Sections 24 and 25 of the Water Resources Act 1991). b) Article 6(3) – Please can the Applicant provide a justification for the inclusion of this provision and explain why it is required for this development.

Ref:	Question to:	Question:
1.1.6	Applicant	<p>Article 11 (Temporary stopping up of streets and public rights of way) -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Please can the Applicant explain the difference between the terms temporarily 'stop up', 'prohibit the use of' and 'restrict the use of'. b) Please can the Applicant explain the need to <i>both</i> temporarily stop up and divert public rights of way (as indicated in Article 11(3)(c)). c) The term 'stop up' has a specific meaning which indicates an element of permanence. Is it possible to temporarily stop up a public right of way?
1.1.7	Applicant	Article 13 (Access to Works) - Please can the Applicant explain why this article does not include provision to restore any access that has been temporarily created.
1.1.8	Applicant	Article 17 (Removal of human remains) - Please can the Applicant identify any known burial grounds within the Order limits. The Applicant's attention is drawn to paragraph 9.2 of the Secretary of State's (SoS) decision letter in the Longfield Solar Farm DCO.
1.1.9	Applicant	Article 18 (Protective works to buildings) - Paragraph 4.4.4 of the EM [APP-017] explains that this Article is required because there are buildings within, and in close proximity to, the Order land that might feasibly require surveys and protective works as a result of the Proposed Development. Please can the Applicant identify these buildings, explain why they might feasibly require protective works and provide details of any such works.
1.1.10	Applicant	<p>Article 19 (Authority to survey etc the land) -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) There appears to be some overlap between this article and the 'permitted preliminary works' in Article 2. This should be addressed. b) Please can the Applicant explain why Article 19(6) is needed for this particular project.
1.1.11	Applicant	Article 26 (Statutory authority to override easements etc) - Please can the Applicant explain the distinction between this Article and Article 23.
1.1.12	Applicant	Article 29 and Article 30 (Temporary Possession) -

Ref:	Question to:	Question:
		<p>a) The ExA notes that Article 29(1)(a)(ii) extends the power to take temporary possession to any Order land. Please can the Applicant justify the inclusion of this broad power and explain the steps that have been taken to alert all landowners/occupiers of land within the Order limits of this possibility.</p> <p>b) Please can the Applicant justify the inclusion of 'buildings' in Article 27(1)(b).</p> <p>c) Please can the Applicant justify the 14-day period set out in Article 29(3).</p> <p>d) Please explain why an obligation to remove any equipment and vehicles from the land has not been included in this Article.</p> <p>e) Please can the Applicant explain why it considers only 28 days' notice should be required before entering on and taking possession of land under Article 30(3).</p>
	Applicant	<p>Article 35 – Consent to transfer benefit of Order</p> <p>a) The Applicant's attention is drawn to paragraph 9.4 of the SoS's decision letter in the Longfield Solar Farm DCO where it was made clear that where a transfer is made to a holding company or subsidiary, the SoS would expect that company to be a holder of a licence under section 6 of the Electricity Act 1989 and as such considered a similarly worded exemption from the need for consent to be unnecessary.</p> <p>b) In light of the above, please can the Applicant provide a detailed justification for the inclusion of Article 35(3)(c).</p>
1.1.13	Applicant	<p>Article 42 (Arbitration) - Please can the Applicant add the Marine Management Organisation to Article 42(2) or otherwise justify its omission.</p>
1.1.14	Applicant	<p>Schedule 1 (Authorised Development) - Does the Applicant consider references in this Schedule to gross electrical capacity should specify alternating current in order to provide certainty.</p>
1.1.15	Applicant	<p>Requirement 6 (Battery Safety Management) - Please can the Applicant explain how the consultees listed in sub paragraph (3) have been determined and explain the statutory responsibility of those bodies in this regard.</p>

ExQ1 issued on 31 October 2023. Responses are due by Deadline 2 on Tuesday 21 November 2023.

Ref:	Question to:	Question:
1.1.16	Applicant	Requirement 11 (Surface and foul water drainage) - Please can the Applicant confirm that the 'outline drainage strategy' referred to in this requirement is ES Appendix 10.1 [APP-090] (Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy).
1.1.17	Applicant	Requirement 13 (Construction Environmental Management Plan) - Should the restriction on commencement of development in sub paragraph (1) include remedial works in respect of any contamination or other adverse ground conditions as well as site clearance involving vegetation.
1.1.18	Applicant	Requirement 17 – Permissive Paths - Please can the Applicant explain why the provision of the permissive path is only linked to work 1A.
1.1.19	Applicant	<p>Requirement 21 – Decommissioning and restoration.</p> <p>a) The ExA notes the Applicant's amendment requiring decommissioning to take place no later than 0 years following the date of final commissioning. While the inclusion of a timescale for decommissioning is welcomed, paragraph 4.3.2 of ES Chapter 4: Scheme Description makes clear that a 40-year period for the operational phase of the Proposed Development has been assessed in the EIA and reported in the ES. Please can the Applicant explain why it considers a 60-year operational period would not result in additional effects to those assessed in the ES.</p> <p>b) The ExA notes that the Outline Decommissioning Statement indicates (at paragraph 1.2.1) that approval and implementation of the Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP) and the Decommissioning Traffic Management Plan will be secured through a requirement in the DCO. Please can the Applicant explain how the approval and implementation of these documents is secured in Schedule 2.</p> <p>c) Please can the Applicant clarify the references to the Decommissioning Plan and the DEMP in this requirement and review its drafting.</p> <p>d) Please can the Applicant explain why this Requirement does not address the matter of restoration.</p>
1.1.20	Applicant	General (Dust Management Plan) - Please can the Applicant explain how the Construction Dust Management Plan will be secured within the DCO.
1.1.21	Applicant	Schedule 3 (Legislation to be Disapplied)

Ref:	Question to:	Question:
		<p>a) Please can the Applicant explain why it is necessary to disapply the entirety of the various pieces of legislation listed in Schedule 3 as opposed to individual provisions.</p> <p>b) Please can the Applicant explain the effect of the disapplication of this legislation within the Order limits.</p>
1.1.22	Applicant	Schedule 7 (Access to Works) - Please can the Applicant review the references to the 'access to works plan'. This document is referred to elsewhere in the dDCO as the 'access plan'.
1.1.23	All parties with protective provisions for their benefit included in Schedule 16 (Protective Provisions) of the dDCO.	Please provide an update on discussions regarding protective provisions, identifying any outstanding areas of disagreement.
1.1.24	Applicant	Please comment on the concerns raised by EDF Energy (Thermal Generation) Limited in its Written Representation (WR) (paragraph 3.3 and 3.4) [REP-092] that the cable route poses a risk to the regeneration of the Cottam Power Station site and its proposed additional requirement.
1.1.25	Applicant	<p>Schedule 17 – Procedure for discharge of requirements</p> <p>a) Please can the Applicant explain how the various timescales for deemed consent or refusal have taken account of potential publicity requirements under the EIA Regulations.</p> <p>b) Please can the Applicant explain why there is no time limit for submitting an appeal.</p> <p>c) Please can the Applicant explain the insertion of the word 'forthwith' in 4(2)(b) and justify this departure from Appendix 1 of Planning Inspectorate Advice Note 15 (AN 15).</p> <p>d) Please can the Applicant explain the departure from the 20 business days in Appendix 1 of AN 15.</p> <p>e) Please can the Applicant explain the 30-day longstop for determination by the appointed person in 4(1)(e) and justify this departure from Appendix 1 of AN 15.</p> <p>f) Please can the Applicant explain the departure from paragraph 4(12) of Appendix 1 of AN 15.</p> <p>g) Please can the Applicant explain the departure from paragraph 4(5) of Appendix 1 of AN 15. The ExA notes that the proposed 5-day time limit in Schedule 17 paragraph 4(3) would be before the receipt by the appointed person of WR under paragraph 4(2)(c).</p>

Ref:	Question to:	Question:
1.1.26	Applicant	The ExA notes that the Applicant intends to submit an updated version of the EM at the final Examination Deadline. In order to assist everyone involved in the examination of the application, the Applicant is requested to submit an updated EM at Deadline 3.
2. General and cross-topic matters		
1.2.1	Applicant	Please update the application documentation in light of the NSIP Action Plan (Feb 2023), the revised Draft Consultation Energy National Policy Statements (dNPS) and Powering Up Britain Security Plan (March 2023). Please also specify the weight you consider should be attached to these documents.
1.2.2	Applicant	Please can the Applicant explain why Appendix 4 of the revised Planning Statement [REP-047] includes the superseded policies of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan 2012-2036?
1.2.3	West Lindsey District Council (WLDC)	Please provide your views on the compliance of the Proposed Development with the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan (2023).
1.2.4	Lincolnshire County Council	Please explain the inclusion of Policies DM1, DM4, DM6 and DM12 in paragraph 4.19 of the Local Impact Report (LIR) [REP-085] as these appear to relate to the types of development which that plan is concerned with, i.e. minerals and waste, rather than other forms of development
1.2.5	Nottinghamshire County Council	Please explain the inclusion of Policies SO2, SO3, SO4, SO5 and WCS1 in paragraph 2.68 of the LIR [REP-086] as these appear to relate to the types of development which that plan is concerned with, i.e. waste, rather than other forms of development?
1.2.6	WLDC	With regard to paragraphs 4.13 and 4.14 of the Council's LIR [REP-091], please specify the policies of the Neighbourhood Plans which the Council considers are of relevance?
1.2.7	Applicant	Please explain on what basis the Neighbourhood Plans that are considered in the revised Planning Statement [REP-047] were included, and whether it includes all such policies of relevance to the Proposed Development in light of those detailed in the LIRs.

ExQ1 issued on 31 October 2023. Responses are due by Deadline 2 on Tuesday 21 November 2023.

Ref:	Question to:	Question:
1.2.8	Applicant	Please explain which part(s) of the Proposed Development lie in each Neighbourhood Plan Area. This can be set out in a tabular form. Please also explain how the Proposed Development relates to the Policy/Proposals Maps for each Neighbourhood Plan.
1.2.9	7000 acres	Where in Section 21 of your Relevant Representation (RR) [RR-041] you refer to a failure to consider Neighbourhood Plans, can you please explain this in this in the context of Appendix 4 of the revised Planning Statement [REP-047].
1.2.10	Applicant	<p>Please provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A full copy of the development plan policies, including the policy titles, and the supporting text for each policy that is set out in Appendix 4 to the revised Planning Statement [REP-047] and any other development plan policies that you now consider relevant, and the cover/title page for each development plan; and • The related proposals maps for the development plans (excluding the minerals local plans as they are shown on the submitted minerals resource plans, .so it is clear where the various allocations and designations that the Planning Statement refers to are located and how far they extend. <p>A full copy of the policies for the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan (2023) do not need to be provided, as these are already in the submissions</p>
1.2.11	Applicant	Please can the Applicant explain why Appendix 2 of the revised Planning Statement [REP-047] does not include reference to permission (1/22/01031/CDM) at Cottam Power Station, as detailed in Nottinghamshire County Council's LIR.
1.2.12	Applicant	Appendix 2 of the revised Planning Statement [REP-047] now refers to the residential permission near to West Farm Cottages, which the ExA notes has also been referred to by Interested Parties. Please explain what the implications of the proposed cable route are for this permission (and vice versa).
1.2.13	Applicant	Why does the Applicant consider that National Policy Statement (NPS) EN-3 is important and relevant to the determination of the application as solar generation is not covered by that NPS (see paragraph 5.4.9 of the revised Planning Statement [REP-047]). Please refer to the findings of the Examining Authority's Recommendation Report into the Little Crow Solar Park and Longfield Solar Farm projects and the Secretary of State's Decision Letters in that regard.

ExQ1 issued on 31 October 2023. Responses are due by Deadline 2 on Tuesday 21 November 2023.

