



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

The Examining Authority's second written questions and requests for information (ExQ2)

Issued on 16 January 2024

The following table sets out the Examining Authority's (ExA's) second set of written questions and requests for information – ExQ2.

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.

All references to the Draft Development Consent Order are to Revision E submitted at Deadline 3 [\[REP3-004\]](#).

Responses are due by Deadline 4, Tuesday 30 January 2024



Abbreviations used

BESS	<i>Battery Energy Storage System</i>	IPs	<i>Interested Parties</i>
BNG	<i>Biodiversity Net Gain</i>	ISH	<i>Issue Specific Hearing</i>
BoR	<i>Book of Reference</i>	LCC	<i>Lincolnshire County Council</i>
CA	<i>Compulsory Acquisition</i>	LIR	<i>Local Impact Report</i>
DCO	<i>Development Consent Order</i>	LVIA	<i>Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment</i>
dDCO	<i>Draft Development Consent Order</i>	MMO	<i>Marine Management Organisation</i>
DML	<i>Deemed Marine Licence</i>	NPPF	<i>National Planning Policy Statement</i>
EA	<i>Environment Agency</i>	NPS	<i>National Policy Statement</i>
EMF	<i>Electromagnetic Fields</i>	NSIP	<i>Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project</i>
ES	<i>Environmental Statement</i>	oCEMP	<i>Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan</i>
ExA	<i>Examining Authority</i>	oSSCEP	<i>Outline Skills Supply Chain and Employment Plan</i>
ExQ1	<i>Examining Authority's First Written Questions</i>	PA 2008	<i>Planning Act 2008</i>
FRA	<i>Flood Risk Assessment</i>	PPs	<i>Protective Provisions</i>
IAQM	<i>Institute of Air Quality Management</i>	RR	<i>Relevant Representation</i>
IEMA	<i>Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment</i>	SM	<i>Scheduled Monument</i>



The Planning Inspectorate

SoCG	<i>Statement of Common Ground</i>
SoS	<i>Secretary of State</i>
SPD	<i>Supplementary Planning Document</i>
UKHSA	<i>UK Health Security Agency</i>
WLDC	<i>West Lindsey District Council</i>
WR	<i>Written Representation</i>
WSI	<i>Written Scheme of (archaeological) Investigation</i>



Contents

Application by Cottam Solar Project Ltd for an Order Granting Development Consent for Cottam Solar Project	1
1. The Draft Development Consent Order and other consents	5
2. General and cross topic matters	8
3. The needs case, electricity generated and climate change.....	10
4. Other projects/cumulative effects	11
5. Landscape and visual, glint and glare, good design.....	11
6. Biodiversity and the Habitats Regulations Assessment	12
7. The water environment	12
8. Soils and agriculture.....	12
9. The historic environment.....	15
10. Transport and access.....	18
11. Noise, vibration, air quality and nuisance.....	18
12. Socio-economic, tourism and recreation	18
13. Other planning matters.....	18
14. Compulsory acquisition and related matters	21



ExQ.	Respondent:	Question:	LCC Response:
1. The Draft Development Consent Order and other consents			
2.1.1	Applicant/Lincolnshire County Council (LCC)	<p>Article 9 (Power to alter layout etc., of streets)</p> <p>Please provide an update on discussions on LCC's concerns regarding the level of detail provided for highway works and the works set out in Schedule 5.</p> <p>Where alternative drafting is proposed by LCC, please provide details.</p>	<p>LCC welcomes the Applicant's movements towards accommodating LCC's requests for appropriate controls and authorisation of (1) works in the highway (Article 9) and (2) traffic regulation and signage (Articles 11 and 15). However, there remains a difference between the parties on this point.</p> <p>It appears from discussions between the parties that the Applicant acknowledges the need for LCC to have oversight of both (1) and (2) and, moreover, to have <u>approval</u> of both. This is not currently reflected in the DCO.</p> <p>Instead, the Applicant has sought to provide for this by way of paragraphs 3.5 and 3.6 of the Outline CTMP. This is unsatisfactory as it creates tension between the wording of the dDCO itself which in relation to works in Article 11 only requires consultation of the HA and in relation to Article 15 requires notification. Article 9 as this currently lacks any need for consultation/consent in relation to those works listed in Schedule 5. This also sits oddly with the proposal to bring the need for consent within the DCO via the CTMP.</p> <p>This leads to conflict and confusion to the reader of the DCO together with its approved documents. If</p>



