

**Byers Gill Solar
EN010139**

8.4.2 Statement of Common Ground with Darlington Borough Council

Planning Act 2008

APFP Regulation 5(2)(q)

Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms
and Procedure) Regulations 2009

Volume 8

Deadline 8 – January 2025

Revision 5



Table of Contents		Page
1.	Introduction	1
1.1.	Purpose of this document	1
1.2.	Terminology	1
1.3.	Status of this document	1
2.	Current position	2
A.1	Record of Engagement	51
A.2	Signing Sheet	53

Table of Tables

Table 1	Current position of matters relevant to the parties' discussions	2
---------	--	---

1. Introduction

1.1. Purpose of this document

- 1.1.1. This Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) has been prepared to support the Examination of the Development Consent Order (DCO) application for Byers Gill Solar (the Proposed Development).
- 1.1.2. This SoCG has been prepared jointly by **RWE (the Applicant)** and **Darlington Borough Council (DBC)** in order to clearly identify the current position of the respective parties on specific matters that are, or have been, under discussion. It seeks to confirm to the Examining Authority (ExA) where there are points of agreement between the parties and where agreement has not been reached to date. It therefore aids the ExA in identifying any specific issues that may need to be addressed during the Examination and provides a structure to any further discussions for the parties engaged in the SoCG.
- 1.1.3. This document has been prepared in response to a specific request from the ExA as per the Rule 6 Letter [PD-003] issued on 25 June 2024.

1.2. Terminology

- 1.2.1. Section 2 of this document sets out the relevant matters raised through discussion between the parties. It provides a summary of the position of each party and identifies the status of discussions on each matter:
- “Agreed” means that a matter has been resolved between the parties and is not anticipated to be subject to further discussion;
 - “Under discussion” means that a matter remains in active dialogue between the parties and a final position has not been reached;
 - “Not agreed” means that the parties have established a final position that they cannot resolve the matter and will remain a point of difference.
- 1.2.2. In accordance with the request from the ExA in the Rule 6 Letter [PD-003], a **Low**, **Medium** and **High** ‘traffic light’ system is applied to each matter to indicate the likelihood of their resolution during the Examination period.

1.3. Status of this document

- 1.3.1. This document is final and signed.

2. Current position

- 2.1.1. The table below provides a summary of the current position of the Applicant and DBC in relation to specific matters that have been under discussion to date.
- 2.1.2. Where a matter is not represented in the table, it should be assumed that it is either: (i) agreed between the parties and has never required detailed discussion; or, (ii) not relevant to the discussion between the parties.
- 2.1.3. Appendix A of this document provides a record of engagement undertaken between the parties in relation to the Proposed Development. This is limited to engagement which is materially relevant to the contents of this SoCG and does not seek to include every correspondence between the parties (e.g. that which was primarily administrative).

Table 1 Current position of matters relevant to the parties' discussions

Row ID	Topic	DBC Position	Applicant Position	Status
DBC001	Need for development	Byers Gill Solar (BGS) would make a significant contribution towards renewable energy generation, providing “an expected 180MW of low-cost, clean and renewable energy to UK customers” (Planning Statement, para. 3.2.38) (APP - 163). This contribution aligns with key commitments at the national level and within the adopted National Policy Statements recognising the importance of the Government’s commitments to cut greenhouse gases by 80% by 2050. DBC recognises that solar energy development can help meet targets for reducing carbon emissions, reduce reliance on fossil fuels and provide local energy security. Such development can also provide economic diversification for farmers and landowners and support local employment opportunities.	The Applicant notes the recognition of the contribution towards renewable energy generation that the Proposed Development would provide. The Planning Statement [APP-163] sets out the planning balance in support of the Proposed Development.	Agreed
DBC002	Accordance with local planning policy IN9.b	Whilst BGS by its very nature offers significant positive impacts in terms of the production of clean	The Planning Statement [APP-163] sets out the planning balance in support of the Proposed Development, including that there are only a	Not agreed

Row ID	Topic	DBC Position	Applicant Position	Status
		<p>renewable energy and the transition and movements towards Net Zero, to be supported it must be demonstrated that there are no significant adverse environmental impacts that cannot be appropriately managed and/or mitigated through the DCO process.</p> <p>DBC's Local Impact Report [REP1-023] considers the impact of the proposed development on a local level and seeks to identify the relevant local planning policies insofar as they are relevant to the proposed development, and the extent to which the proposed development accords with the policies identified. The LIR continues at para. 1.6 to set out that the LIR does not seek to assess compliance of the scheme with National Policy Statements (NPS).</p> <p>The need to ensure that there are no unacceptable impacts that cannot otherwise be mitigated for is set out in Darlington Local Plan Policy IN9.b (Renewable Energy Infrastructure – Solar Power Developments).</p>	<p>limited number of residual effects in three areas: soil, landscape / visual and noise. These residual effects are reported after the application of the mitigation hierarchy, with mitigation measures to be implemented described within ES Chapter 2 The Proposed Development [APP-025] and ES Chapters 5 to 13 [APP-028 to 036]. In line with IEMA Guidance and professional best practice, both embedded and essential mitigation are considered. Mitigation will be secured through the DCO [REP5-002].</p> <p>NPS EN-1 makes clear that subject to consideration of the impacts of the project and the application of the mitigation hierarchy, any residual impacts of CNP infrastructure should not outweigh the urgent need for its delivery. As such, NPS EN-1 does not require that there are no significant adverse environmental effects, as referred to by DBC. Indeed, paragraph 3.13.63 of NPS EN-1 states in reference to CNP infrastructure, that "Subject to any legal requirements, 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. Government strongly supports the delivery of CNP Infrastructure, and it should be progressed as quickly as possible."</p> <p>In relation to the weighting of impacts in determining consent, NPS EN-1 paragraph 4.1.7</p>	