Ref:	Question to:	Question:
1.2.14	Applicant	Paragraph 5.6.1 of the revised Planning Statement [REP-047] states that the Applicant expects the existing NPS will be attributed most weight. Please provide reasons.
1.2.15	Applicant	Please specify the weight that you consider should be attributed to the policies of the development plans and the NPPF.
1.2.16	Applicant	Appendix 4 of the revised Planning Statement [REP-047] lists Policy ST51 of the Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2037 twice, yet provides different text each time. Please explain.
1.2.17	Applicant	Please explain the siting of Work No 3 (one of the 2 battery and energy storage facility options) on the Works Plans (Sheets 8 and 14) [AS-007], as this seems to be found in two separate locations (to either side of Works Nos 2 and 4A). Please can the Applicant explain why it is not a single location.
1.2.18	Applicant	Some of the Works Nos. (e.g. Works Nos. 5 and 8) do not have parameters listed within the revised Concept Design Parameters and Principles [REP-039]. Can the Applicant comment on why these Works Nos. do not have stated maximum parameters.
1.2.19	Applicant	Can the Applicant explain the discrepancies between the topic Chapters and the revised Concept Design Parameters and Principles [REP-039], confirm which of the maximum parameters are accurate, and update both the descriptions and any implications to the ES assessments accordingly. Eg ES Chapter 4: Scheme Description states that fibre communications chambers could be up to 2000m apart whereas the Concept Design Parameters states a maximum parameter of 1000m apart.
1.2.20	Applicant	ES Chapter 2: EIA Process and Methodology [APP-037] and the relevant sections in the aspect Chapters do not state that agreement on the short list of cumulative developments to be assessed have been agreed with the Local Planning Authorities. Row 6.1 of 'Appendix 3.8.4.4 Workshop 3 Minutes' [APP-076], states that approval was needed "asap" from the LPAs regarding the cumulative schemes assessed. Many aspect Chapters assess cumulative effects only with other Solar Farm NSIP developments including Gate Burton, West Burton and Tillbridge. There is no evidence that cumulative effects resulting from the Proposed Development along with other types of plans and projects in the locality have been considered, nor is there any justification for this approach to cumulative effects assessment although other plans and projects are identified in the 'long list' of developments in Appendix 2.3 Cumulative Assessment Sites [APP-065].

ExQ1 issued on 31 October 2023. Responses are due by Deadline 2 on Tuesday 21 November 2023.

Ref:	Question to:	Question:
		Can the Applicant explain how the developments assessed within each aspect Chapter have been identified and whether these developments have been agreed with the relevant LPAs.
1.2.21	Local Planning Authorities	Do the host Local Planning Authorities agree with the identified cumulative developments assessed within each aspect chapter? If not, can they identify which cumulative developments have been omitted from which assessments and explain why they consider that they should be included.
1.2.22	Applicant	Table 23.1, ES Chapter 23: Summary of Significant Effects [APP-058] identifies several residual significant adverse effects where no additional mitigation has been proposed. Can the Applicant provide an explanation as to why no additional mitigation measures have been proposed where residual significant adverse effects are reported.
1.2.23	Applicant	<p>Details of several of the monitoring requirements proposed in the revised outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) [REP-037] are limited with details due to be confirmed in the final CEMP. Please can the Applicant able to provide further detail of the following monitoring requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Climate change impacts such as greenhouse gas emissions from construction traffic and equipment and use of natural resources in construction materials. • Disruption to local residents, businesses, and community facilities; and • Increased traffic flows during construction.
1.2.24	Applicant	Paragraph 4.6.2 of ES Chapter 4: Scheme Description [REP-012] states that a 5-year construction period has been adopted as a worst-case scenario to accommodate the potential sequential installation of Cottam, West Burton and Gate Burton solar projects. However, considering the proposed construction timeframes for each project, it is unclear why a 5 year period has been adopted (when there is potential for a 7 year sequential construction period). Please can the Applicant explain why a 5-year sequential construction period between these three projects captures an appropriate worst-case scenario?
1.2.25	Applicant	Paragraph 4.2.3 of ES Chapter 4: Scheme Description [REP-012] states that a 40-year operational lifetime has been assessed in the ES. At Deadline 1, the dDCO was updated to extend this operational lifetime to 60 years. The 40-year lifespan underpins a number of ES assessments during operation: ES Chapter 7 Climate Change, the Flood Risk Assessment (climate change projections), ES Chapter 18 Socio-Economics and ES Chapter 20 Waste. Please can the Applicant update the relevant ES assessments (and any supporting documents where required) to reflect a worst case scenario of a 60 year operational lifetime and

ExQ1 issued on 31 October 2023. Responses are due by Deadline 2 on Tuesday 21 November 2023.

Ref:	Question to:	Question:
		decommissioning at 60 years. Can the Applicant explain if and how this has altered any assessments in the ES?
1.2.26	Applicant	Paragraph 7.8.39 of ES Chapter 7: Climate Change [APP-042] states that it is assumed the half of the construction materials would come from China and half would come from Europe. However, paragraph 7.8.41 states that the PV panels are expected to be sourced from China. Can the Applicant comment on what basis the above assumption is made and explain how a worst-case-scenario has been assessed.
1.2.27	Applicant	<p>Please can the Applicant explain what factors will be used to determine whether tracking or fixed structures will be used and what effect a decision to opt for fixed or mounting structures would have on the overall generating capacity of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>Please can the Applicant also provide a comparison of hourly projections showing the likely energy output throughout the day/year for both fixed and tracking panels.</p>
1.2.28	WLDC	In its LIR [REP-091], WLDC raise concerns that the Proposed Development represents an inefficient use of land. However, the ExA notes that paragraph 5.5.6 of ES Chapter 5: Alternatives and Design [APP-040] indicates a ratio of around 3.7 acres (excluding landscape and mitigation) of land for each MW of output. Please provide further explanation as to why the council considers this would represent an inefficient use of land, in view of the estimated levels of land take required for solar generation referred to in paragraph 3.10.8 of dNPS EN-3.
1.2.29	Applicant	WLDC raise concerns in its LIR that the proposed development represents an inefficient use of land (see paragraph 6.1-6.2 and 6.4). Furthermore, the ExA notes the other solar schemes referenced by WLDC which utilise less land than that proposed by the Applicant to generate comparable amount of electricity. Can the Applicant explain how the generation of 600MW from a 1300ha (approx.) site represents an efficient use of land.
1.2.30	Applicant	Please explain how the 'network of sites' approach referred to by the Applicant in ES Chapter 5: Alternatives and Design represents 'good design'.
1.2.31	Applicant	WLDC, in its WR [REP-089] draws attention to apparent inconsistencies between the Applicant's consideration of the maximum viable distance to the Point of Connection (PoC) and that considered in other NSIPs currently in Examination.

Ref:	Question to:	Question:
		Please can the Applicant explain the apparent inconsistency and why considers a 20km distance between the Proposed development and the PoC is viable.
1.2.32	Applicant	<p>Please can the Applicant address the following apparent inconsistencies on the reporting of the same significant effects across the ES documents:</p> <p><u>Biodiversity:</u></p> <p>The Schedule of Significant Effects provided in Table 23.1 of ES Chapter 23: Summary of ES Significant Effects [APP-058] reports significant effects for some aspects but not for others despite significant effects being reported within the individual aspect chapters of the ES e.g. ecology and biodiversity (and LVIA). The Applicant is requested to update this table to align with the significant effects reported in the aspect chapters of the ES, including significant cumulative effects.</p> <p><u>Cultural Heritage:</u></p> <p>Please confirm whether paragraph 13.7.43 of ES Chapter: 13 Cultural Heritage [APP-048] is correct in stating there would be significant effects at four HLC units in Cottam 1. Both the Cumulative Impact Assessment Tables [APP-132] and ES Chapter 23; Summary of Significant Effects [APP-058] also refer to HLI156 in this regard.</p> <p><u>Socio-Economics, Tourism and Recreation:</u></p> <p>Please confirm whether all of the significant residual effects reported in ES Chapter 18: Socio-Economics and Tourism and Recreation [APP-053] are included within Table 23.1: Schedule of Significant Effects) within ES Chapter 23: Summary of Significant Effects [APP-058].</p> <p>Can the Applicant provide an updated summary of residual effects as appropriate, ensuring that all significant effects are reported, update the revised Non-Technical Summary [REP-035] to ensure that it reported the likely significant effects of the Proposed Development and cite where Table 6.1 is taken from as regards Chapter 18: Socio-Economics and Tourism and Recreation.</p> <p><u>Waste:</u></p> <p>Please explain why paragraph 20.8.1 (sic) of ES Chapter 20: Waste [APP-055] states there would not be a significant effect, whereas paragraph 20.11.1 states there would be in relation to the Proposed Development.</p>
<p>3. The need case, electricity generated and climate change</p>		

Ref:	Question to:	Question:
1.3.1	All IPs	The ExA notes that since the Applicant prepared its Statement of Need [APP-350], the Government has published its response to the consultation comments on the dNPS, updated the dNPS documents and published its blueprint for the future of energy in the UK 'Powering Up Britain' (all dated 30 March 2023). All IPs are invited to comment on the implications of these documents on the Applicant's needs case.
1.3.2	The Applicant, Interested Parties	Please comment on the implications for the Government's Net Zero and climate change commitments should the Proposed Development not be implemented.
1.3.3	Applicant, All IPs.	The ExA notes the Applicant's Statement of Need [APP-350] (paragraph 4.3.9) refers to the then unpublished 'Skidmore Review'. Following its publication on 13 January 2023 as 'Mission Zero Independent Review of Net Zero', please comment on any implications you consider this review may have in the consideration of the Proposed Development.
1.3.4	7000 acres	7000 Acres state in its WR [REP-117] that there is no policy case for further development of large scale ground mounted solar. Please explain this statement in light of paragraph 3.3.58 of dNPS EN-1.
1.3.5	Applicant	Please respond to the points raised by 7000 acres in its WR [REP-117] in relation to the Applicant's Statement of Need [APP-350].
4. Other projects and cumulative effects		
1.4.1	Applicant	The Applicant's Report on the Interrelationship between NSIPs [REP-054] contains a number of typographical errors including two references to Table 1.3 and incorrect captions (e.g table 1.4 on page 6). Please can the Applicant review and make the necessary amendments.
1.4.2	Applicant	The Applicant's Report on the Interrelationship between NSIPs [REP-054] indicates that the One Earth Solar Farm project has been scoped out as it is in its early stages and there is little information available. The Applicant is asked to keep this under review and update the report in the event that further information becomes available during the Examination.
1.4.3	Applicant	Paragraph 8.10.23 and 8.10.25 of ES Chapter 8: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) [APP-043] identify a minor beneficial effect to Nationally and Locally Designated Landscapes and Ancient Woodlands and Natural Designations as a result of the Proposed Development and other cumulative developments. Please can the Applicant explain how it has reached this conclusion with reference to table 8.1.13 and 8.1.14 of ES Appendix 8.1.1: LVIA Methodology [APP-068].