ExQ.	Respondent:	Question:	LCC Response:
			<p>the Applicant agrees with the need for HA approval, the DCO should reflect this.</p> <p>Or, more appropriately, the existing procedures for obtaining HA consent or a permit as the case may be should remain.</p> <p>Nevertheless, the Applicant and LCC are due to continue discussions to see if this matter can at the very least be narrowed, LCC will naturally keep the ExA informed of any progress.</p>
2.1.2	Applicant/LCC	<p>Article 15 (Traffic regulation measures)</p> <p>Please provide an update on discussions in relation to this Article. Where alternative drafting is proposed by LCC, please provide details.</p>	Please see above response.
2.1.3	Applicant/LCC	<p>Article 38 (Felling or lopping of trees and removal of hedgerows)</p> <p>Please provide an update on discussions regarding this article.</p> <p>Where alternative drafting is proposed by LCC, please provide details.</p>	LCC is content with the provisions.
2.1.4	LCC	<p>Requirement 21 (Decommissioning and Restoration)</p>	LCC is grateful for the Applicant's update to Requirement 21 which was needed to bring clarity to



ExQ.	Respondent:	Question:	LCC Response:
		The Applicant amended requirement 21 at Deadline 3 to provide greater clarity on the timing for submission of the decommissioning plan in response to matters raised by LCC at ISH5. Please confirm whether or not this addresses the concerns raised by LCC at ISH5 on this point.	the need to submit a decommissioning plan within good time prior to any decommissioning works.
2.1.5	Host Authorities	Please provide full details of any outstanding drafting points previously raised which are still a matter of dispute between the Applicant and the respective Host Authorities. Where alternative wording is proposed by the Host Authorities this should be provided.	Requirement 12 remains unsatisfactory given the substantive shortcomings of the current WSI. Additional proposed wording was proposed within LCC's post hearing submissions at DL3 as follows: <i>“(1) No development may commence until an overarching Archaeological Mitigation Scheme has been submitted and approved by the relevant Planning Authorities, such approval to be in consultation with Historic England;</i> <i>(2) No phase of the authorised development may commence, and no part of the permitted preliminary works for that phase may start, until a supporting Written Scheme of Investigation for that phase has been submitted to and approved in writing by the relevant Planning Authorities, such</i>



ExQ.	Respondent:	Question:	LCC Response:
			<p><i>approval to be in consultation with Historic England.</i></p> <p><i>(3) The approved scheme must— (a) identify areas where archaeological work is required; and (b) the measures to be taken to protect, record or preserve any significant archaeological remains that may be found (i.e. preservation in situ, preservation by record or mix of these elements).</i></p> <p><i>(4) Pre-construction archaeological investigations and pre-commencement material operations which involve intrusive ground works may take place only in accordance with the approved Written Scheme of Investigation and any archaeological works must be carried out by a suitably qualified and competent person or body previously notified to the relevant planning authority”</i></p> <p>It remains the case that such wording is necessary, appropriate and proportionate.</p>
2. General and cross topic matters			3.
2.2.1	All Parties	The Revised National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published in December 2023. Comments	The revised National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published on 19 December 2023 and, like the previous



ExQ.	Respondent:	Question:	LCC Response:
		<p>are invited from all parties on its implications for the consideration of the Proposed Development.</p>	<p>version, does not contain specific policies for nationally significant infrastructure projects as these are instead set out in National Policy Statements. However, the NPPF is still relevant and so should still be taken into account when making decisions on NSIP projects.</p> <p>The vast majority of the revisions and additions to the December 2023 version of the NPPF relate to housing delivery, land supply and local plans however a key and notable change which is relevant is the wording contained within paragraph 181 and in particular footnote 62 which states: <i>“Where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, areas of poorer quality land should be preferred to those of a higher quality. The availability of agricultural land used for food production should be considered, alongside the other policies in this Framework, when deciding what sites are most appropriate for development”</i>.</p> <p>In our view the inclusion and now specific reference to the need to recognise and consider the value of agricultural land for food production is a material planning consideration and reinforces the need to ensure that should the DCO be granted then it is necessary that measures are secured to ensure sheep grazing is undertaken on the land during the 60 year operational period (albeit this is not like for like replacement in terms of potential yield or value in terms of food production). It also reaffirms the need to ensure provision is made for early decommissioning and reinstatement of the land occur in the event the development ceases operating before the 60 year period sought.</p>



