



National Infrastructure  
Planning  
Temple Quay House  
2 The Square  
Bristol, BS1 6PN

Customer: 0303 444 5000  
Services:  
e-mail: [tillbridgesolarproject@planninginspectorate.gov.uk](mailto:tillbridgesolarproject@planninginspectorate.gov.uk)

---

To the Applicant  
(By email only)

Your Ref:

Our Ref: EN010142

Date: 08 May 2024

---

Dear Ms Reeve

## **Planning Act 2008 (as amended) – Section 51**

### **Application by Tillbridge Solar Limited for an Order Granting Development Consent for the Tillbridge Solar Project**

#### **Advice following issue of decision to accept the application for examination**

On 8 May 2024 the Secretary of State decided that the application for the above project satisfied the acceptance tests under section 55 of the Planning Act 2008 (PA2008). The Planning Inspectorate's acceptance checklist and the application documents have been published and made available on the project page of our website.

In undertaking checks at the acceptance stage, the Inspectorate has made some initial observations in relation to the application. This letter comprises advice to the Applicant provided under section 51 of the PA2008 in respect of these initial observations. The Applicant should pay attention to its content and consider how appropriate action might be taken in response.

#### **Consultees identified on a precautionary basis**

Given the individual circumstances of this case, the Planning Inspectorate advises taking a precautionary approach to consultation under s42(1)(a) of PA2008 to ensure that all persons potentially affected by, or potentially likely to have an interest in the application are given the opportunity to participate fully in the Examination of the application. On this basis, the Applicant may wish to serve notice on the bodies listed in Box 6 of the section 55 checklist when it serves notice of the accepted application under s56(2)(a) of the PA2008; unless there is a specific justification why this is not necessary.

## Minor errors and omissions

There are minor errors and omissions, as reflected in Box 30 of the acceptance checklist.

### Draft Development Consent Order (Doc 3.1)

**Schedule 13 Certified Documents and Plans** – The Inspectorate has noted some minor errors and inconsistencies and advises a review of all references. For example, the Works Plan, Access and Rights of Way plan, Traffic Regulations measures plan, Soil Management Plan, Public Right of Way management plan, Landscape Ecological Management Plan, Skills Supply Chain and Employment Plan – all do not tally with the document references as submitted.

The Applicant is to consider if ES separate chapters should be listed (with individual document refs) or the entire ES (ref 6.1).

The Applicant is to consider if the Design and Access Statement should be listed as a certified document.

**Schedule 15 Protective Provisions** - Include Protective Provisions for Uniper (Part 14) and EDF Energy (Part 15).

### Explanatory Memorandum (Doc 3.2)

The Applicant is asked to ensure references to precedents are updated to reflect any currently unmade DCOs which may have since proceeded to decision (e.g. Mallard Pass, Gate Burton).

### Works Plans (Doc 2.3)

**Work No. 2** – There are numerous smaller Battery Energy Storage Systems (BESS) stations proposed rather than in one or two central locations. Works No.2 appear to be in all the same areas as Work No. 1 (solar panels). Could the Applicant consider if the BESS can be separated out to more specific locations, or if not, could explanation be given for including them in such broad areas?

Related to this, the **Battery Safety Management Plan (doc 7.13)** doesn't appear to account for there being so many BESS stations and the lack of specific locations, and its implications for fire safety management.

**Work No. 6** – This appears to encompass a lot of different works covering a very large area. The Applicant is asked to consider labelling the individual elements (a to l) on the Works Plan, or to further separate out the Works.

The Inspectorate notes that numerous areas of the Works Plan have no colour/are white land (predominately along the local highways) and an explanation for this would be useful.

There are some minor discrepancies between page cut/continuation lines – each set seems to be internally consistent but slight variance between the two sets as to where the cuts fall.

## Land Plans (Doc. 2.2)

Land not in the Order Limits is highlighted yellow where it is surrounded by order land for clarity. Whilst this doesn't change the meaning of what is proposed it may cause confusion for the public, therefore the Applicant should consider whether this land should be uncoloured/white.

If these plots remain yellow: The Applicant is to ensure that the parcels of yellow coloured land match with those on the Works Plans. For example:

- Sheet 13 shows a yellow area of land to west of cable route on the Land Plans (between plots 13-16 and 13-18 and 13-19 – Chestnut Manor and Lowfield Farm) but this is white on the sheet 13 of the Works Plan.
- Sheet 21 shows area of land to west/north of Cottam as yellow coloured on the Land Plans but this is white on sheet 21 of the Works Plan.

There are some minor discrepancies between page cut/continuation lines – each set seems to be internally consistent but slight variance between the two sets as to where the cuts fall.

## Framework Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) (Doc 7.17)

Appendix A of the LEMP contains the Indicative Landscape Management Plan. This is a large document spread across 1 of 3 to 3 of 3 of the LEMP. This is likely to be a plan which is frequently referred to in the Examination and as such it would be useful to have it as a standalone document.

## Minor labelling and typographic errors in the Environmental Statement (ES) (Docs 6.1 to 6.3)

It is noted that all chapters, appendices and figures have the same document reference 6.1 to 6.3 which may make them difficult to search within the Examination Library.

**ES Figure 12-10: Local Landscape Character Areas** – Figure number is inconsistent (12 – 11).

**ES Figure 2-2 (Doc 6.3)** – also in the Environmental Statement Non-Technical Summary). The Environmental Constraints Plan figure lacks labels to identify the sites. The colour scheme obscures background mapping and makes it difficult to distinguish Ancient Woodland from Grade 3 agricultural land.

**ES Figures 4-2 and 4-3 (Doc 6.3)** are difficult to read due to the colours and shading used.

Approximately 7 of the 35 viewpoints illustrated in **ES Figures 12-13 Q-CC (Doc 6.3)** are slightly blurred or photographs are unclear.

**ES Appendices 8-5-1 and 8-5-2 (Doc 6.2)** contain a black line across the pages obscuring some of the text.

**ES Appendix 9-5 (Doc 6.2)** redacts field numbers.

**ES Figures 16-3 and 16-8 (Doc 6.3)** are missing road names / numbers.

**ES Figures 12-4a to 12-4h: Zones of Theoretical Visibility** – the full ZTV is not shown.

### **Book of Reference (Doc 4.3)**

The Applicant is asked to consider including an additional column which sets out the type of acquisition / rights sought – rather than including this as part of ‘Description of Land’.

Please pay close attention to the advice set out in this letter and act on it accordingly. Ensuring that documentation is complete and accurate in a timely manner will assist other parties and the Examining Authority and contribute to a more efficient examination.

We trust you find this advice helpful, however if you have any queries on these matters, please do not hesitate to contact our office using the contact details at the head of this letter.

Yours sincerely

*Robert Cook*

**Robert Cook**  
**Case Manager**

This communication does not constitute legal advice.  
Please view our [Privacy Notice](#) before sending information to the Planning Inspectorate.