Ref:	Question to:	Question:
1.4.4	WLDC	Paragraph 8.10.6 of ES Chapter 8: LVIA identifies the developments considered by the Applicant in its assessment of cumulative landscape and visual effects. Please explain how different combinations of these developments could result in greater effects to those identified by the Applicant in ES Chapter 8: LVIA [APP-043].
1.4.5	Applicant	Please explain why the four landscape character areas identified by LCC in its LIR [REP-085] (paragraph 6.4) have not been included in the cumulative landscape assessment.
1.4.6	Lincolnshire County Council (LCC)	LCC state (in its LIR [REP-085]) that it considers there would be significant impacts to landscape character that has the potential to affect the landscape at a regional scale. Please explain how LCC has reached this conclusion, identifying key characteristics within the landscape that it considers would be affected.
1.4.7	Applicant	Please explain why there are conflicting levels of impact of cumulative effects between the Proposed Development and the other nearby NSIPs. For example, please explain why no significant cumulative landscape and visual effects have been identified for the Proposed Development (in contrast to the findings of cumulative effects for Gate Burton and Tilbridge as indicated in Table 2.2 of the Report of the Interrelationship between NSIPs [REP-054].
1.4.8	Applicant	Please explain the alleged inconsistency identified by WLDC in paragraph 22.5 of its LIR.
1.4.9	Applicant	Please respond to paragraph 22.16 of WLDC's LIR [REP-091] which notes that the period for the installation of the cables for all the schemes is considerably less in the Applicant's assessment than that predicted by the other nearby NSIP projects.
5. Landscape and visual, glint and glare, good design		
1.5.1	Applicant	Please can the Applicant explain how it has considered opportunities to demonstrate good design in terms of siting of the various elements of the Proposed Development in order to mitigate their effects on the landscape. How does it propose to ensure that both the panels and associated development will contribute to the quality of the area.
1.5.2	Applicant	Paragraph 1.1.7 of ES Appendix 8.2.1 (Visual Assessment Methodology) explains that visual amenity from both ground and first floor windows were considered under steps 1-3 of the RVAA but that at step 4, only

Ref:	Question to:	Question:
		effects from ground floor windows were considered. Please can the Applicant explain why, under step 4 at Year 15, only effects from ground floor windows were considered.
1.5.3	Applicant	<p>Paragraph 8.4.11 of ES Chapter 8: LVIA states that the 5km study area does not include assessment of either the battery storage or substation areas on the basis that effects are not expected to extend beyond the 2km radius. This justification is unclear considering the substation represents the worst-case parameter in terms of height (up to 13.2m) and the Augmented Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) [APP-195] shows theoretical visibility of the substation (both alone and together with PV panels) up to the 5km study area boundary.</p> <p>Can the Applicant justify why the use of the 2km study area is sufficient for the assessment of landscape and visual effects from the battery storage and substation areas or update the assessment to include all elements of the Proposed Development within the 5km study area.</p>
1.5.4	Applicant	<p>It is unclear whether the substations (Works Nos. 4A, 4B, 4C, and 4D) are included within the photomontages. The photomontage for Viewpoint 78 [APP-276] appears to include the busbars associated with the 400kV substation at Cottam 1. However, it is unclear whether the other photomontages include the substations located at Cottam 2, 3a, or 3b.</p> <p>Can the Applicant confirm which components of the Proposed Development have been factored into the photomontages. Should elements of the Proposed Development, such as the substations, not be included within the photomontages, the Applicant is asked to provide updated versions to ensure the photomontages represent a worst-case scenario.</p>
1.5.5	Applicant	<p>Paragraph 8.4.11 of ES Chapter 8: LVIA [APP-043] states that the 5km study area includes long distance views from high value receptors including Lincoln Castle and Cathedral and settlements with views from along the escarpment to the east (eg Grayingham) which are not within a 5km radius but are included in the assessment. However, it is not clear where in the ES long distance visual effects from these receptors are considered. Long distance viewpoints are not shown as visual receptors on Figures 8.11 to 8.13 [APP-196 to APP-198] nor are effects on viewpoints reported [APP-075].</p> <p>Can the Applicant explain which receptors outside of the 5km study area have been included in the assessment and signpost where these have been assessed in the ES.</p>
1.5.6	Applicant	Paragraphs 8.9.27 to 8.9.29 of ES Chapter 8: LVIA [APP-043] state that there is potential for likely significant visual effects at the construction phase. However, the supporting appendices (8.3.3.3, 8.3.4.2

Ref:	Question to:	Question:
		<p>and 8.3.5.2) and Supplementary Visual Effects Tables [REP-061] identify likely significant effects at year 1 of operation as well as construction.</p> <p>Can the Applicant update the ES to report the significant effects accurately so that appendices and Chapters align.</p>
1.5.7	Applicant	<p>Considering significant landscape and visual effects alone from the Proposed Development are reported in the ES, can the Applicant explain their reasoning as to why this would not lead to cumulative effects with other development?</p>
1.5.8	Applicant	<p>Mitigation has been proposed for all adverse landscape and visual effects. However, there are a number of effects reported in Table 23.1 of ES Chapter 23 (Summary of Significant Effects) [APP-058] where the significance of effects is not reduced following the implementation of mitigation measures, suggesting mitigation is not effective for these effects. The effects are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Landscape: Character of land use: All substation sites (moderate adverse). • Landscape: Character of the topography and watercourses: All substation sites (moderate adverse). • Visual: Transport receptors: Cottam 2 (T040, T045), Cottam 3a (T016), and Cottam 3b (T021) (moderate adverse). <p>Can the Applicant comment on whether alternative mitigation measures have been considered to mitigate or reduce these adverse effects.</p>
1.5.9	Applicant	<p>ES Chapter 8: LVIA [APP-043] states that at Year 15 there would be a review of the management prescriptions within the oLEMP [APP-339] to determine whether further management is necessary to further reduce landscape and visual effects. This review is not secured in the LEMP, OEMP or the DCO.</p> <p>The Applicant is requested to explain why the ExA should be confident (i) that the review would be undertaken; and (ii) if the review were to take place, that any identified actions would be implemented.</p>
6.	Biodiversity and the Habitats Regulations Assessment	
1.6.1	Applicant	<p>Paragraph 9.5.8 of ES Chapter 9: Ecology and Biodiversity [APP-044] states that the study areas of 10km, 5km and 2km for international, national and local designated sites are 'standard distances' beyond which</p>

ExQ1 issued on 31 October 2023. Responses are due by Deadline 2 on Tuesday 21 November 2023.

Ref:	Question to:	Question:
		<p>impacts are not anticipated to occur. However, it is unclear from where these standard distances have derived.</p> <p>Can the Applicant explain where these study areas derive from and why they are confident these distances are sufficient to capture the zone of influence of the Proposed Development?</p>
1.6.2	Applicant	<p>The Applicant responded to section 51 advice in April 2023 stating that the Humber Estuary Ramsar site is located 25km from the Proposed Development and therefore was not included on the Ecology and Nature Conservation Features Plan. The Inspectorate noted that this site is not specifically mentioned in ES Chapter 9: Ecology and Biodiversity [APP-044]. However, paragraph 9.5.11 states that the Humber Estuary Special Area of Conservation (SAC) is located approximately 15km from the Proposed Development and the boundary of this SAC is the same as the Humber Estuary Ramsar site. This has not been assessed in ES Chapter 9. Although the Inspectorate notes agreement with Natural England that the Proposed Development would not impact internationally designated sites [RR-037] for completeness, can the Applicant:</p> <p>(i) provide an update to the Information to Support a Habitat Regulations Assessment document [APP-357] to include an assessment of the potential for significant effects on the Humber Estuary Ramsar site;</p> <p>(ii) explain why potential impacts to the Humber Estuary Ramsar site have not been assessed within ES Chapter 9 with reference to the potential for likely significant effects to occur. Should the potential for likely significant effects exist, can the Applicant update the assessment to assess this designated site; and</p> <p>(iii) consider whether other application documents (eg Planning Statement) require updating to refer to the Humber Estuary Ramsar site (and the Humber Estuary internationally protected sites more broadly) and update these accordingly.</p>
1.6.3	Natural England	<p>In its detailed advice [RR-037] on Internationally Designated Sites and in relation to its WR [REP-098], has Natural England considered the Humber Estuary Ramsar site?</p>

Ref:	Question to:	Question:
1.6.4	Applicant	ES Chapter 9: Ecology and Biodiversity [APP-044], paragraph 9.7.14 identifies a potential temporary impact to Willingham to Fillingham Road Verges LWS from construction traffic movements mounting the verges. ES Table 9.3 states that there would be a neutral residual effect (suggesting no impact) on this receptor following mitigation. However, the mitigation proposed (HDD for cables and no new accesses for traffic) does not address the potential impact of mounting the verges. Can the Applicant explain how a neutral impact on this site is concluded where there is potential for impact from construction traffic, identifying any relevant mitigation and explaining how it is secured.
1.6.5	Applicant	Paragraph 9.7.113 of ES Chapter 9: Ecology and Biodiversity [APP-044] states that the effects of the installation of solar panels on bat activity and the activity of their prey is largely unknown, in light of this please explain how confident the SoS can be that the purported beneficial effect would occur (paragraph 9.7.126).
1.6.6	Applicant	As arable field habitats have been found to contain notable bird species of conservation concern, please explain why arable fields are considered to be of Site Importance only, under paragraph 9.5.32 of ES Chapter 9: Ecology and Biodiversity [APP-044].
1.6.7	Applicant	Paragraphs 9.7.57 to 9.7.71 of Chapter 9: Ecology and Biodiversity [APP-044] sets out hedgerow effects. Please clarify the overall distance of hedgerow that would be lost.
1.6.8	Applicant	Please explain why set aside habitat and wetland bird habitat is also not proposed on sites other than Cottam 1 (paragraph 9.7.174-5 of ES Chapter 9: Ecology and Biodiversity [APP-044]), as it seems there is evidence of the related bird species using these sites in smaller numbers.
1.6.9	Applicant	Please explain why at paragraph 9.7.185 of ES Chapter 9: Ecology and Biodiversity [APP-044], it is said that mitigation for the lapwing would have the potential to bring about at least a beneficial effect given that it is stated (in paragraph 9.7.166) that this species would be displaced to a significant if not complete degree.
1.6.10	Applicant	Why under section 9.8 of ES Chapter 9: Ecology and Biodiversity [APP-044] are the significance of effects for the decommissioning phase not reported, similarly for Table 23.1 of ES Chapter 23: Summary of Significant Effects [APP-058].

Ref:	Question to:	Question:
1.6.11	Applicant	What is the Applicant's level of confidence that certain areas of the site may be retained due to their value for wildlife on decommissioning, as is said in paragraph 9.8.3 of ES Chapter 9: Ecology and Biodiversity [APP-044]. Please explain how this will be secured through the DCO.
1.6.12	Applicant	<p>The reported cumulative effects reported within ES Chapter 9: Ecology and Biodiversity [APP-044] do not include a definition of those which are considered significant. In addition, the justification for some of the conclusions remain vague e.g. paragraph 9.9.19 states there is potential for increased effects on species but does not explain what these are.</p> <p>Can the Applicant:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) explain the methods used to define significant cumulative effects on ecological receptors; (ii) clarify the significance of the cumulative biodiversity effects reported; and (iii) provide an update to ES Chapter 9.
1.6.13	Applicant	Is the approach to Biodiversity Net Gain considering solely enhancement, over and above the identified mitigation in ES Chapter 9: Ecology and Biodiversity [APP-044]? If it also incorporates the identified mitigation in ES Chapter 9, please provide figures which exclude this to provide a true 'net gain' figure.
1.6.14	7000 Acres	Please explain why you consider BNG is unproven in the UK at this scale and your concern in this regard [RR-041].
1.6.15	Applicant	<p>The Biodiversity Net Gain Report [APP-089] indicates that the proposed development would result in an overall net gain of 96% of habitat units, 70% gains in hedgerow, and more than 10% in river units. These figures are referenced throughout the application including in the Planning Statement [REP-047 (and elsewhere), as some of the benefits which would be delivered as part of the scheme.</p> <p>Please confirm whether, and if so how, the above levels of BNG are secured in the dDCO. If they are not, please provide details of the amount of biodiversity net gain the Applicant considers should be taken into account when considering potential benefits.</p>
7. The water environment		
1.7.1	Applicant	Has ES Chapter 10: Hydrology, Flood Risk and Drainage [APP-045] considered matters in relation to field drainage (and the effect of the Proposed Development on such systems)?