ExQ.	Respondent:	Question:	LCC Response:
4. The needs case, electricity generated and climate change			5.
2.3.1	All interested parties	<p>On 22 November 2023, the Department for Energy Security and Net Zero published an updated version of the draft National Policy Statements (NPS) for Energy (EN-1 to EN-5) which contain some changes to elements regarding the decision-making process for low carbon generation applications in general including solar generating stations and related connections. These revised draft Statements have also been laid before Parliament but are not yet designated for the purposes of s104 of the Planning Act 2008.</p> <p>Do any parties have any comments on the potential effect of changes in the November 2023 versions of the revised draft Energy NPS on matters related to this application, compared to the March 2023 versions of the Energy National Policy Statements?</p>	<p>The November 2023 versions of the EN-3 and EN-1 have been updated and include provisions which support the urgent need for new low carbon infrastructure by stating that all onshore and offshore electricity generation subject of the NPSs that do not involve fossil fuel combustion are now considered to be Critical National Priority (CNP) Infrastructure. This revision means that large scale solar projects such as the proposal at Cottam fall within the definition of CNP and that <i>'the urgent need for CNP Infrastructure to achieving our energy objectives, together with the national security, economic, commercial, and net zero benefits, will in general outweigh any other residual impacts not capable of being addressed by application of the mitigation hierarchy'</i>.</p> <p>The transitional provisions at paragraph 1.6.2 of the latest draft of EN-1 reaffirms that <i>"any application accepted for examination before designation of the 2023 amendments, the 2011 suite of NPSs should have effect in accordance with the terms of those NPS"</i>. Therefore as a starting point we would highlight that the 2011 version of the NPSs remain in force until they are replaced. Whilst the November 2023 NPSs represent the Government's latest energy-related policy, with technology specific policies relevant to solar PV in the NPS for renewable energy infrastructure (EN-3) (November 2023), they nevertheless remain undesignated and</p>



ExQ.	Respondent:	Question:	LCC Response:
			so like the previous versions, whilst they are important and should be given relevant considerations and weight based on their status.
2.3.2	Applicant	Action Point 2 of the Written Summary of the Applicant’s Oral Submissions and Responses at ISH5 [REP3-038] states that a panel failure rate of 0.4% has been applied “ <i>in line with industry standards</i> ” to the climate change assessment of operational impacts from panel failure/replacement. Table 1.1 of the ‘Review of Likely Significant Effects at 60 Years: Environmental Statement Review’ [REP2-058] states that over a 60-year operational lifespan 24% of the panels would be replaced. However, the Applicant states [REP2-048] that solar panels have an “average lifespan of 40 years” suggesting a 100% replacement rate at 40 years. Can the Applicant explain this discrepancy?	As stated in LCC’s Local Impact Report (REP-085, page 23), our concern is that: ‘there are currently no waste facilities to process discarded solar infrastructure as it is replaced during the lifetime of the development and at the decommissioning stage’, particularly ‘when combined with the other DCO solar projects in the County that may be granted consent in the next 12 months’ Can the applicant confirm how many panels 0.4% equates to? If this is multiplied across all the potential DCO projects that may get consent plus the more modest scale Town and Country Planning Act developments the numbers of panels being discarded on a annual basis will not be insignificant so that justification for ensuring a facility for dealing with the end of life panels should be brought forward now so we do not end up with a ‘panel mountain’ as was the case with fridges a few years ago.
6. Other projects/cumulative effects			7.
8. Landscape and visual, glint and glare, good design			9.
2.5.1	Applicant/LCC	Please provide an update on the outcome of the meeting between the Applicant’s landscape consultants and LCC which was due to take place in early January 2024.	Two meetings were held on Thursday 5th January 2024 and Monday 15th January 2024 between LCC and the Applicant to discuss Beneficial Landscape Effects associated with the scheme. Following these meetings a <i>Joint Statement on Beneficial Landscape</i>