Row ID	Topic	DBC Position	Applicant Position	Status
			<p>states: “For projects which qualify as CNP Infrastructure, it is likely that the need case will outweigh the residual effects in all but the most exceptional cases. This presumption, however, does not apply to residual impacts which present an unacceptable risk to, or interference with, human health and public safety, defence, irreplaceable habitats or unacceptable risk to the achievement of net zero.”</p> <p>Local planning policies, including IN9, are considered in Appendix A Policy Compliance Document [APP-164], on which the LPA were consulted.</p>	
DBC003	Assessment of alternatives and site selection	DBC consider that land availability has been a key influence on site selection.	The Applicant agrees with this position, as is set out within Section 3.6 of ES Chapter 3 Alternatives and Design Iteration [APP-026] and Energy Generation and Design Iteration [REP2-010].	Agreed
DBC004	Design Approach Document	DBC consider that the Applicant has not complied with relevant guidance in the preparation of the Design Approach Document.	The Applicant disagrees with this statement and wishes to note that the Design Approach Document was produced in collaboration with stakeholders on its content, including DBC, as evidenced in Table 1-1 of the Design Approach Document [REP5-024].	Not agreed
DBC005	Biodiversity – impact on winter birds	<p>DBC is in overall agreement with the changes made to the design of the Proposed Development to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Avoid areas of open water ▪ Avoid areas where wintering geese were recorded ▪ Allocate eight biodiversity enhancement areas ▪ Leave two large fields in Panel Area F free of solar PV modules to provide continued availability of habitat 	The Applicant notes and agrees with DBC’s position.	Agreed

Row ID	Topic	DBC Position	Applicant Position	Status
		Due to the revised layout, impacts on wintering birds have therefore been assessed to be long term and of low magnitude, with the effects considered to be not significant.		
DBC006	Biodiversity – ground nesting birds	DBC is satisfied to see that the two large fields in Panel Area F: North of Bishopton, will be maintained with low maintenance grass sward providing enhanced availability of open ground for curlew, lapwing, and other ground nesting birds. This area will also provide foraging habitat for bats.	The Applicant notes and agrees with DBC's position.	Agreed
DBC007	Revised layout enabling the retention of woodland and the majority of hedgerows and associated trees	<p>The Hedgerow Regulations referenced in the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal Report (APP-126) (section 2.3.4) remain in force and are the appropriate legislative to be referred to. The new Management of Hedgerows (England) Regulations 2024 make provision for the protection of hedgerows on agricultural land. The existing retained hedgerows and new hedgerows will be suitably buffered and managed appropriately, as detailed in sections 5.4 and 5.5 of the OLEMP.</p> <p>The latest version of the oCEMP [REP5-012] makes appropriate provision for this at IDs BD10 – CEMP and LV2 – CEMP.</p>	As per the Other Consents and Licenses [REP2-005], the Hedgerow Regulations are sought to be modified through the draft DCO. Furthermore, article 38 ensures that Regulation 6 of the Hedgerow Regulations 1997 is read to include the carrying out or maintenance of development which has been authorised by the Order when assessing whether work is permitted under those regulations. This ensures that the Hedgerow Regulations continue to be in force and are appropriate must be read alongside the amendments caused by article 38.	Agreed
DBC008	Boundary features	DBC agree that all boundary features and other features such as larger hedgerows with trees and woodland edge that are of value to foraging bats will be retained, with it predicated that only small sections of poor-quality hedgerow will be removed to accommodate the grid connection cables and access routes. Where possible and practical, construction access and cabling will use existing field entrances and	The agreement of DBC in relation to hedgerows and trees is noted.	Agreed

Row ID	Topic	DBC Position	Applicant Position	Status
		horizontal directional drilling (HDD) will install the cables under hedgerows.		
DBC009	Maintenance buffers	DBC agree with the proposed maintenance of 10 m buffers between Solar PV modules and riparian boundaries and watercourses.	The agreement of DBC in relation to proposed buffers is noted	Agreed
DBC010	Maintenance buffers	DBC agree with the proposed maintenance of 8m buffers (3m from hedgerows to security fencing and 5m from security fencing to Solar Cells) between Solar PV modules and hedges to retain foraging and commuting corridors for bats.	The agreement of DBC in relation to proposed buffers is noted.	Agreed
DBC011	Maintenance buffers	DBC agree with the proposed maintenance of appropriate buffers between Solar PV modules and trees with potential bat roost trees with potential roost features (PRF), which will be protected during development, in line with British Standard BS 5837: Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction by establishing a Construction Exclusion Zone (CEZ) around their Root Protection Areas (RPA).	The agreement of DBC in relation to proposed buffers and tree protection is noted.	Agreed
DBC012	Natural England District Level Licence for GCN	DBC agree with the Applicants statement that much of the terrestrial habitat for GCN within the Proposed Development was considered either suboptimal or unsuitable with the majority of suitable habitat to be retained, with no ponds to be removed. As there remains a possibility that GCN might be present in low numbers or might enter the construction area, an application for a Natural England District Level Licence (DLL) for GCN will be made. The terms of this licence will include an appropriate payment to be determined by Natural	As per the Other Consents and Licenses [REP2-005], the Applicant has progressed a DLL with Natural England as far as possible in the pre-consent stage. The DLL process will be completed post-consent should consent be granted.	Agreed