Ref:	Question to:	Question:
1.7.2	Applicant	Paragraph 10.5.14 of ES Chapter 10: Hydrology, Flood Risk and Drainage [APP-045] sets out that a 0.1% annual probability surface water scenario has been used as a proxy for the 1% Annual Exceedance Probability and Climate Change fluvial event. Where the 0.1% annual probability surface water scenario has been utilised, please confirm whether this has included a Climate Change fluvial event.
1.7.3	Applicant	Why does the 'Effects on Flood Risk and Drainage' section of ES Chapter 10: Hydrology, Flood Risk and Drainage [APP-045] consider that the sensitivity of people and property only medium?
1.7.4	Applicant	Paragraph 1.4.1 of the Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy [APP-090] refers to Strategic and Preliminary Flood Risk Assessment documents of the host authorities. How have these been utilised in the Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy?
1.7.5	Applicant	With regard to Section 2.6 of the Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy [APP-090], please explain if climate change allowances have been applied for peak river flow; peak rainfall intensity; sea level rise; offshore wind speed; and extreme wave height. Also please clarify if the flood depths, which are based on Environment Agency mapping are up to date and why maps showing the flood extent of the event are only provided in annexes C to F.
1.7.6	Applicant	With regard to Section 5 of the Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy [APP-090], further detail on what SuDs would be provided and their suitability is required. Please also clarify how the SuDS will be managed post-consent.
1.7.7	Applicant	Please clarify if flood storage is proposed, e.g. from surface water runoff under times of heavy rainfall.
1.7.8	Applicant	Please explain why paragraph 5.3.8 of the Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy [APP-090] considers there would likely be betterment over the existing surface water runoff regime, in light of the site's existing predominant agricultural use.
1.7.9	Applicant	With regard to Section 6.1 of the Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy [APP-090], please provide further and more detailed explanation on why it is considered that the Proposed Development passes the sequential test under NPS EN-1, the National Planning Policy Framework and local planning policy, given that parts of the Proposed Development would be in Flood Zones 2 and 3. Please utilise the wording of the test in your answer.

ExQ1 issued on 31 October 2023. Responses are due by Deadline 2 on Tuesday 21 November 2023.

Ref:	Question to:	Question:
1.7.10	Applicant	Section 2.1 of the Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy – Cable Route [APP-091] concerns tidal flooding. It is understood that the River Trent is tidal at this point. Does that have any bearing in relation to either the proposed cable route or the grid connection at Cottam Power station, or the nearest areas of arrays and associated development?
1.7.11	Applicant	The flood maps [APP-091 to 7] provided do not delineate flood risk zones 3a and 3b and the flood risk zone is just identified as flood risk zone 3. Can the Applicant provide a map identifying the Proposed Developments' location in relation to flood risk zones 3a and 3b.
1.7.12	Applicant/ Environment Agency	Please provide an update on the position as regards the Flood Risk Activity Permit. Please also clarify whether an Environmental Permit will be required for flood risk and/or land drainage.
1.7.13	Applicant	Please clarify proposals for the Battery Energy Storage System, the extent to which this area would be impermeable, and how contaminated water would be dealt with regard to safeguarding both water supplies and flood risk, with reference to the specific location of the battery storage.
1.7.14	Applicant	Can the Applicant clarify if it has consulted with the Scunthorpe and Gainsborough Internal Drainage Board on Cottam 2 and 3a/3b, as suggested by the Upper Witham Internal Drainage Board in its RR (RR-045).
1.7.15	Applicant	With regard to paragraph 10.8.17 of ES Chapter 10: Hydrology, Flood Risk and Drainage [APP-045], how does what is proposed through ES Chapter 14: Transport and Access [APP-049] address run off and spillage risk?
1.7.16	Applicant	With regard to paragraph 10.8.24 of ES Chapter 10: Hydrology, Flood Risk and Drainage [APP-045], how would a temporary drainage network address matters related to mud and debris blockages?
1.7.17	Applicant	With regard to paragraph 10.8.27 of ES Chapter 10: Hydrology, Flood Risk and Drainage [APP-045], please provide more detail on the construction mitigation guidance referred to, in relation to the temporary increase in impermeable area.
1.7.18	Applicant	Please clarify where temporary drainage features during construction would be placed and the location of attenuation ponds.

Ref:	Question to:	Question:
1.7.19	Applicant	With regard to paragraph 10.8.29 of Chapter 10: Hydrology, Flood Risk and Drainage [APP-045], please provide more detail on the good practice standards and robust maintenance plan referred to, in relation to the blockages of networks.
1.7.20	Applicant	With regard to Table 10.7 of ES Chapter 10: Hydrology, Flood Risk and Drainage [APP-045], please explain how the first item will be secured through design, as it would not be a DCO requirement
1.7.21	Applicant	Paragraph 6.10.40 of the Planning Statement [REP-047] states that drainage vehicles should be fitted with low pressure tyres to further reduce the impact on the underlying soil. How would this be secured and in relation to what type of vehicles.
1.7.22	Environment Agency	Please provide your comments on the revised Water Framework Directive Assessment [REP-043], including in relation to the matters that the EA raised in its RR [RR-026]
1.7.23	Applicant	Would the Proposed Development have impacts on private water supplies and water abstraction licences? Please identify and provide details of likely significant effects and mitigation, as appropriate.
1.7.24	Trent Valley Internal Drainage Board	In light of the distance between the Order Limits and Toft Dyke near Clayworth and Cuckstool Dyke east of Ossington, Sutton-on-Trent, please provide further explanation for the need to investigate these watercourses following the IDB's WR [REP-102].
8.	Soils and agriculture	
1.8.1	Applicant	What is the justification for using superseded national planning policy in the Farming circumstances assessment, as per paragraph 19.2.23 of revised ES Chapter 19: Soils and Agriculture [REP-010], as IEMA guidance is not national planning policy?
1.8.2	Applicant	Please explain why Table 19.2 (How the Response has been addressed) and paragraph 19.5.3 of revised Chapter 19: Soils and Agriculture [REP-010] considers that food security is not a material planning consideration?
1.8.3	Applicant	As there would be loss of agricultural land, including BMV, over the intended lifespan of the Proposed Development, and that previously developed land would not be utilised for the energy generation, please explain whether you consider the proposal would constitute an efficient use of land?

ExQ1 issued on 31 October 2023. Responses are due by Deadline 2 on Tuesday 21 November 2023.

Ref:	Question to:	Question:
1.8.4	Natural England	What is Natural England's view over whether the Agricultural Land Classification survey follows Natural England guidance for such an assessment now that the Applicant has provided further information to Natural England regarding the amounts and proportions of agricultural land, including BMV across the full Order Limits?
1.8.5	Applicant	Why do the Agricultural Land Classification Grade Distribution Figures 19.1 to 19.3 [APP-331 to 333] include land outside of the Order Limits?
1.8.6	Applicant	The WR of 7000 Acres on 'Agriculture & ALC' [REP-105] makes reference to BMV soil re-testing that took place at the West Burton 4 site at Clayworth. Please explain why retesting was not also carried out for Cottam.
1.8.7	Applicant	7000 Acres also refer to purported anomalies and inconsistencies in the submitted agricultural land survey work/reporting. The Applicant's comments are sought on this matter.
1.8.8	Applicant	Why is the agricultural land resource in revised Chapter 19: Soils and Agriculture not broken down by ALC grade for each of the Cottam sites? [REP-010]
1.8.9	Applicant	Paragraph 19.3.9 of revised Chapter 19: Soils and Agriculture [REP-010] states there would be an anticipated limited impact of the Cable Route Corridor. However, paragraphs 19.3.7 and 8 set out, respectively, that the corridor has not been subject to soil survey assessment and that agricultural occupancy and land use information will need to be collected ahead of trenching work. Please explain how it can be said there would be an anticipated limited impact. If further information is now available on the Cable Route Corridor, please provide it including the amount of land which has not been assessed.
1.8.10	Applicant	Does diverging from the magnitude of change criteria with regard to the loss of land, as is set out in paragraph 19.7.7 of revised ES Chapter 19: Soils and Agriculture [REP-010] impact on the validity of the overall approach to considering significant effects for the impact assessment?
1.8.11	Applicant	Why is there no mention of the effect on BMV land in the potential effects section (19.9) of revised ES Chapter 19: Soils and Agriculture [REP-010]?
1.8.12	Applicant	Paragraph 19.9.17 of revised ES Chapter 19: Soils and Agriculture [REP-010] sets out that grass management below and between the solar panels will need to be managed, including by livestock/grazing

ExQ1 issued on 31 October 2023. Responses are due by Deadline 2 on Tuesday 21 November 2023.

Ref:	Question to:	Question:
		where appropriate. Please provide further details of how this would be managed, including through the DCO, and explain why such an approach is being taken as it is reported that the majority of the site is in arable rather than livestock/grazing use.
1.8.13	Applicant	The application submission does not seek to substantively address the matter of the temporary loss of agricultural land over the intended timespan for the Proposed Development. Please set out your views on this with regard to use of agricultural land in particular.
1.8.14	Applicant	Further to comments made about the termination of a Countryside Stewardship arrangement due to end December 2022 in paragraph 19.8.22 of revised ES Chapter 19: Soils and Agriculture [REP-010], please confirm whether any of the land within the Order Limits is the subject to such environmental stewardship arrangements.
1.8.15	Applicant	<p>Please explain why the Applicant considers there would be a significant beneficial effect to farming circumstances in view of the amount of agricultural land that would be utilised (revised ES Chapter 19 Soils and Agriculture paragraph 19.9.19).</p> <p>In light of the above, please can the Applicant also explain why it considers there would be a significant beneficial effect when the land returns to agricultural use following decommissioning (revised ES Chapter 19 Soils and Agriculture, paragraph 19.9.29) [REP-010].</p>
1.8.16	Applicant	Paragraph 6.7.15 of the revised Planning Statement [REP-047] refers to discussions with landowners to focus the scheme on land least agriculturally productive and most difficult to farm effectively. Please provide more details of these discussions.
1.8.17	Applicant	What are the actual current yields in terms of arable, pasture and livestock and what is the estimated loss in yield due to the Proposed Development?
1.8.18	Applicant	Has the Applicant considered the effects of any displacement of food production that would be caused by the proposal? Please also provide a more detailed explanation over how the Proposed Development would support the farming enterprises whose land would be utilised.

Ref:	Question to:	Question:
1.8.19	Applicant	With regard to paragraph 19.3.10 of revised ES Chapter 19: Soils and Agriculture, will that the cable ducts are unlikely to be decommissioned have a bearing over the agricultural use of the land, post decommissioning? [REP-10]
1.8.20	Applicant	With regard to the cables themselves, paragraph 4.8.7 of revised ES Chapter 4: Scheme Description [REP-012] states that 33kV, 132kV, and 400kV may be left in-situ rather than being removed during decommissioning. However, paragraph 19.9.20 of revised ES Chapter 19: Soils and Agriculture [REP-010] states that buried cables within the solar PV sites will be removed. The magnitude of impacts to agricultural land are deemed negligible on the basis that cables will be removed in Chapter 19: Soils and Agriculture, paragraph 19.9.22. Can the Applicant explain whether and where cables will be removed at decommissioning and whether this alters any ES conclusions and update the relevant Chapter assessments of the ES.
1.8.21	Applicant	Please respond to Natural England's comments in its RR [RR-03] and its WR [REP-098] to the Outline Soil Management Plan [APP-146] including with regard to the restoration of the site following decommissioning.
1.8.22	Applicant	Will the Outline Soil Management Plan [APP-146] be updated in line with Natural England's WR [REP-098]. If not, please explain why.
1.8.23	Applicant	Please explain why section 19.11 of revised ES Chapter 19: Soils and Agriculture Revision A [RE1-010] has not been updated now that other schemes have been submitted and where there is now likely publicly available data, including ALC surveys, soil resources and farming circumstances..
1.8.24	Applicant	The revised oLEMP [REP-045] states in paragraph 4.7.8 that mowing may replace grazing as a management practice underneath the panels. Revised ES Chapter 19 Soils and Agriculture [REP-010], paragraphs 19.9.17 to 19.9.19 states that there would be a moderate beneficial significant effect on the premise that the farming enterprise would diversify (through income from panel placement) and that management can include grazing from livestock. The discussion does not explain how a worst-case scenario of a change in land use has influenced the conclusion of effects on farming circumstances during operation. Can the Applicant explain how the change in land use has influenced the conclusion of a moderate beneficial effect.

9. The historic environment

ExQ1 issued on 31 October 2023. Responses are due by Deadline 2 on Tuesday 21 November 2023.