ExQ.	Respondent:	Question:	LCC Response:
			<p><i>Effects</i> was produced by the Applicant with input from LCC. This sets out:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where matters and conclusions of significant beneficial effects are agreed; • Where there are differences in agreement over the significant beneficial effect conclusions; and • The reasons for the differences in agreement over opinion regarding the findings of significant beneficial landscape effects. <p>The <i>Joint Statement on Beneficial Landscape Effects</i> is intended to be issued by the applicant at deadline 4, and the statement summarises LCCs position in regards to landscape effects.</p>
10. Biodiversity and the Habitats Regulations Assessment			11.
12. The water environment			13.
14. Soils and agriculture			15.
2.8.1	Applicant	Has the cable route corridor been surveyed since the response to ExQ1 and when will this information be before the examination, as regards the depth where the cables would be found, and in relation to soil management and field drainage?	Prior to work commencing this Cable Route Corridor should be subject to a survey to record soil physical characteristics such as horizon depth and texture. A detailed ALC survey, as undertaken for the Sites, would not be appropriate as the 100m spacing of sample points would be widely spaced around the narrow trench excavation. Instead a specific sampling of soil within the proposed Cable Route Corridor should be undertaken as part of the final SMP. This will enable effective segregation of topsoil



ExQ.	Respondent:	Question:	LCC Response:
			and subsoil horizons during excavation and infilling of the cable trench. 8.4.1 Cable trenches should be restored to their current ALC grades, as informed by the proposed detailed ALC survey of the cable corridor.
2.8.2	Applicant	How would damage to the field drainage be avoided?	Damage may not be avoidable, but detailed records of condition of the cable corridor should be made pre entry. Regular inspections of the route during cable laying to identify drains and areas of damage should occur so that remedy can be made post construction
2.8.5	Applicant	The Review of Likely Significant Effects at 60 Years document [REP2-058] sets out that soil resources will benefit from the longer fallow period. Please explain how this extended time period would affect agricultural productivity given that the Applicant is not relying on the land remaining in agricultural use during the operational period?	The land will be taken out of mostly arable production and this represents a loss of crops and bi-products such as straw for the life of the project. Some sheep or small animal grazing may occur at the site but this represents largely a maintenance or 'keeping tidy' exercise rather than substantial agricultural production. Whilst nationally the loss of production may be seen as small, nevertheless the impact on local farms will be significant and it could have knock on effects to the local agricultural supply merchants such as tractor/machinery suppliers and inputs such as ag-chemicals and fertilisers. The loss of total yields of combinable crops over a 60+ year timeframe is also quite substantial. The soil management plan recognises that "There is little evidence available regarding any impact on soil health specific to solar panels over a 40-60 year timescale, however in comparison to the effect of



ExQ.	Respondent:	Question:	LCC Response:
			reverting arable land to grass, any detectable effect of solar panels is anticipated to be marginal.”
2.8,6	Natural England	The Applicant has submitted a further version of the Outline Soil Management Plan [REP3-010] at Deadline 3. The ExA seeks Natural England’s views, in light of comments made on previous version(s) of this document.	Prepare a plan of topsoil units within the Sites <u>and</u> the Cable Route Corridor Avoid handling of soils to be carried out during periods of prolonged, heavy rainfall; or when soils are simply too wet to handle, as defined by The Plastic Limit. Additional soil surveys should be undertaken on the route of the grid connection works, Cable Route Corridor should be subject to a survey to record soil physical characteristics such as horizon depth and texture. Prior to beginning work of the solar panel deployment and development of the associated infrastructure, a dense vegetated cover should be established to eliminate areas of bare soil.
2.8.7	Applicant	Please explain why cumulative effects on soils and agriculture is in not included in Appendix E of the Joint Report on Interrelationships with other NSIPs [REP3-027] . The ExA also notes that paragraphs 19.11.3 and 4 of the revised ES Chapter 19: Soils and Agriculture [REP-010] still sets out there is an absence of such assessment results in the public domain and no meaningful data is available to appraise farming circumstances for these six cumulative sites, even	The report concentrates on the soil resource impact and suggests that it will be minimal, but the loss of agricultural production is not well addressed due to lack of data. The impact on individual holdings is unclear again due to lack of data.