Row ID	Topic	DBC Position	Applicant Position	Status
		England to further the enhancement of GCN in the region.		
DBC013	Perimeter fencing design	<p>The fence design to allow movement of deer through the landscape along retained hedgerows is welcomed and reduces habitat fragmentation and allows dispersal of deer and other wildlife through the landscape.</p> <p>Section 6.4.4. of the OLEMP states that 'Maintenance of 8m buffers (3m from hedgerows to security fencing and 5m from security fencing to Solar Cells) between Solar PV modules and hedges to retain foraging and commuting corridors for bats.' It is unclear whether the 3m is from the inner or outer edge of the hedgerow or central point. This needs to be clarified. DBC would recommend a minimum of 5m between hedgerow edge closest to fencing and fencing to reduce risk of collision from birds flying across/along the hedgerows.</p> <p>The Applicant is to confirm whether the 3m buffer is taken from the centre point or edge of the hedgerow, which will make a difference to the suitability of a 3m buffer. The Council will provide a further update on this matter at a future deadline.</p> <p>DBC is satisfied that the buffer width is sufficient to prevent/reduce collisions of birds with the fencing.</p>	<p>Sparrowhawks are highly agile and adept fliers, evolved to navigate through dense vegetation and hunt in confined spaces, such as woodlands, gardens, and hedgerows. Studies have shown that sparrowhawks are capable of navigating through gaps as narrow as 1-2 meters while pursuing prey. This ability indicates that these birds can effectively hunt and avoid obstacles in relatively confined environments. The presence of a security fence 3 meters away from the hedgerow is unlikely to significantly impede their movement or increase the risk of collisions. A 3-meter buffer provides sufficient space for sparrowhawks to fly parallel to the hedgerow, and their natural agility reduces the likelihood of accidental impacts with the fence. Research on bird collisions with man-made structures suggests that birds are more likely to collide with transparent or reflective surfaces, such as windows, rather than solid objects like fences. Since security fences are generally not reflective and are often visible to birds, they pose a lower risk of collision. In conclusion, based on the ecological behaviour and flight capabilities of sparrowhawks, a 3-meter distance and a 6-meter distance to the security fence along mature hedgerows should be sufficient to minimise the risk of collisions. The combination of their hunting strategies, adaptability to narrow spaces, and the visibility of the fencing supports the argument that a 3-</p>	Agreed

Row ID	Topic	DBC Position	Applicant Position	Status
			<p>meter buffer can effectively accommodate these birds.</p> <p>The Applicant can confirm that the buffers are measured from the edge of the hedgerow. There is a total width of 8m from the hedge to PV panel, taken from outer edge of the hedge to the edge of the panel, with 3m on top for the hedgerow itself. This makes for an 11m wide buffer in total. The cross section in Plate 7-5 of the Design Approach Document [REP5-024/5] illustrates this.</p>	
DBC014	Perimeter fencing	The inclusions of wildlife access points through security fencing are welcomed. This will reduce the fragmentation of habitat availability for foraging to badgers and other smaller wildlife.	The support of DBC in relation to ecological fencing is noted.	Agreed
DBC015	Lighting	<p>Where possible, lighting should not be used during the hours of darkness to minimize disturbance to nocturnal wildlife. Where lighting will be used between the hours of dusk to dawn, a lighting design plan to show the spill of light onto the adjacent habitats should be submitted. The lighting plan should refer to the updated Bats and Artificial Lighting at Night Guidance Note 08/23 (ILP, 2023).</p> <p>The oCEMP [REP5-012] has been updated to make reference to a lighting plan being prepared as part of the CEMP in accordance with the aforementioned guidance (ID BD9a – CEMP) and also includes reference to temporary lighting during the construction period (ID LV3 – CEMP). DBC is satisfied that these measures will address any concerns regarding lighting.</p>	<p>As set out in paragraph 2.7.23 of ES Chapter 2 The Proposed Development [APP-025], construction lighting would be intermittently used throughout the construction phase for select operations in isolated locations only at the construction compounds, and may be required for working during night time hours in the winter Paragraph 2.6.14 confirms that best practice guidelines, namely the Guidance Note 08/23 as referenced by DBC, would be utilised. Paragraph 2.3.38 confirms that operational lighting would be limited to infrared security lighting, which would be required around key electrical infrastructure. This lighting would be sensor triggered and therefore not continuous. The Applicant is willing to commit to delivering a lighting plan, in accordance with the aforementioned guidance, for any stage of</p>	Agreed