Ref:	Question to:	Question:
1.9.1	Applicant	The Scoping Opinion [APP-064] explained that the heritage study area should be based on the views to and from the Proposed Development and on this basis, should align with the study area set out for the LVIA. This includes potential long-distance views. The study areas for designated and non-designated assets are different without explanation why. Can the Applicant explain the reasoning for applying different study areas for different receptors.
1.9.2	Applicant	It is noted that the figures in the Heritage Statement [APP-125 to 128] show zones of theoretical visibility and observer points. It does not appear though that photomontages have been provided as regards heritage assets. If the Applicant is relying on photomontages provided elsewhere in the documentation in this regard this should be clarified and paper copies provided in the correct form as regards how those photomontages are to be viewed.
1.9.3	Applicant	The Heritage Statement [APP-125] does not appear to cover non-designated heritage assets, yet ES Chapter: 13 Cultural Heritage [APP-048] does. Please explain the relationship between the two documents in that regard as they are both part of the ES and where information can be found with regard to the significance of non-designated heritage assets.
1.9.4	Applicant/Historic England/Host Authorities	Please confirm that the study areas identified in Section 13.4 of ES Chapter 13: Cultural Heritage [APP-048] have been agreed.
1.9.5	Historic England/Applicant	Historic England's RR [RR-029] states that the application appears to have largely addressed the setting of designated heritage assets and earthwork monuments of equivalent importance apart from the Thorpe medieval settlement Scheduled Monument (SM). Does that include all of the other designated heritage assets that Historic England drew to the Applicant's attention at the pre application stage, as is set out at paragraph 13.4.2 of ES Chapter: 13 Cultural Heritage? [APP-048] The Applicant is also to provide listing and schedule descriptions and conservation area appraisal (if it exists) for those assets. This is not required for the Thorpe medieval settlement SM, as this has already been provided.
1.9.6	Applicant	The difference in position with Historic England over the field boundary and the proximity of the Proposed Development to the Thorpe medieval settlement SM is noted from the draft Statement of Common Ground

ExQ1 issued on 31 October 2023. Responses are due by Deadline 2 on Tuesday 21 November 2023.

Ref:	Question to:	Question:
		[REP-065]. Can the Applicant explain the likely reduction in energy generation that would result from the removal of the solar panels between the SM and this boundary.
1.9.7	Applicant	Does the assessment on the Grade I Fillingham Castle and the associated Grade II Registered Park and Garden as set out at paragraphs 13.7.36 and 13.7.40 of ES Chapter: 13 Cultural Heritage [APP-048] have regard to the elevated position of these assets, which is described in the Heritage Statement [APP-125].
1.9.8	Historic England	It is noted that Historic England drew the Grade I listed Fillingham Castle to the Applicant's attention at the pre application stage. The Heritage Statement [APP-125] and paragraph 13.7.36 of ES Chapter: 13 Cultural Heritage [APP-048] has lowered the level of adverse effect on this asset, based on visibility. What is Historic England's view on this approach?
1.9.9	Applicant	Paragraph 13.8.10 of Chapter 13; Cultural Heritage [APP-048] recommends that further consultation with Historic England is undertaken in the Examination Period with a view to identifying a design that would reduce the significant effect identified for the Thorpe medieval settlement SM (NHLE 1016978) to an acceptable level. Can the Applicant confirm whether an alternative design is being explored with Historic England and if so, how will this be presented into the Examination
1.9.10	Applicant/ Historic England	<p>The potential for a direct physical impact to the Site of a college and Benedictine Abbey, St Marys Church, Stow is indicated in paragraphs 13.8.2 and 13.8.5 of ES Chapter: 13 Cultural Heritage [APP-048], where mitigation is sought by way of a banksman to monitor the HGV where there is a requirement to mount the pavement in the village of Stow. Is a tracking plan available of such a vehicle at the point where it would need to mount the pavement?</p> <p>Please also clarify whether there would be the potential for an effect on the structural integrity of this asset, such as on the foundations, caused by abnormal loads or other forms of construction traffic.</p> <p>Historic England's views are also sought on these matters.</p>
1.9.11	Applicant	Please signpost in the submissions where there is a ZTV taken from the Site of a college and Benedictine Abbey, St Marys Church, Stow, including on a cumulative basis?
1.9.12	Applicant	ES Chapter: 13 Cultural Heritage [APP-048], section 13.7 assesses the likely significant effects on cultural heritage receptors. Seven conservation areas are identified in Table 13.7 however, these are not included in the assessment in section 13.7. Can the Applicant explain why conservation areas are not assessed or

ExQ1 issued on 31 October 2023. Responses are due by Deadline 2 on Tuesday 21 November 2023.

Ref:	Question to:	Question:
		update ES Chapter 13 to include an assessment of likely significant effects on conservation areas, or else cross reference with the Heritage Statement [APP-125] if that is being relied on this regard.
1.9.13	Applicant	From the information presented in ES Chapter: 13 Cultural Heritage [APP-048] and supporting Appendices, it is difficult to determine the percentage of land anticipated to be/trial that has been trench and therefore whether the 2% has been or will be achieved. Can the Applicant quantify the percentage of the total area of the Proposed Development that has been/will be trench and provide supporting evidence of this.
1.9.14	Lincolnshire County Council	LCC has expressed in its RR [RR-001] that the baseline characterisation is inadequate but confirm that the agreed 2% coverage within the redline boundary was achieved. LCC's LIR [REP-085] also considers that the baseline characterisation is inadequate. Can LCC explain what information it considers is required to deem the baseline adequate in line with reference to relevant guidance and the geophysical surveys [APP110-122] that have been submitted.
1.9.15	Lincolnshire County Council/ Applicant	As an alternative to an agreed % coverage area, are there specific areas of land within the Order Limits that could be the subject of the baseline characterisation? Lincolnshire County Council and the Applicant's views are sought on this. Please also signpost where such evidence in relation to these areas of land may be found within the application documentation.
1.9.16	Applicant	Lincolnshire County Council has stated in its RR [RR-001] that it is awaiting an overall evaluation plan for the Proposed Development. Can the Applicant confirm whether an overall evaluation plan will be submitted to the examination and if so, provide a submission date.
1.9.17	Lincolnshire County Council	Lincolnshire County Council expressed in its RR [RR-001] that concrete feet may cause compaction and harm archaeology beneath, specifically, shallow archaeology. Has the Applicant's response to the RR [REP-049] addressed this concern?
1.9.18	Applicant	With regard to paragraph 13.7.15 of ES Chapter: 13 Cultural Heritage [APP-048] and the 5th bullet point as regards the shared cable corridor, is a full evaluation of the results now available
1.9.19	Nottinghamshire County Council	Nottinghamshire County Council has expressed at paragraph 2.71 of its LIR [REP-086] that the Applicant's approach to archaeological mitigation 'seems vague and ill defined'. Please explain this comment.

Ref:	Question to:	Question:
1.9.20	Applicant	ES Chapter 23: Summary of Significant Effects [APP-058] identifies several residual significant adverse effects for cultural heritage receptors where no additional mitigation has been proposed. Can the Applicant provide an explanation as to why no additional mitigation measures have been proposed.
1.9.21	Applicant	With regard to the potential for beneficial effects to non-designated archaeological remains under paragraphs 13.7.33-4 of ES Chapter: 13 Cultural Heritage [APP-048], how does this take account of the effect on earthworks associated with the proposal, such as in areas of ridge and furrow?
1.9.22	Applicant	Please explain with regard to paragraph 13.9.5 of ES Chapter: 13 Cultural Heritage [APP-048] and the Heritage Statement [APP-125] why new planting would have a beneficial effect in relation to the significance of these assets?
1.9.23	Applicant	Paragraph 13.3.2 of ES Chapter:13 Cultural Heritage [APP-048] refers to the legislative framework but no particular conclusion is reached against that Act in the chapter or the revised Planning Statement [REP-047]. Please clarify why this has not been done, also considering Part 3 of The Infrastructure Planning (Decisions) Regulations 2010 and the findings in ES Chapter 13: Cultural Heritage and Cumulative Impact Assessment Tables [APP-132].
1.9.24	Applicant	Has Section 6.6 of the revised Planning Statement [REP-047] had regard in its findings to where ES Chapter: 13 Cultural Heritage [APP-048] and the Cumulative Impact Assessment Tables [APP-132] has found slight adverse impacts to designated heritage assets. Please explain what level of harm under NPS EN1 and the National Planning Policy Framework has been attributed in this regard.
1.9.25	Applicant	Where paragraph 6.6.7 of the revised Planning Statement [REP-047] refers to 'lesser weight' given to grade II listed buildings and a Registered Park and Garden, can this be explained in light of what the first sentence of paragraph 200 of the National Planning Policy Framework sets out. This should also be explained in relation to the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.
1.9.26	Applicant	Please explain what public benefits Section 6 of the revised Planning Statement [REP-047] has taken account of in its section titled 'harm policy test?'. This can be provided as a separate statement.
10.	Transport and access, highways and public rights of way	

ExQ1 issued on 31 October 2023. Responses are due by Deadline 2 on Tuesday 21 November 2023.

Ref:	Question to:	Question:
1.10.1	Applicant	Please explain how access would be taken from Ingham Road/Stow Lane to Willingham Road/Fillingham Lane, as it is not clear at the resolution that the figure has been produced at, nor in attempting to relate it to features on the ground nor in attempting to relate it to features on the ground nor in the revised Construction Traffic Management Plan) [REP-016]
1.10.2	Applicant	Paragraph 14.4.33 of ES Chapter 14: Transport and Access [APP-049] mentions the effect of the Covid 19 pandemic. Please provide further details on the timings of the various surveys (including periods outside of the lockdowns) and whether these have a bearing on the survey results presented. Please explain how the latest Department of Transport's TAG uncertainty toolkit has been applied in this regard.
1.10.3	Applicant	Please confirm if Table 14.9 of ES Chapter 14: Transport and Access [APP-049] is up to date in relation to accident data, given that it does not include accidents from 2022 or 2023.
1.10.4	Applicant	Please clarify whether it is ES Chapter 14: Transport and Access [APP-049] or the revised Construction Traffic Management Plan [REP-016] which provides the definitive list of construction vehicle routes, as the summary list in paragraph 14.7.20 of ES Chapter 14 does not entirely tally with those which are set out in the revised Construction Traffic Management Plan.
1.10.5	Applicant	Will the utilisation of the construction routes result in the removal of hedgerows other than at access points. If so, please provide details of the amount of removal and the location.
1.10.6	Applicant	With regard to the consideration of the Cable Route Corridor under ES Chapter 14:Transport and Access [APP-049], why is a study area not defined and why is not the equivalent level of baseline conditions provided as for Cottam 1,2,3a and 3b.
1.10.7	Applicant	Paragraph 14.6.4 of ES Chapter 14: Transport and Access [APP-049] mentions works to enable abnormal load deliveries. Please explain what these would be.
1.10.8	Applicant	Please clarify whether the figures presented in Section 14.9 of ES Chapter 14:Transport and Access [APP-049], are still accurate as regards the cumulative effects, and if they have changed, please provide an update.
1.10.9	Applicant	Please also provide further explanation of paragraph 14.9.5 of ES Chapter 14: Transport and Access [APP-049] as regards the cumulative effects from the Cable Corridor Route and the various solar array schemes.

ExQ1 issued on 31 October 2023. Responses are due by Deadline 2 on Tuesday 21 November 2023.

Ref:	Question to:	Question:
		Please signpost to where such a conclusion over the residual effect is drawn from as regards the submitted evidence and if not, please provide further evidence over how this conclusion has been reached.
1.10.10	Applicant	It is not clear from ES Chapter 14: Transport and Access [APP-049] and the associated transport documents whether the B1241 has been assessed from its junction with the A1500, along "High Street" through Sturton-by-Stow until it becomes Stow Road. Has this been considered, including the proximity of this construction route to the various services in this village.
1.10.11	Applicant	Nottinghamshire County Council in its LIR [REP-086] expresses preference for the use of Cottam Road which it states is intending to be used by the Gate Burton project. Why therefore is the Proposed Development intending to utilise Torksey Ferry Road through the village of Rampton.
1.10.12	Applicant	Please clarify/explain if the assessment of likely effects in ES Chapter 14: Transport and Access [APP-049] includes the abnormal loads.
1.10.13	Lincolnshire/ Nottinghamshire County Councils	Would the Proposed Development deliver off-road parking provision, servicing and access arrangements in accordance with the Highway standards that the Highway Authority utilises. Please refer to those standards in your answer.
1.10.14	Applicant	Why were the three particular Public Rights of Way (PRoW) chosen for surveys of those PRoW that run through the Order Limits, as set out in paragraph 4.5.10 of ES Chapter 14: Transport and Access [APP-049]?
1.10.15	Applicant	It is unclear how the effect on pedestrians and cyclists would be minor at worst under Section 14.7 of ES Chapter 14: Transport and Access [APP-049], if such road users came across HGVs, abnormal loads and the increased numbers of cars/LGV on the number of minor roads and Public Rights of Way that would provide access and cross the site. Please explain with regard to the safety implications for those users.
1.10.16	Applicant	Further to the consideration of the likely effects on pedestrians and cyclists under ES Chapter 14: Transport and Access (APP-049), has this considered the potential effect of diversions during the construction phase, as indicated on the PRoW Plan [AS-008]?