ExQ.	Respondent:	Question:	LCC Response:
		though a number of these schemes have now progressed.	
2.8.8	All Parties	The NPPF (December 2023) has been updated to include the following: “ <i>The availability of agricultural land used for food production should be considered, alongside the other policies in this Framework, when deciding what sites are most appropriate for development</i> ” (footnote 62). IPs are invited to comment.	In our view the inclusion and now specific reference to the need to recognise and consider the value of agricultural land for food production is a material planning consideration and reinforces the need to ensure that should the DCO be granted then it is necessary that measures are secured to ensure sheep grazing is undertaken on the land during the 60 year operational period (albeit this is not like for like replacement in terms of potential yield or value in terms of food production). It also reaffirms the need to ensure provision is made for early decommissioning and reinstatement of the land occur in the event the development ceases operating before the 60 year period sought.
16. The historic environment			17.
2.9.1	LCC, NCC	LCC and NCC have both referred to percentages of how much of the Order limits should be the subject of trial trenching at this stage (2%,3-5%), including at ISH2. Please provide details of where these percentages are taken from, as regards guidance.	<p>We are guided by our professional Chartered Institute for Archaeology (CIfA) Guidance and Standards, their definition of a field evaluation is <i>‘to determine the presence or absence of archaeology, to define their character, extent, quality and preservation, and enable an assessment of their significance.’</i></p> <p>For archaeological consultants there is CIfA’s Standard and guidance for commissioning work or providing consultancy advice on archaeology and the historic environment. Section 3.1.2a states that</p>



ExQ.	Respondent:	Question:	LCC Response:
			<p><i>“Advisors should ensure that their advice regarding the scope of any assessment of archaeological or cultural heritage significance complies with the relevant ClfA Standard and guidance, and is sufficient to ensure as full an understanding as is reasonably possible of the potential impact of change on the asset’s significance. This should include consideration of all aspects of the historic environment, be proportionate to both the significance of the asset(s) and the potential impact of the proposal on them, and be clearly explained and reasoned.”</i></p> <p>The East Midlands Association of Local Government Archaeological Officers currently agree to 2-3% trenching across the region.</p>
2.9.2	LCC NCC	LCC and NCC raised concerns at ISH2 around the ability of the Applicant's trial trenching to pick up discrete, earlier features and shallow burials. Please explain why.	Trenching is the archaeological technique which locates these types of archaeological feature and burials, they do not for example come up in geophysical survey results or LiDAR. We are therefore concerned because only 17.5% of the redline boundary has had trenching evaluation, leaving the archaeological potential for over 80% undetermined. This means that effective mitigation of the impact of the development is not possible: trenching results provide site-specific information on the location, depth, extent and significance of surviving archaeology across the scheme, and provide the basis for effective deployment of reasonable proportionate mitigation techniques to