Row ID	Topic	DBC Position	Applicant Position	Status
			construction in which works are required during hours of darkness. This will be set out in an update to the outline CEMP [REP5-012] as reflected in ES Errata and Management Plans Proposed Updates [REP5-030].	
DBC016	Invasive non-native plant species (INNS) method statement	<p>The PEA and CEMP outline that an INNS method statement will be submitted to manage the INNS. The PEA and CEMP also recommend a pre-construction site survey to identify areas of Himalayan balsam and to check for presence of other INNS within the development area. The Mitigation Route Map identifies that a pre-construction and pre-decommissioning survey and method statement for INNS will be undertaken. This needs to be secured to ensure that surveys both pre-construction and pre-decommissioning are undertaken to determine presence and location of INNS, with a supporting method statement to detail measures to minimize the risk of spreading Himalayan balsam and any other INNS present.</p> <p>The latest version of the oCEMP [REP5-012] has been updated to include provision for pre-construction surveys to be undertaken to update on the presence and location of any INNS and for method statement to be prepared setting out measures to minimise the risk of spreading INNS (ID BD6 - CEMP & BD7 – CEMP). The Council is satisfied with this approach.</p>	Requirement 4 of the DCO [REP5-002] states that the CEMP must be produced in accordance with the Outline CEMP [REP5-012], whilst Requirement 5 requires the production of a DEMP in accordance with the outline DEMP [REP5-015]. The Outline CEMP and Outline DEMP specify that an invasive non-native plant species (INNS) method statement will be produced, as secured via commitment BD6-CEMP in the Mitigation Route Map [APP-171]. As such, the detailed CEMP produced under Requirement 4 and the detailed DEMP under Requirement 5 will need to accord with this provision, along with any other commitments made in the outline documents. It is considered that the INNS is sufficiently secured in this manner.	Agreed
DBC017	Ecological Clerk of Works (ECoW)	DBC are in agreement that an ECoW to be appointed to help oversee construction and decommissioning from an ecology perspective.	The agreement of DBC in relation to an ECoW is noted.	Agreed

Row ID	Topic	DBC Position	Applicant Position	Status
DBC018	Pre-decommissioning surveys	In agreement that a preconstruction and predecommissioning suite of surveys are required in advance of work and will be undertaken by an ECoW.	The agreement of DBC in relation to further survey work is noted.	Agreed
DBC019	Species Protection Plan (SPP)	DBC agree that a SPP is to be to be implemented during the construction and decommissioning phases of the Proposed Development.	The agreement of DBC in relation to an SPP is noted.	Agreed
DBC020	Vegetation clearance	DBC is in agreement with the proposed vegetation clearance methods. ECoW should be available to check for nesting birds and to install buffer area where nesting birds are located, and to check for fledgings.	The agreement of DBC in relation to vegetation clearance is noted.	Agreed
DBC021	Tree felling in relation to bat roosts	A suitably qualified ecologist with appropriate licenses should be commissioned to undertake the bat roost check on trees to be felled. In addition, if trees are determined to have bat roosts, then either the trees should be retained and protected, or a Natural England Mitigation Licence should be sought to ensure that appropriate mitigation is undertaken to protect the conservation status of the bat species roosting.	Any trees to be felled identified with bat roost potential will be subject to preconstruction checks, either a climbing or emergence survey by a licensed bat ecologist. If roosting bats are identified, then the tree will not be felled until a licence has been applied for and received from Natural England and suitable mitigation measures agreed to compensate for the loss of the roost. This is secured via commitment BD5-CEMP of the Mitigation Route Map [APP-171] via the Outline CEMP [REP5-012]. As per Requirement 4 of the DCO, no phase of the authorised development may commence until a CEMP for that phase has been submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority. Any CEMP submitted for approval must be in accordance with the outline CEMP and any approved CEMP must be adhered to for the duration of the works in the phase of the authorised development to which the CEMP relates.	Agreed

Row ID	Topic	DBC Position	Applicant Position	Status
DBC022	Tree protection	DBC agree that, where possible, hedgerows, tree lines, ditches and trees including the tree RPA are to be protected during construction and decommissioning through the use of suitable buffers and fencing. For further information on tree buffers, see ES Appendix 7.5 Arboricultural Impact Assessment (APP-138) (Document reference 6.4.7.5).	The agreement of DBC in relation to tree protection is noted.	Agreed
DBC023	Habitat clearance in relation to reptiles and amphibians	DBC agree that, should ground clearance of habitat suitable for reptiles/amphibians be required then this should be undertaken at the right time of year to avoid the hibernation period - i.e., avoid the period: October to March. The ECoW would supervise works and relocate any reptiles/amphibians found.	The agreement of DBC in relation to reptiles and amphibians is noted.	Agreed
DBC024	Badger setts	Where new badger setts or foraging areas are identified they should be mapped, and protection measure and mitigation should be outlined. Where badger setts are to be impacted by the development, a badger mitigation licence must be obtained to undertake the work.	The agreement of DBC in relation to works involving badgers is noted.	Agreed
DBC025	Sediment control measures	DBC are in agreement with the CEMP which states 'Sediment control measures (silt fences, settlement/attenuation ponds etc.) would be used in the vicinity of watercourses, springs or drains where natural features (e.g. hollows) do not provide adequate protection.'	The agreement of DBC in relation to watercourses is noted.	Agreed
DBC026	Over-pumping of watercourses	It is anticipated that most works will take place 10m away from watercourses/waterbodies. A small number of small tributaries will be crossed by the proposed cable route corridor. At these watercourse crossings HDD will be used. DBC consider that if	Use of 2mm mesh is not discussed in the CEMP [REP5-012] because it is uncertain whether over-pumping of the watercourse will be necessary. If over-pumping is needed, best practice techniques will be employed to avoid	Agreed