Ref:	Question to:	Question:
1.10.17	Applicant	Where the Cable Route Corridor has been assessed under paragraph 14.7.68 of ES Chapter 14: Transport and Access [APP-049] has this had regard to the effect on users of the Trent Valley Way (which does not appear to have been the subject of the PRoW survey)?
1.10.18	Applicant	Has ES Chapter 14: Transport and Access [APP-049] accounted for horse riders in relation to effects?
1.10.19	Applicant	Why does ES Chapter 14: Transport and Access [APP-049] not consider the effects in particular from construction traffic on rail and water borne traffic, given the presence of rail lines through the red line boundary and the River Trent?
1.10.20	Applicant	Please confirm whether the summary of likely effects in paragraph 14.7.68 of ES Chapter 14: Transport and Access [APP-049] considers the effect at the bridge crossing points over the River Trent (A57 toll, A631).
1.10.21	Applicant	Have full surveys of the River Trent been completed in order to inform the depth of horizontal direction drilling? If such surveys have already been submitted, please signpost.
1.10.22	Applicant	It appears from paragraphs 14.6.3 and 4 of ES Chapter 14: Transport and Access [APP-049] that the revised Construction Traffic Management Plan [REP-016] would attempt to control construction vehicle routing. As this involves public roads and vehicles/drivers who may not be under direct control of the Applicant, how will this be effectively adhered to?
1.10.23	Applicant	Would any mitigation/management measures be put in place on the access roads that would be used that are the subject of weight limits?
1.10.24	Applicant	With regard to paragraph 14.7.12 of ES Chapter 14: Transport and Access [APP-049] and the Construction Worker Travel Plan [REP-016. Appendix D], please provide more information on how the shuttle bus will operate, including origins and destinations, and how workers will be incentivised to use the shuttle bus and car sharing. Please also explain how workers could utilise public transport.
1.10.25	Applicant	Paragraph 14.7.75 of ES Chapter 14: Transport and Access [APP-049] refers to a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit and additional safety measures. Has such an audit been carried out?
11.	Noise, vibration, air quality, and nuisance	

ExQ1 issued on 31 October 2023. Responses are due by Deadline 2 on Tuesday 21 November 2023.

Ref:	Question to:	Question:
1.11.1	Applicant	Please explain why moderate effects for the purposes of ES Chapter 15: Noise and Vibration [APP-050] have not been considered to be significant in terms of the EIA Regulations
1.11.2	Applicant	Please explain what is meant by absolute noise levels with regard to the use of the alternative noise methodology in paragraph 15.4.40 of ES Chapter 15: Noise and Vibration [APP-050] as this is not defined in Appendix 15.2 Acoustic Terminology [APP-138].
1.11.3	Applicant	The Applicant's comments are sought on the WLDC's LIR [REP-091] in respect of methodology, surveys, sources and assumptions (14.1.1 NV1 to NV11).
1.11.4	Applicant	Please confirm if the tonal correction set out at paragraph 15.7.73 of ES Chapter 15: Noise and Vibration [APP-050] has been applied to all plant, or solely the battery storage.
1.11.5	Applicant	The Planning Practice Guidance: Noise states that "The subjective nature of noise means that there is not a simple relationship between noise levels and the impact on those affected" (paragraph 006). The countryside location of the site may therefore have a bearing in respect of the existing sound environment and how new noise sources may be perceived by local residents. How is this more qualitative aspect of noise reflected in the noise assessment work that has taken place?
1.11.6	Applicant	Paragraph 15.4.12 of ES Chapter 15: Noise and Vibration [APP-050] refers to horizontal directional drilling, but it is not clear why this has not subsequently been considered as regards the effects of noise and vibration impacts (paragraph 15.4.13). Please explain.
1.11.7	Applicant	Please confirm whether ES Chapter 15: Noise and Vibration [APP-050] has considered multiple effects at the same receptor (e.g. a receptor that would experience both noise from site construction and construction traffic noise).
1.11.8	Applicant	Does the assessment of key effects under ES Chapter 15: Noise and Vibration [APP-050] address where noise may arise from construction activities outside of normal working hours
1.11.9	Applicant	Where paragraph 15.7.65 of ES Chapter 15: Noise and Vibration [APP-050] states that there would not be noise emission associated with the solar PV panels, has this assessment of effects had regard to the potential use of tracker panels and any 'hum' from the panels?

ExQ1 issued on 31 October 2023. Responses are due by Deadline 2 on Tuesday 21 November 2023.

Ref:	Question to:	Question:
1.11.10	Applicant	Please explain why you consider the combined operational noise effect with Blyton Park Driving Centre would be negligible, in considering the proposal in combination with the operation of that site (paragraph 15.9.4 of ES Chapter 15: Noise and Vibration) [APP-050].
1.11.11	LNT Group	Please explain your noise concerns as set out in your RR [RR-033] as regards the acoustic reflective surface of the solar panels.
1.11.12	Applicant	How has the effect on the navigational safety and land stability of the River Trent been considered as regards noise and vibration?
1.11.13	Applicant	Paragraph 2.4.1 of the revised outline Construction Environmental Management Plan [REP-037] sets out the days and times for construction activities. Please clarify if such activities are to be excluded from bank and public holidays.
1.11.14	Applicant	Paragraph 15.6.10 of ES Chapter 15: Noise and Vibration [APP-050] refers to the use of acoustic barriers. To what extent are these proposed and what would their stated performance? Also, how will these be secured, including their specific design?
1.11.15	Applicant	How would the Best Practicable Means specifically deal with the major magnitude of change at the identified receptors as set out at paragraph 15.7.22 of ES Chapter 15: Noise and Vibration? [APP-050]
1.11.16	Applicant	The UK Health and Safety Agency has stated in its RR [RR-044] that UK Air Quality Standards have not been used. Please explain why not.
1.11.17	Applicant	Table 17.1 of ES Chapter 17: Air Quality [APP-052] states that a worst case assessment has been undertaken. Please explain how this has been undertaken.
1.11.18	Applicant	With regard to paragraph 17.4.6 of Chapter 17: Air Quality [APP-052] and the scoping out of construction traffic, please explain whether this accounts for abnormal load movements and what the relevant criteria is as regards the IAQM document cited that has led to construction traffic being scoped out.

ExQ1 issued on 31 October 2023. Responses are due by Deadline 2 on Tuesday 21 November 2023.

Ref:	Question to:	Question:
1.11.19	Applicant	Paragraph 17.4.17 of ES Chapter 17: Air Quality [APP-052] utilises fire smoke exposure guidance that relates to wildland fires. Please explain its relevance given that paragraph 17.4.14 identifies the risk arises from solar panels, battery storage and sub-stations fire.
1.11.20	Applicant	Please explain how the four air quality category zones have been identified under paragraph 17.7.15 of ES Chapter 17: Air Quality [APP-052].
1.11.21	Applicant	Please explain why paragraph 17.7.17 of ES Chapter 17: Air Quality [APP-052] states there will not be adverse effects at the closest receptor points whilst paragraph 17.7.8 states there would be a low risk of adverse effects. Please also explain if other sources of risk such as solar panels and sub-stations (as per paragraph 17.4.14) have been considered.
1.11.22	Applicant	Is the determination of effects as negligible with regard to the fire impact assessment of battery energy storage systems dependant on the actions of local residents, with regard to paragraphs 17.7.18 and 19 of Chapter 17: Air Quality [APP-052]. Please also explain the process of residents being informed and moved, as is proposed.
1.11.23	Applicant	With regard to cumulative effects, why are the AAWT and AADT related figures in paragraph 17.9.4 of ES Chapter 17: Air Quality [APP-052] the same as predicted to be for the proposed development on its own?
1.11.24	Applicant	With regard to paragraph 17.7.13 of ES Chapter 17: Air Quality [APP-052] explain how following the implementation of the appropriate site-specific mitigation measures, included within the revised Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan [REP-037], the significance of the effects from dust and PM10 emissions associated with the construction works is considered to be negligible
1.11.25	Applicant	<p>ES Chapter 17: Air Quality [APP-052] refers to the IAQM Guidance on the Assessment of Dust from Demolition and Construction to determine the level of site-specific mitigation measures required based on the risk of impacts from the Proposed Development on air quality. Appendix 17.1 [APP-141] identifies the risk in table 4-3 in line with the IAQM guidance and sets out the appropriate mitigation measures in Tables 5-1 and 5-2.</p> <p>However, Table 3.10 of the revised Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan [REP-037] does not reflect all of these measures. Can the Applicant explain this inconsistency or else update this Plan to reflect the identified appropriate mitigation measures.</p>

Ref:	Question to:	Question:
1.11.26	Applicant	Are the mitigation measures that are set out in Section 17.8 of ES Chapter 17: Air Quality [APP-052] additional mitigation measures or part of the earlier described embedded mitigation.
1.11.27	Applicant	Please explain whether the Updated Air Quality Impact Assessment of a Solar Panel Fire Incident [REP-078] and Environmental Statement Addendum: Air Quality Impact Assessment of Battery Energy Storage Systems (BESS) Fire [REP-079] have any bearing on ES Chapter 17: Air Quality [APP-052], which has not been updated.
12. Socio-economics, tourism, and recreation		
1.12.1	Applicant	Why does the list of Neighbourhood Plan policies in paragraph 18.3.27 of ES Chapter 18: Socio-Economics and Tourism and Recreation [APP-053] not accord with that which is set out in policy accordance tables in the revised Planning Statemen [REP-047], as regards socio-economics, tourism and recreation?
1.12.2	Applicant	Paragraph 18.7.15 of ES Chapter 18: Socio-Economics and Tourism and Recreation [APP-053] refers to Chapter 19: Soils and Agriculture [REP-010] in relation to loss of agricultural sector jobs. That Chapter does not provide such a calculation, so please explain how this has been derived.
1.12.3	Applicant	With regard to paragraph 18.7.17 of ES Chapter 18: Socio-Economics and Tourism and Recreation [APP-053], please explain why increasing accommodation occupancy rates would itself lead to an increase in Full Time Equivalent employees? As the construction phase at least appears to be displacing visitors, please also explain why the level of the respective beneficial or adverse effects would not be the same.
1.12.4	Applicant	Please explain what the difference is between calculating employment numbers in the Full Time Equivalent per Annum as a Result of Scheme Construction (Table 18.10 of ES Chapter 18: Socio-Economics and Tourism and Recreation, APP-053) and Overall Changes to employment per Annum (Table 18.11).
1.12.5	Applicant	With regard to the predicted uplift in employment, please explain what types/numbers of employment would come from the Local Impact Area (LIA) in terms of skilled roles, or would those roles be likely filled from outside of the LIA, given the skills and qualification attenuation remarks that ES Chapter 18: Socio-Economics and Tourism and Recreation [APP-053] makes about the LIA, such as at paragraphs 18.5.27 to 29 and 18.7.39.

ExQ1 issued on 31 October 2023. Responses are due by Deadline 2 on Tuesday 21 November 2023.