ExQ.	Respondent:	Question:	LCC Response:
			preserve or record the archaeology which will be damaged or destroyed by the development works.
2.9.3	Applicant, LCC, NCC	<p>At ISH2, references were made to the percentages of trial trenching which had been sought on other developments in the area. The Applicant subsequently submitted a Comparison of Archaeological Evaluation Investigations on Solar Schemes document [REP3-041] which includes schemes in Lincolnshire and Nottinghamshire.</p> <p>To what extent do these sites (or some of these sites) share archaeological similarities with the Order limits and how does this translate to the 'need for a flexible approach to evaluation', as is set out in paragraph 1.1.8 of the Comparison of Archaeological Evaluation Investigations on Solar Schemes document [REP3-041]?</p>	<p>Some of these sites include areas which have been removed to allow archaeology to be preserved, Little Crow for example has a large central exclusion area for the Medieval Priory and much of the trenching evaluation was based on determining the extent of significant archaeology.</p> <p>Several of the proposed Lincolnshire NSIPs have removed areas from development following the trenching results, and this is exactly how archaeological evaluation should work, with evaluation informing effective mitigation measures to avoid developmental impact.</p> <p>Sufficient site-specific evaluation is the essential basis for effective mitigation and allows for reasonable and proportionate deployment of mitigation measures.</p>
2.9.4	Historic England, LCC, NCC	Please comment on the Archaeological Trial Trenching Evaluation Fieldwork Report for the Shared Cable Corridor document submitted by the Applicant at Deadline 3 [REP3-049] .	<p>The report was well done, as was all of the evaluation work for the Gate Burton Solar Project</p> <p>Regarding the cable corridor itself there have been changes to the redline boundaries, a gap analysis has been undertaken and outstanding areas will be evaluated accordingly by another scheme.</p>
2.9.5	Applicant, LCC, NCC	The ExA notes that the Statements of Common Ground are being updated with LCC (and presumably NCC) to show where there is agreement and disagreement over the Archaeological Mitigation WSI [APP-131] to reflect ongoing discussions.	The current version of the SoCG in respect of cultural heritage was updated by LCC on the 30 th January 2024.



ExQ.	Respondent:	Question:	LCC Response:
		The final versions to be submitted at Deadline 5 need to set out clearly where the areas of agreement and disagreement are at the close of the Examination (and please avoid the use of comment boxes in the final versions).	
18. Transport and access			19.
20. Noise, vibration, air quality and nuisance			21.
22. Socio-economic, tourism and recreation			23.
24. Other planning matters			25.
Waste:			
2.13.1	LCC/Applicant	<p>The ExA notes that LCC has set out in its response to ExQ1.13.2 [REP2-073] that paragraph 1.13.2 of the Waste ES Chapter [APP-055] does not seem to match with the Council's Waste Needs Assessment. Can you explain please.</p> <p>The Applicant's response is also sought on this matter.</p>	<p>Looking at each paragraph in their ES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 20.5.5 –Question the target of 75%? This differs to the Council's WNA (C, D & E report Table 16). • 20.5.5 – The other figures don't themselves appear directly in the WNA but seem to be arise from that 75% assumption so further clarity is requested regarding the calculations performed. • 20.5.6 (landfill) –cannot see how the applicant's stated figures have been derived from our WNA and would appreciate clarification. This particularly applies to landfill capacity which the ES refers to as 'per annum' whereas our WNA sees this as a finite resource which is used up over time. <p>20.5.7 (hazardous) – Whilst the 67,000 tpa total comes from our WNA, it should be noted that much of the sites hazardous waste will be WEEE (solar panels etc.) for which the capacity is only a fraction of this total.</p>



ExQ.	Respondent:	Question:	LCC Response:
2.13.2	Applicant	Can the Applicant provide further details of how the recycling of solar array infrastructure would take place over the operational period of the Proposed Development in light of that it is recognised that there are no facilities that specifically handle waste solar infrastructure in the host authority areas/local impact area?	As stated in LCC’s Local Impact Report (REP-085, page 23), our concern is that: ‘there are no waste facilities to process discarded solar infrastructure as it is replaced during the lifetime of the development and at the decommissioning stage’, particularly ‘when combined with the other solar projects in the County that may be granted DCOs in the next 12 months’.
2.13.3	Applicant	The Applicant has set out in its response to ExQ1.13.8 [REP2-034] how it intends to deal with the deficit of landfill waste handling in Nottinghamshire from 2029. Would this mitigation also be impacted by the baseline covering up to 2038 only, in terms of what might be needed after that date? How would mitigation be addressed after 2038 if it is not known what the baseline and therefore the level of effect would be?	<p>The applicants response to Q1.13.8 (and the text of the original ES paragraphs) seems to suggesting that Lincolnshire has more landfill capacity so they’ll use it. This is a concern to LCC given:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The forecasted dwindling of landfill capacity in Lincolnshire (see below), and <p>That our WNA only forecasts up to 2045</p> <p>Full details of the assumptions made and calculations used are given in the WNA Summary and material-specific reports (see Waste needs assessment – Lincolnshire County Council) but, as set out in the WNA Summary, this is based on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non-Inert Landfill (density = 1 Te per m3 as per paragraph 2.13) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ (Table 15) Permitted/Operational Capacity = (greater than) 9,144,539 m3 ○ (Table 23) Landfill Requirement = 5,967,243 Te = 5,967,243 m3 (at 1 Te per m3) cumulative to 2045. ○ Difference = 3.18 Mm3 (rounded) remaining capacity