Row ID	Topic	DBC Position	Applicant Position	Status
		<p>over-pumping of a watercourse is required, the pump intake must have a 2mm diameter mesh on it to prevent the entrainment of elvers and other small fish.</p> <p>The updated oCEMP [REP5-012] includes measures to employ best practice techniques to avoid trapping fish should the over-pumping of watercourses be required (ID BD19 – CEMP). DBC is satisfied with this approach.</p>	trapping fish. This will involve using a 2mm mesh, along with considering and adjusting the flow velocity to prevent fish from getting stuck to the mesh. A reference to secure consideration of the use of mesh, should over-pumping be required, has been added to the oCEMP [REP5-012], under commitment BD19-CEMP.	
DBC027	Nighttime working	No nighttime work is to take place within 30 m of watercourses / waterbodies (the period when otters are most active).	The agreement of DBC in relation to nighttime work near watercourses is noted.	Agreed
DBC028	Mitigation for loss of ground nesting bird breeding and foraging habitat	The loss of ground nesting bird breeding and foraging habitat is to be mitigated through the provision of eight land parcels currently used for intensive agriculture to be used for biodiversity enhancement, with no Solar PV modules proposed within these areas. The two large fields to the north of Bishopton will be maintained with low maintenance grass rich sward ensuring continued availability of open ground for ground nesting birds such as curlew and lapwing. DBC agree with this statement, and consider that there must be a clear management and monitoring plan for the habitats created to ensure that species composition and sward height are suitable for the target species	This comment is noted. An outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [REP5-020] has been submitted as part of this application. This would be secured via Requirement 12 of the DCO [REP5-002].	Agreed
DBC029	Biodiversity enhancement areas	Eight land parcels currently used for intensive agriculture across the Order Limits are to be used for biodiversity enhancement with two large fields in Panel Area F: North of Bishopton, also to remain free of solar PV modules. These areas will provide enhanced foraging opportunities across the Order	This comment is noted. An outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [REP5-020] has been submitted as part of this application. This would be secured via Requirement 12 of the DCO [REP5-002].	Agreed

Row ID	Topic	DBC Position	Applicant Position	Status
		Limits for bat species and mitigate the potential avoidance of Panel Areas. The establishment of a network of new and improved native-species-rich hedgerows with hedgerow trees will also create additional and enhanced commuting, foraging, and roosting habitat for bats. There must be a clear management and monitoring plan for the habitats created.		
DBC030	Ground nesting birds	The two large fields to the north of Bishopton will be maintained with low maintenance grass rich sward ensuring continued availability of open ground for ground nesting birds such as curlew and lapwing. To be managed with no grazing during the nesting season (April to August) with a late summer hay cut (late August to September) after young birds have fledged followed by grazing if required. There must be a clear management and monitoring plan for the habitats created.	This comment is noted. An outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [REP5-020] has been submitted as part of this application. This would be secured via Requirement 12 of the DCO [REP5-002].	Agreed
DBC031	Ongoing fence maintenance	<p>DBC have requested clarification as to who would be responsible for the checks of fencing across the site, and how often is 'regular'? Additionally, DBC have sought clarification on how this would be recorded to ensure the checks are being conducted.</p> <p>DBC is, in principle, satisfied with the suggestion proposed but would seek clarification as to how the Applicant proposes to secure this commitment as part of the application. DBC will provide an update on this matter upon consideration of further information from the Applicant.</p> <p>The commitment to monitor fencing as referred to at various points within the Outline LEMP is acknowledged, however none of these references</p>	Security camera footage will be monitored on a weekly basis to ensure no large mammals get trapped in the fencing. In addition, maintenance checks to be carried out by operational staff conducted at least every 3 months by walking around the security fence to ensure badger access points are clear and no other problems with the fencing. This will be reported to the operations manager with records kept. The commitment to monitor fencing is secured in the Outline LEMP [REP5-020/21] via paragraphs 5.2.2-3 and 8.3.7, and with reference to badger fencing specifically, in paragraph 6.3.6, however as set out in the ES Errata and Management Plans Proposed Updates (Document Reference	Agreed

Row ID	Topic	DBC Position	Applicant Position	Status
		includes any information about the frequency at which this monitoring will take place. Should this be further updated to include reference to 3 monthly monitoring as set out in the 'Applicant Position' then DBC would be in agreement with this.	8.11, Revision 4), these references will be updated at Deadline 8 to specify that this will be every three months.	
DBC032	New hedgerows and trees	The establishment of a network of new and improved native-species-rich hedgerows with hedgerow trees to increase biodiversity across the Order Limits. Existing hedgerows will be enhanced with planting along defunct hedgerows where landscape concerns suggest it is effective mitigation. Only native species will be planted along these hedgerows. DBC consider that the new hedgerows will be suitably buffered and managed appropriately, as detailed in sections 5.4 and 5.5 of the OLEMP. They are in agreement with the methods proposed overall but would expect to see a species list outlining which native species are to be used within the hedgerows.	This comment is noted. An outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [REP5-020] has been submitted as part of this application. This would be secured via Requirement 12 of the DCO [REP5-002].	Agreed
DBC033	Flailing of hedgerows	DBC acknowledges that the reduced cutting (flailing) will enable improved growth, reinforcement of defunct hedgerows. However, they request that the Applicant considers a different method of management to flailing, as this is damaging to hedgerow vegetation, and can destroy eggs laid by invertebrates such as the nationally scarce small egg moth; and Lackey moths, which overwinter as eggs on shoots and twigs, and are very vulnerable to annual flailing. Additionally, DBC would encourage any cutting to be undertaken outside of nesting bird season (March to August inclusive), and where possible avoid cutting hedgerows with berries on as overwintering birds such as fieldfare and redwing will feed on these. Where possible, reduce cutting to	Hedgerows will be lightly flailed every three years on rotation with only one side of an individual hedgerow flailed in any one year outside of the bird breeding season. If required, for example road visibility, then more regular flailing will occur. ES Appendix 2.14 Outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (LEMP) [REP5-020] sets out the proposed management and maintenance regime, which is committed to under DCO requirement 12 of the draft Development Consent Order [REP5-002]. No phase of the Proposed Development would be commenced until a LEMP covering that phase which accords with the outline LEMP has been submitted to and approved by	Agreed