Ref:	Question to:	Question:
1.12.6	Applicant	Please explain whether the effect on the agricultural sector at paragraph 18.7.48 of ES Chapter 18: Socio-Economics and Tourism and Recreation [APP-053] includes the effect on suppliers and the upward chain.
1.12.7	Applicant	Please clarify how the proposal would affect neighbouring agricultural businesses as regards access and boundary enclosure, and any other relevant matters [RR-034].
1.12.8	Applicant	Please explain how Section 18.10 of ES Chapter: Socio-Economics and Tourism and Recreation [APP-053] and the revised Planning Statement [REP-047] has accounted for Blyton Park Driving Centre and the Automotive Research and Development Centre planning permission in relation to the economic impacts.
1.12.9	WLDC	Is the Blyton Park Driving Centre and the Automotive Research and Development Centre afforded any protection under the development plan?
1.12.10	WLDC	Noting the full copy of the Central Lincolnshire Local Plan (2023) which the Council provided with its LIR [REP-091], would the Proposed Development have any bearing where it concerns the agri-food sector?
1.12.11	Applicant	<p>Please explain the following in relation to the Priority Regeneration Area at the Cottam Power Station under the Bassetlaw Local Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why has this not been taken account of in Section 18.10 of ES Chapter 18: Socio-Economics and Tourism and Recreation [APP-053]; • Please explain in relation to the revised Planning Statement [REP-047] how the Proposed Development fares in relation to each criteria of draft Policy ST6 of the Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2038?; and • How will it be ensured that the flexibility which is proposed for the Cable Route Corridor does not compromise the existing operations and the development of the regeneration area?
1.12.12	Bassetlaw District Council	Noting the Council's comments in its LIR [REP-080], does it consider that the proposal would comply with draft Policy ST6 of the Bassetlaw Local Plan 2020-2038?
1.12.13	Applicant	Where paragraph 18.4.1 of ES Chapter 18: Socio-Economics and Tourism [APP-053] states that "Where applicable and practicable, additional fine-grain data at individual District level, or at District Ward level will be provided to determine the sensitivity of likely effected receptors and the magnitude of potential impacts

ExQ1 issued on 31 October 2023. Responses are due by Deadline 2 on Tuesday 21 November 2023.

Ref:	Question to:	Question:
		upon them”, please explain where this has been provided as regards the settlements nearest the Proposed Development, as well as the nearest town, Gainsborough.
1.12.14	Applicant	How does Section 18.5 Baseline Conditions of ES Chapter 18: Socio-Economics and Tourism and Recreation [APP-053] deal with population well-being?
1.12.15	Applicant	With regard to paragraph 18.7.37 of ES Chapter 18: Socio-Economics and Tourism and Recreation [APP-053] please explain if this would have a potential effect on the housing stock in relation to maintaining an adequate supply and on local people seeking accommodation who are not connected to the proposal. In addition, would such an effect be exacerbated by way of the cumulative effects (paragraph 18.10.17)?
1.12.16	Applicant	Please clarify whether it is the intention for any temporary accommodation to be provided during the construction and decommissioning phases, in particular as paragraph 18.10.12 of ES Chapter 18: Socio-Economics and Tourism and Recreation [APP-053] states that as regards cumulative effects the peak level of accommodation needed for temporary construction workers is likely to exceed accommodation stock.
1.12.17	Applicant	Table 5.1 of the Equalities Impact Assessment [APP-351] sets out that ES Chapter 21: Other Environmental Matters [APP-056] includes assessment in respect of the general population and vulnerable groups. Please explain where this is the case as regards how the effect on the vulnerable groups, in particular where they have protected characteristics.
1.12.18	7000 Acres	Paragraph 3 of 7000 Acres’ Equality Impact Assessment WR [REP-107] refers to the Travelling Community. Please clarify if this is a general remark or if it is referring to a specific site(s) within or close to the Order Limits.
1.12.19	Applicant	7000 Acres’ Equality Impact Assessment WR [REP-107] has raised matters in relation to Article 8 of the Human Rights Act (1998). What are the Applicant’s views by way of the application of this Act to the Proposed Development?
1.12.20	Applicant	With regard to the socio-demographic impacts as set out in Section 18.7 of ES Chapter 18: Socio-Economics and Tourism and Recreation [APP-053], what would the demographic profile of the workforce be compared to the local population, and would this have potential effects in relation to the Equality Impact

ExQ1 issued on 31 October 2023. Responses are due by Deadline 2 on Tuesday 21 November 2023.

Ref:	Question to:	Question:
		Assessment [APP-351] and the protected characteristics under the Equality Act 2010 and the Public Sector Equality Duty?
1.12.21	Applicant	In respect of socio-demographic impacts: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How has this considered the effect on population well-being, beyond identifying this as a receptor? • What do you consider the effect on local residents would be by way of how they perceive and appreciate their surroundings, as has been set out in the RRs and at the Open Floor Hearing?
1.12.22	7000 Acres	7000 Acres' RR [RR-041] states there is the possibility of socioeconomic decline from the cumulative effect and size of these developments, which would then affect people's health and wellbeing, which then has the long-term potential to impact on health inequality. Please explain.
1.12.23	Applicant	Please explain the rationale for the new permissive path between Stow and Stow Pastures, as is referred to in paragraph 18.6.9 of ES Chapter 18: Socio-Economics and Tourism and Recreation [APP-053] Also, explain the status of the permissive path as regards Policy 15 of the Sturton by Stow and Stow Neighbourhood Plan, how it would connect into the existing recreational routes and what type of recreational users would be able to use it.
1.12.24	Applicant	Please also confirm whether other permissive paths are proposed as paths in the plural is referred to in other application documentation such as the revised Planning Statement [REP-047] and the revised Draft DCO [REP-006]. Interested Parties have referred to the pre application stage in relation to the potential for a route following the banks of the River Till.
1.12.25	Applicant	Does Table 18.15 of ES Chapter 18: Socio-Economics and Tourism and Recreation [APP-053] reflect usage of the Public Right of Ways, in particular by way of the long distance recreational routes?
1.12.26	Lincolnshire County Council	Can the Council provide more information in relation to 'claimed paths' that are referred to in paragraph 9.4 of its LIR [REP-085]. Also, where paragraph 9.5 refers to a requirement for more details and opportunities for enhancement, which Public Rights of Way is it referring to?
1.12.27	Applicant	Please explain why the baseline conditions do not concern heritage assets under tourism and recreation, where they may be tourist attractions?

Ref:	Question to:	Question:
1.12.28	Applicant	How does the conclusion reached at paragraph 18.7.59 of ES Chapter 18: Socio-Economics and Tourism and Recreation [APP-053] reflect the important landscape context to the recreational use of the land, as is acknowledged in paragraph 18.5.69.
1.12.29	Applicant	Section 18.8 of ES Chapter 18: Socio-Economics and Tourism and Recreation [APP-053] relies in part on the Outline Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan (APP-349). How can it be assured that the measures in this plan will become outcomes, beyond simply opportunities, and therefore can be relied on as regards where this plan has informed likely significant effects.
13. Other planning matters		
Waste		
1.13.1	Applicant	With regard to the Local Impact Area (ES Chapter 20: Waste, paragraph 20.4.2) [APP-055], why does this not include North Lincolnshire Council, given its proximity to Cottam 3a/b.
1.13.2	Applicant	Paragraph 20.5.15 of ES Chapter 20: Waste [APP-055] confirms that baseline estimates only cover up to 2038. How will reassessment beyond 2038 be dealt with regard to the EIA Regulations and by the revised draft DCO [REP-006]?
1.13.3	Applicant	Why does Appendix 4 to the revised Planning Statement [REP-047] not concern itself with specific waste development plan policies, given that waste will be generated by the Proposed Development, is intended will make use of waste handling facilities and would result in a significant effect?
1.13.4	Applicant	How are the destinations for construction waste in Table 20.5 of ES Chapter 20: Waste [APP-055] reflective of the waste hierarchy, given the number of references to landfill disposal and as most destinations are shown as recycling or landfill? Similarly, with regard to Tables 20.6 and Table 20.7, further explanation on how the waste hierarchy will be followed across the project is required and how this will be dealt with through the revised draft DCO [REP1-006]?
1.13.5	Applicant	To what extent will the proposed solar panels be able to be recycled, re-used and recovered? Are such waste facilities available to deal with solar panels?

ExQ1 issued on 31 October 2023. Responses are due by Deadline 2 on Tuesday 21 November 2023.

Ref:	Question to:	Question:
1.13.6	Applicant	Where ES Chapter 20: Waste paragraph 20.7.32 [APP-055] sets out that the assumption is that waste is handled proportionally between Lincolnshire and Nottinghamshire, what does this mean and how is this addressed by the revised dDCO [REP1-006]?
1.13.7	Applicant	The Proposed Development includes a number of product types and materials that are deemed hazardous, in particular associated with the battery storage and the substations. How will these be dealt with in a safe manner, and how will this be addressed by revised dDCO [REP1-006]?
1.13.8	Applicant	In light of that a significant effect on landfill waste handling in Nottinghamshire during the decommissioning period has been identified, please provide greater detail over the specific mitigation measures and how a bias towards Lincolnshire will impact on the landfill resource in that county. Please also provide further explanation over how this is seen to reduce the effect to not being significant (ES Chapter 20: Waste paragraphs 20.8.2 and 1 (sic)) [APP-055].
1.13.9	Applicant	With regard to cumulative effects under ES Chapter 20: Waste paragraph 20.10.8 [APP-055], what does the assumption that waste is handled proportionally between Lincolnshire and Nottinghamshire mean in practice across the 4 sites and if that was not the case, would the magnitude of impact change? It would assist to clarify if there have been discussions between the developers of each of the sites in this regard.
1.13.10	Applicant	ES Chapter 20: Waste paragraph 20.10.13 [APP-055] appears to exclude some waste streams from the calculation. Could therefore the waste volumes set out in Table 20.10 (sic) be higher by including metal, etc, and approximately by how much?
1.13.11	Applicant	The embedded mitigation as set out in section 20.6 of ES Chapter 20: Waste [APP-055] includes a number of third party contractors in relation to the recovery, recycling and disposal of waste. Whilst it is noted that it would be the intention that this would be covered by the Decommissioning Statement [APP-338] and the Operational Environmental Management Plan [APP-353], how will it be ensured that third party contractors will adhere to it?

Ref:	Question to:	Question:
1.13.12	Applicant	ES Chapter 20: Waste paragraph 20.11.2 [APP-055] considers the impacts from the scheme can be sufficiently mitigated. How does this though relate to the cumulative effects, in particular with the significant effect on landfill waste handling in Nottinghamshire during decommissioning?
1.13.13	Applicant	Where there is reference at paragraph 6.14.7 of the revised Planning Statement [REP1-047] to the various related management plans being approved by the relevant Planning Authority, how will that be coordinated if waste from the site would potentially be dealt with by facilities outside that authority's boundaries?
1.13.14	Lincolnshire County Council	Where paragraph 11.5 of the Council's LIR [REP-085] refers to a requirement for a waste management strategy, would the OEMP [APP-353] and the Decommissioning Plan [APP-338] under the DCO fulfil this function?
Land Contamination		
1.13.15	Applicant	Notwithstanding the Scoping Opinion that has been issued, why do the receptors and pathways set out in Table 11.5 of ES Chapter 11: Ground Conditions and Contamination [APP-046] not also apply to Cottam 3a/b, at least in part
1.13.16	Applicant	The first entry line in Table 11.5 of ES Chapter 11: Ground Conditions and Contamination [APP-046] refers to asbestos fibres. Why would workers, users and residents encounter this substance as regards the Proposed Development?
1.13.17	Applicant	With regard to the cable route corridor and Table 11.6, and paragraphs 11.7.5 and 11.7.6 of ES Chapter 11: Ground Conditions and Contamination [APP-046] has the location of the proposed grid connection within the power station site been considered? If so, please explain how.
1.13.18	Applicant	How would the proposed embedded mitigation measures as set out in paragraph 11.8.2 of ES Chapter 11: Ground Conditions and Contamination [APP-046] deal with effects on adjacent site users and residents?
1.13.19	Applicant	How will the 'Discovery Strategy', as referred to in paragraph 11.8.2 of ES Chapter 11: Ground Conditions and Contamination (APP-046) be secured through the revised draft DCO [REP-006]?