ExQ.	Respondent:	Question:	LCC Response:																								
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inert Landfill (density = 1.6 Te per m3 as per paragraph 2.13) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ (Table 15) Permitted/Operational Capacity = (greater than) 3,145,832 m3 ○ (Table 22) Inert Landfill Requirement = 7,221,352 Te = 4,513,345 m3 (at 1.6 Te per m3) cumulative to 2045. ○ Difference = minus 1.37 Mm3 (rounded) i.e. insufficient capacity available. • Overall, the excess Inert material would have to go to Non-Inert Landfill, and thus 2045 overall landfill capacity = 3.18 – 1.37 = 1.81 Mm3 remaining capacity in 2045 which is a significant decrease compared both to current total capacity (circa 12.3 Mm3) and with the preceding milestone year. <div data-bbox="1325 938 2049 1138" style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; margin-top: 10px;"> <p>Table 25: Lincolnshire Void Assessment & Milestone Capacity Gap Analysis at Forecast Milestone Years (Mm3)</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th>Capacity Type</th> <th>2025</th> <th>2030</th> <th>2035</th> <th>2040</th> <th>2045</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Non-Inert Landfill (Table 22)</td> <td>+7.08</td> <td>+5.59</td> <td>+4.46</td> <td>+3.69</td> <td>+3.18</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Inert Deposit to Land (Table 23)</td> <td>+1.67</td> <td>+0.82</td> <td>-0.023</td> <td>-0.87</td> <td>-1.7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Grand Total Surplus (diff)</td> <td>+8.75</td> <td>+6.41</td> <td>+4.437</td> <td>+2.82</td> <td>+1.48</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> </div>	Capacity Type	2025	2030	2035	2040	2045	Non-Inert Landfill (Table 22)	+7.08	+5.59	+4.46	+3.69	+3.18	Inert Deposit to Land (Table 23)	+1.67	+0.82	-0.023	-0.87	-1.7	Grand Total Surplus (diff)	+8.75	+6.41	+4.437	+2.82	+1.48
Capacity Type	2025	2030	2035	2040	2045																						
Non-Inert Landfill (Table 22)	+7.08	+5.59	+4.46	+3.69	+3.18																						
Inert Deposit to Land (Table 23)	+1.67	+0.82	-0.023	-0.87	-1.7																						
Grand Total Surplus (diff)	+8.75	+6.41	+4.437	+2.82	+1.48																						
2.13.4	Applicant	In light of the deficit of landfill waste handling in Nottinghamshire coupled with the baseline covering up to 2038 only, what, if any, joint arrangements would be put in place with other nearby NSIP solar projects and how would this be addressed through the DCO?	The Council as Waste Planning Authority agrees that it is important that cumulative waste impacts are assessed and planned for.																								



ExQ.	Respondent:	Question:	LCC Response:
2.13.5	LCC/Applicant	The ExA notes that LCC has responded [REP2-073] to waste questions that were directed at the Applicant through ExQ1. The questions largely relate to the application documentation, which LCC would have had sight of previously. Given the stage of the Examination, LCC and the Applicant are asked to utilise the SoCG to set out the matters of agreement and disagreement on waste in relation to these matters.	Confirm that this is being captured in the SOCG with Lincolnshire County Council
2.13.6	LCC	Further to LCC's response to ExQ1.13.14 [REP2-073] , the Outline Decommissioning Statement [REP3-014] has now been revised for provision for a waste management plan to be submitted. Does this address LCC's concerns?	The Council note the Decommissioning Statement states (page 12) that 'a Decommissioning Waste Management Strategy, will be provided as part of the Decommissioning Plan'. Which is a reasonable approach that the Council can accept as addressing this particular concern.
Electromagnetic Fields:			
Telecommunications, Utilities and TV:			
Major Accidents and Disasters:			
26. Compulsory acquisition and related matters			27.

END