Row ID	Topic	DBC Position	Applicant Position	Status
		<p>every three or more years as this will allow hedge plants to produce flowers and berries and achieve a better structure.</p> <p>DBC is satisfied in principle with this approach but would ask the Applicant to give consideration to a staggered approach to hedge flailing across the Order Limits to ensure impacts upon biodiversity are minimised.</p> <p>The commitment to update the oLEMP at the next deadline to include reference to agreeing the timing and approach to flailing, and whether it could be staggered is noted. However, the reference to this within the ES Errata and Management Plans Proposed Updates (Document Reference 8.11, Revision 4) p20 would only require the Principal Contractor to 'consider' a staggered approach to flailing. There should be a commitment to this within the update. With clear planning this should not be an issue for the Principal Contractor and should not be seen as a barrier to management.</p>	<p>the relevant planning authority, as outlined in DCO requirement 12. As such, specific measures such as the flailing regime of hedgerows would be captured through the approvals process of the detailed LEMP.</p> <p>A specific reference to agreeing the timing and approach to flailing, and committing to a staggered approach, will be added to the final version of the outline LEMP at Deadline 8. This is committed to in the ES Errata and Management Plans Proposed Updates (Document Reference 8.11, Revision 4).</p>	
DBC034	Field margins between hedgerows and fencing	<p>DBC agree that the field margins between the boundary hedgerows and the security fencing will be enhanced in line with three options and managed accordingly: provision of winter wild bird food (sowing with specific wild bird winter food), provision of rough grass margins (sowing with tussock forming grass species), and provision of flower rich margins (sowing with a wildflower seed). It is anticipated that a third of the total length of margins will be given over to each treatment.</p>	<p>The agreement of DBC in relation to the filed margin enhancement is noted.</p>	Agreed

Row ID	Topic	DBC Position	Applicant Position	Status
DBC035	Low maintenance grassland under solar PV panels	DBC agree with the Applicant's statement that the area underneath panels to be sown with a low maintenance grassland while between panels and to margins they will be sown with legume rich herbal ley/wild flora mixes, this aims to improve soil health and insect diversity such as pollinators to improved foraging habitat for species such as birds and bats. To be managed accordingly with either a light cutting or grazing regime in late autumn (August onwards) to maintain the vegetation. DBC would also expect to see a species list outlining which native species are to be used within the habitats. A management plan for grazing/cutting should be submitted.	This comment is noted. An outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [REP5-020] has been submitted as part of this application. This would be secured via Requirement 12 of the DCO [REP5-002].	Agreed
DBC036	Bat and barn owl boxes	DBC are satisfied with the provision of boxes for roosting bats and barn owls. DBC would expect that a plan for locations of boxes, type of box, and numbers of boxes be submitted. DBC further request that the Applicant ensures that boxes provided for barn owls have a numbered tag and are checked on an annual basis. The boxes should be installed at a height that allows monitoring to be undertaken – no more than the height of a double ladder (for reasons of health and safety). The monitoring could be undertaken by a local bird ringing scheme – DBC LPA ecologist can advise on local groups.	Section 8.3 of the outline LEMP [REP5-020] sets out how bat boxes and bird boxes would be inspected. Bat boxes would be monitored during late spring or summer by a bat licenced ecologist annually within the first five years of the Proposed Development to confirm use. If during these monitoring visits there is no evidence of use by roosting bats, the location and position of the boxes would be re-evaluated, with alternative locations considered. Bird boxes would be monitored during late spring or summer by a suitably experienced (or licensed, for barn owls) ecologist or ornithologist annually within the first five years of the Proposed Development to confirm use. The boxes for the barn owls will also have a numbered tag, as suggested by DBC. No phase of the Proposed Development would be commenced until a LEMP covering that phase which accords with the outline LEMP has been submitted to and approved by the relevant	Agreed

Row ID	Topic	DBC Position	Applicant Position	Status
			planning authority, as outlined in DCO requirement 12 [REP5-002]. As such, specific measures such as the specific height of barn owl box installation, the locations, type and numbers would be captured through the approvals process of the detailed LEMP.	
DBC037	Proposed hedgerow creation and enhancement	DBC agree with the proposed hedgerow creation and enhancement with a forecast length of approximately 12km and 29km, respectively.	The agreement of DBC in relation to hedgerows noted.	Agreed
DBC038	Temporary cable works impacts	DBC agree that the construction and decommissioning works including cabling are temporary, and in the short term have the potential to generate significant localised effects, however, these will not last into the long term. Due to the main areas of the works occurring in arable and pasture farmland, the impacts are limited to those habitats.	This comment is noted and agreed with.	Agreed
DBC039	Common Valerian (Valeriana officinale)	Common Valerian (Valeriana officinale) which is on the England ref list listed as near threatened, was recorded within the study area. It is not expected to be impacted by the proposed development; therefore no plant-species-specific surveys or mitigation is recommended. DBC are in agreement with this. However, if common valerian is encountered in areas where works will commence, then DBC consider that a suitably qualified ecologist should be contacted for advice and mitigation.	The outline Landscape and Ecology Management Plan [REP5-020] details that pre-commencement surveys would be undertaken in advance of works to reconfirm the ecological baseline conditions and to identify any new ecological risk or changes to existing known constraints. This would be secured via Requirement 12 of the DCO [REP5-002].	Agreed
DBC040	Trees	DBC acknowledge that the majority of trees identified as suitable bat roost trees will be protected during development by establishing a Construction Exclusion Zone (CEZ) around their Root Protection	This comment is noted and agreed with.	Agreed