Ref:	Question to:	Question:
1.13.20	Applicant	With regard to paragraph 11.8.2 of ES Chapter 11: Ground Conditions [APP-046] and Contamination, please clarify how potential leakage from fire water storage will be mitigated in order to prevent ground contamination.
1.13.21	Applicant/ Environment Agency	Please clarify whether an Environmental Permit will be required for land contamination related matters.
Minerals		
1.13.22	Applicant	Table 12.1 of ES Chapter 12: Minerals [APP-047] refers to Tarmac quarries, named Sturton Le Steeple and Rampton. Please confirm if this is the same quarry, or they are separate (former) minerals workings.
1.13.23	Applicant	Unlike other ES Chapters, Chapter 12: Minerals [APP-047] does not appear to express what level of effect or greater would constitute a significant effect in its Assessment Methodology and Significance Criteria. Please explain, or correct this omission.
1.13.24	Applicant	Paragraph 12.7.11 of ES Chapter 12: Minerals [APP-047] states that there is not a need for future reserves as regards the Area of Search for sand and gravel that includes the Cottam 3a site and the Cottam Power Station Cable Route Corridor for at least 10 years. As the site would still be operational and not decommissioned until well beyond 10 years, can you explain why you consider that it would seem highly unlikely (paragraph 12.7.16) that the sand and gravel reserve will need to be worked within the lifetime of the Proposed Development.
1.13.25	Applicant	In relation to petroleum exploration and development, as per paragraphs 12.7.18 to 12.7.26 of ES Chapter 12: Minerals. [APP-047] has the Applicant consulted with PEDL licence holder(s) and/or the Oil and Gas Authority? If not, please explain why.
1.13.26	Applicant	With regard to the mitigation measures that are set out in section 12.8 of ES Chapter 12: Minerals [APP-047], how would these have a bearing on Cottam 3a and the Cottam Power Station Cable Route Corridor being located in the Area of Search for sand and gravel?
1.13.27	Applicant	Please also explain how appropriate mitigation measures have been put in place as regards safeguarding mineral resources where the array sites lie within Minerals Safeguarding Areas.

Ref:	Question to:	Question:
1.13.28	Applicant	Appendix 4 of the revised Planning Statement [REP-047] does not concern the same Lincolnshire minerals development plans and the associated policies that are set out in Chapter 12: Minerals [APP-047]. Please explain the different approach taken and if the policies for the Nottinghamshire minerals development plan policies are correct in the Planning Statement.
1.13.29	Applicant	The planning application history that is set out in Appendix 1 to the revised Planning Statement [REP-047] includes the restoration of Rampton Quarry that is said to lie adjacent to the cable route. Please explain why you consider that no significant implications arise from the location of the scheme on this permission.
1.13.30	Nottinghamshire County Council	Can you further please explain paragraph 2.82 of the Council's LIR [REP-086] in relation to Sturton Le Steeple Quarry and what is meant by a northern cabling route option in relation to the cable route that is proposed?
Electromagnetic Fields		
1.13.31	Applicant	Please explain why paragraph 21.2.8 of ES Chapter 21: Other Environmental Matters [APP-056] considers that the transient use of Public Rights of Way crossing three 400kV circuits does not require any further investigation to exposure. ICNIRP reference levels in particular, would be exceeded (paragraph 21.2.7). Please refer to ICNIRP guidance, as appropriate.
1.13.32	Applicant	<p>Applicant: Why has the ES not considered the potential effects of electromagnetic fields on biodiversity interests, including the lamprey and therefore the potential for effects on the Humber Estuary Special Area of Conservation in this regard?</p> <p>Please also explain why the Information to Support a Habitats Regulations Assessment [APP-357] rules out the likelihood of significant effects, given that this document also acknowledges that this species may be found within the River Trent (paragraph 5.1.6).</p> <p>Your attention is directed towards the Environment Agency's WR [REP-093] in this regard</p>
Utilities		
1.13.33	Applicant	With regard to the Anglian Water entry in Table 21.5.2 of ES Chapter 21: Other Environmental Matters [APP-056], please explain where the ES deals with this point?

Ref:	Question to:	Question:
1.13.34	Applicant	Please explain how the cable corridor route has had regard to the necessary stand-off distances which are required by utilities providers, and with regard to residential properties, in particular West Farm Cottages, Normanby by Stow – including residential planning permission(s) in this area?
1.13.35	Uniper	Please provide further explanation over Uniper’s reservations and concerns [REP-101] in respect of the Proposed Development and your assets at Cottam Power station.
Lighting		
1.13.36	Applicant	Please clarify your position as regards lighting during the construction phase, as paragraph 21.4.2 of ES Chapter 21: Other Environmental Matters [APP-056] simply sets out that it is this phase when lighting impacts are most likely to occur.
1.13.37	Applicant	Can the Applicant ass and clarify when and where construction lighting will be used, where this is secured in the application and explain why a worst-case scenario (alone and cumulatively) would not lead to adverse effects as regards biodiversity.
Human Health		
1.13.38	Applicant	With regard to the approach that ES Chapter 21: Other Environmental Matters [APP-056] takes with human health under Section 21.5, please explain how this approach addresses the potential for effects on pre-existing health conditions, such as those of residents who may live close to the proposal. Please respond to where this matter has been raised in relation to RRs and if this has a bearing on the Equality Impact Assessment [APP-351].
1.13.39	Applicant	Please explain why in Table 21.5.4 of ES Chapter 21: Other Environmental Matters [APP-056], the two significant effects as regards ES Chapter 18: Socio-Economics and Tourism and Recreation [APP-053] have been chosen (as opposed to others).
1.13.40	Applicant	Where paragraph 21.5.16 of ES Chapter 21: Other Environmental Matters [APP-056] refers to that “all of these factors have been addressed in the ES and so there is no change to the scope of assessment as a result of comments made by the public”, please explain in light of the concerns that continue to be raised by the public through the Relevant and WRs, in particular to the change to their local environment which might result from the Proposed Development?
Major Accidents and Disasters		

ExQ1 issued on 31 October 2023. Responses are due by Deadline 2 on Tuesday 21 November 2023.

Ref:	Question to:	Question:
1.13.41	Applicant	<p>Paragraph 1.1.7 of the Outline Battery Storage Safety Management Plan [APP-348] states that the LeBlock modular battery system by LeClanché has been used for assessment. Please provide the following information for this battery type:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • detailed Specification, Testing and Certification; • metal content in the batteries, type of wafer insulation and testing conditions, Manufacturers Warranties, specific failure rates; and • the lifecycle of battery, how often it would need to be changed and the associated procedure for this.
1.13.42	Applicant	<p>Why does Table 21.6.4 of ES Chapter 21: Other Environmental Matters [APP-056] not signpost the interruption to water supply and the location of the site within consultation zones of major accident sites and major accident hazard pipelines? These would appear relevant considerations to major accidents and disasters effects.</p>
1.13.43	Applicant	<p>Please clarify whether the identification and evaluation of likely significant effects for major accidents and disasters (paragraphs 21.6.37 to 21.6.55 of ES Chapter 21: Other Environmental Matters, APP-056) is assessing these effects solely with the embedded mitigation set out in paragraphs 21.6.34 to 21.6.36, or whether it is also considering additional mitigation (paragraphs 21.6.56 to 21.6.57).</p>
1.13.44	Applicant	<p>With regard to paragraph 1.1.12 of the Outline Battery Storage Safety Management Plan [APP-348], please provide further information on how the BESS would deal with thermal runaway.</p>
1.13.45	Applicant	<p>Please explain where paragraph 21.6.59 of ES Chapter 21: Other Environmental Matters [APP-056] states that as regards cumulative effects and major accidents and disasters these schemes have been considered within this ES chapter in determining whether there would be significant effects from major accidents and disasters.</p>
1.13.46	Applicant/ Lincolnshire County Council	<p>Does the recent addition to the PPG: Renewable and Low Carbon Energy concerning battery energy storage systems have a bearing on this case, including the role of the Fire and Rescue Service?</p>
1.13.47	Applicant/ Environment Agency	<p>Will an Environmental Permit be required for any aspect of the battery energy storage systems?</p>

Ref:	Question to:	Question:
1.13.48	Lincolnshire County Council	Is the Council's 'neutral' conclusion in its LIR (REP-085] on health and fire safety predicated on a financial contribution via a Section 106 Agreement, as is referred to in paragraph 14.8?
1.13.49	Lincolnshire County Council	Do you consider that there is sufficient water storage for a thermal runaway situation and will the spacing of battery containers lead to any fire risk issues?
1.13.50	Applicant	What engagement is the Applicant proposing with the Fire and Rescue service during the construction, operational and decommissioning stages in relation to the battery storage?
1.13.51	Applicant	Applicant: Revised ES Chapter 4: Scheme Description [REP-012]], paragraph 4.5.55 refers Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD) during construction. However, no emergency spill management plan has been submitted with the application. Can the Applicant explain how any accidental spills from HDD will be managed and where this is secured through the revised dDCO [REP-006]?
14. Compulsory Acquisition and related matters		
1.14.1	Applicant	There are a number of plots identified in the BoR [REP-008] for which the owners are not known. Please provide an update on efforts to establish these owners/interests and details on what further steps will be undertaken to identify these owners prior to the exercise of CA powers.
1.14.2	Applicant	Please provide an update on discussions with Network Rail and identify any likely obstacles to reaching an agreement before the close of the Examination.
1.14.3	Network Rail	Please explain how the proposed acquisition of new rights/ restrictive covenants over plot numbers 02-042, 16-320 and 16-372 would affect Network Rail's undertaking.
1.14.4	Applicant	Annex C of the CA Guidance related to procedures for the compulsory acquisition of land indicates (at paragraph 4) that where it is necessary for the Land Plan to have more than one sheet, appropriate references must be made to each of them in the text of the draft order so that there is no doubt that they are all related to the order. Please signpost where these can be found or include appropriate references in subsequent versions of the dDCO.
1.14.5	Applicant	Paragraph 5.4.2 of the SoR [AS-013] explains that the exact location of the cable circuits within the cable route corridor cannot yet be confirmed and, as a result, CA powers are being sought over the whole of the

ExQ1 issued on 31 October 2023. Responses are due by Deadline 2 on Tuesday 21 November 2023.

Ref:	Question to:	Question:
		Cable Route Corridor. Please can the Applicant explain how this approach accords with the need for the SoS to be satisfied that the Applicant is seeking no more land than is reasonably required for the purposes of the development.
1.14.6	Applicant	The funding statement [APP-019] identifies the cost estimate for the scheme as £850 - £900 million which includes the compensation payable in respect of CA. Please provide a figure for the estimated compensation payable in respect of CA, including details of how this figure was arrived at.
1.14.7	Applicant	<p>The Applicant states in its Funding Statement [APP-019] that, in the event that consent was granted, it would seek further funding but that a final form of funding has not yet been identified. Furthermore, it states a final decision has not yet been taken on the type of finance that will be used.</p> <p>The CA Guidance makes clear that that the funding statement should include information on the degree to which other bodies have agreed to make financial contributions to to underwrite the scheme. Furthermore, it advises that Applicants should demonstrate that adequate funding is likely to be available to enable CA within the statutory period following an order being made.</p> <p>While the ExA notes that the Applicant is confident that the scheme is commercially viable, in light of the limited information available in the funding statement how can the SoS be confident that sufficient funds would be available to meet all CA compensation obligations.</p>
1.14.8	Applicant	Please can the Applicant confirm the status of the option agreement referred to in the BoR [REP-008] in relation to land owned by Tillside Limited.
1.14.9	Applicant	Please can the Applicant ensure that any changes to the BoR [REP-008] are, where necessary, carried through to the SoR [AS-013].
1.14.10	Applicant	Please explain the references to 'temporary use of land' in the blue and pink land shown on the key to the Land plans. Similar references are made in the BoR [REP-008].
1.14.11	Applicant	The Applicant's Schedule of Progress on Objections and Agreements in relation to CA [REP-057] states that the Applicant does not consider it necessary to seek a voluntary agreement for a number of plots given the nature of the interest being sought. Please explain how this accords with paragraph 7.5.1 of the SoR [AS-013] which states that the Applicant has considered all reasonable alternatives to CA, including amongst other things, voluntary agreements.

ExQ1 issued on 31 October 2023. Responses are due by Deadline 2 on Tuesday 21 November 2023.