Row ID	Topic	DBC Position	Applicant Position	Status
		Areas (RPA). A total of seven trees which were identified as suitable bat roost trees with be removed by the Proposed Development. These trees will undergo pre-construction checks to determine the presence or absence of a bat roost. If a bat roost is located, a bat licence will be required before the start of works. Any trees to be removed or to have branches pruned to be checked by an ecologist prior to work, to determine the likely presence of a bird's nest and/or bat roost.		
DBC041	Bats	Static bat detectors were deployed between May and September 2022 by RSK Biocensus. The results were predominantly common and widespread species, however, activity level demonstrated that the habitat was variable, from low to high foraging suitability. Nathusius' pipistrelle accounted for a low number of recordings, however, is still considered to be of county importance for the species. 6.2.6 Environmental Statement Chapter 6 Biodiversity outlines the impacts to bats through the construction noise, and through habitat changes from the installation of the solar PV models which may lead to reduced insect prey availability. Notwithstanding this, the increase in habitat provided via the landscaping plans for the site are expected to result in an increase in insect prey availability over the longer term. The areas with solar PV modules may result in avoidance behaviours from some bat species.	This comment is noted and agreed with.	Agreed
DBC042	Hazel dormice	Hazel dormice were scoped out of further surveys due to the geographic distribution and lack of records. DBC would agree with this assumption.	The agreement of DBC in relation to hazel dormice noted.	Agreed

Row ID	Topic	DBC Position	Applicant Position	Status
DBC043	Other wildlife	<p>If mammal burrows such as a fox earth and rabbit warren are to be destroyed, then the burrow may need to be excavated under ecological supervision, to ensure no mammals are harmed during the unearthing process. It should be noted that all wild mammals are protected by The Wild Mammals (Protection) Act 1996 (as amended). If works are undertaken into December – February, hedgehogs may be hibernating under the hedgerows. Whilst hedgehogs themselves are not European endangered species, they are a species of principal importance under the NERC Act 2006 due to them declining significantly within the UK. DBC advise they should not be disturbed during hibernation, however, if one is encountered during the hedgerow removal you must stop works and wait until the hibernating hedgehog has moved on of its own accord. Hibernating hedgehogs which are removed from their locations have the potential to die due to being woken up and having to find a new place to hibernate, which uses up the fat reserves stored for the winter.</p>	<p>The outline Construction Environmental Management Plan [REP5-012] details how impacts to ecological features will be mitigated during construction. This would be secured via Requirement 4 of the DCO [REP5-002].</p>	Agreed
DBC044	Water voles	<p>Given that there are streams which have the potential to support water voles, albeit not optimal habitats, further survey effort is recommended to determine impacts both direct and indirect to water voles. These could be undertaken by visual searching and through the use of eDNA. If eDNA returns water vole presence, it is expected further consideration and mitigation for water vole to be implemented where impacts are likely. There are no considerations of potential impacts to water voles in section 6.8 of the ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity. Impacts to water voles during the construction, operational and decommissioning phases of the development should</p>	<p>During the Preliminary Ecological Appraisal (PEA) [APP-126], waterbodies, watercourses, and their surrounding habitats within the order limits were surveyed for their suitability for water voles. While the drain at Letch Beck was noted for its potential riparian habitat, the majority of habitats within the order limits were found to be unsuitable due to their shallow water depth and lack of in-channel vegetation. Given the fragmented and poor-quality nature of the habitat, the presence of water voles within the order limits is determined to be unlikely. Additionally, no signs</p>	Agreed

Row ID	Topic	DBC Position	Applicant Position	Status
		<p>be given appropriate consideration as part of the application, with particular emphasis on the temporary bridge crossing points which have the potential to destroy water vole burrows and habitat, and potentially cause injury or death to water voles themselves if not mitigated for.</p> <p>DBC would recommend that a pre-commencement start survey is undertaken to screen out water vole burrows at the location of temporary crossings. This could be incorporated as part of the pre-commencement surveys for otters which is set out in the latest revision to the oCEMP [REP5-012] (ID BD20 – CEMP).</p> <p>DBC is satisfied with the approach set out in the commitment to undertake pre-commencement surveys for water voles in the ES Errata and Management Plans Proposed Updates (Document Reference 8.11, Revision 4)</p>	<p>of water vole activity, such as burrows or droppings, were recorded during the surveys. Consequently, the order limits were considered to have limited potential for supporting water voles. Furthermore, given appropriate buffers between watercourses and the solar array with temporary watercourse crossings for the cable route using existing crossing were possible with HDD a consideration over any sensitive watercourses, then the impacts on water voles are not envisaged. The Applicant will include water vole in the pre-commencement surveys under BD20 in the final version of the outline CEMP prior to close of Examination. This is committed to in the ES Errata and Management Plans Proposed Updates (Document Reference 8.11, Revision 4).</p>	
DBC045	Otters	<p>Otters need to be considered at all stages of development from construction, operational, to decommissioning. Section 6.10.26 of the ES Chapter 6 Biodiversity states that 'buffers of 10m between construction and riparian boundaries and watercourses will be maintained'; however, where the temporary crossings will be installed these will breach the 10m buffer. Where temporary crossings are proposed over water courses, these should be considered to have impacts on otters using the watercourses. It must also be considered that otters can and do create holts in areas of up to 100m away from the water courses, and natal dens can be up to 1km from a water body. Whilst this is unlikely to</p>	<p>Given the fact that the solar array will be located in open arable or grassland fields the chances of ad hoc otter holts being present is considered extremely unlikely. Habitats more likely to support holts away from watercourses such as woodland are being retained. Notwithstanding this pre-construction surveys will be carried out at each of the proposed temporary crossing points to ensure no otter holts are present. If in the unlikely event holts are identified these will be monitored and if active suitable safeguard measures agreed with Natural England.</p>	Agreed

Row ID	Topic	DBC Position	Applicant Position	Status
		<p>occur in suboptimal habitat, it cannot be discounted as a possibility.</p> <p>The oCEMP [REP5-012] makes provision for a pre-construction checking survey for otter to be completed in advance of any works within 50m of any watercourse on site, and for the production of an Otter Protection Plan (OPP) as part of the detailed CEMP (ID BD20-CEMP). DBC is satisfied with this approach.</p>		
DBC046	Fish	<p>Where temporary crossings are proposed over water courses, these should be considered to have impacts on fish present within the watercourses. Where there is an omission of information this needs to be explained full as to why this is.</p> <p>The oCEMP [REP5-012] has been updated to consider impacts on fish (IDs BD19 – CEMP & BD20 – CEMP). The Council is satisfied with this approach.</p>	<p>Fisheries surveys were not carried out as we do not know the watercourse crossing designs. The two new watercourse crossings relate to proposed access tracks across minor tributaries of the River Skerne and Little Stainton Brook. The final design of these crossings is not yet known and will be subject to detailed design following the appointment of a contractor. The potential effects of these crossings have been discussed with the EA and the Applicant has committed to providing further detail via the detailed CEMP, on which the EA will be consulted. Other watercourse crossings may be required but these are likely to relate to the final cable route selection. Again, any works to these crossings would be controlled through the updated CEMP, in consultation with the EA. If the crossings will involve instream work, then pre-construction surveys such as fisheries, otter, and water vole would be required.</p>	Agreed
DBC047	Landscape and visual – assessment to inform baseline	<p>DBC maintains that the assessment work should have included additional analysis at a strategic/local level to identify the baseline landscape conditions and inform the design of the development layout and the</p>	<p>The Applicant is of the view that the baseline information provided within the ES is “<i>that which is reasonably required to assess the likely significant effects</i>” (GLVIA3 para 3.16) and</p>	Not agreed

Row ID	Topic	DBC Position	Applicant Position	Status
		<p>mitigation strategy. It is the view of DBC that fieldwork analysis is lacking in the Application documents except for analysis of the character of the villages undertaken by the Applicant after a request from DBC for additional information on the setting of the villages. This was made for reasons set out in the LIR.</p> <p>Adequate baseline information, including fieldwork analysis is a key requirement for understanding the landscape, its character and the effect of changes. This is covered in GLVIA3 in paragraphs 3.15, 4.7, 5.1, 5.3, 5.4, Table 3.1 and Chapter 5 Summary. The value of the process is described in paragraphs 4.5 and 4.6 and in other parts of GLVIA.</p>	<p>provides a “description of the baseline conditions relevant to that topic” (GLVIA 3 para 8.8). Detailed baseline studies have been undertaken and have informed the landscape and visual input to design and the assessment of effects as advised in GLVIA3, but none of the paragraphs referenced by DBC advise that detailed records of ‘fieldwork analysis’ should be provided in an LVIA.</p>	
DBC048	Landscape and visual – desktop baseline information	DBC agree that the desktop baseline information set out in the Application documents is adequate.	The Applicant notes the position of DBC.	Agreed
DBC049	Landscape and visual – village setting assessment:	DBC maintains that the assessment work needs to include the effects of the development on the setting of villages, as receptors which are separate from the villages. Local Policy SH1 is concerned with the character of rural villages and the protection and enhancement of the setting of the villages. The Darlington Landscape Character Assessment specifically highlights the rural context of the villages and the setting of the villages as key sensitivities of the local character areas.	<p>The assessment of effects on village character and settings has been provided in response to DBC’s request, as presented in the ES Chapter 7 Landscape and Visual [APP-130] despite not being required by standard methodologies.</p> <p>The Planning Statement [APP-163] provides details on how the Applicant has complied with national and local policy requirements, it does not discuss policy SH1 which was deemed to be not relevant given it relates to maintaining the settlement hierarchy (which the Proposed Development would not alter) and is thus more relevant to settlement extensions.</p> <p>Policy SH1 and its supporting text do not set out a requirement for an assessment, (or two separate assessments).</p>	Not agreed

Row ID	Topic	DBC Position	Applicant Position	Status
DBC050	Landscape and visual - Viewpoints	<p>Paragraph 4.3 in GLVIA3 states that it may be appropriate to consider the ‘worst case’ situation to identify adequate mitigation proposals. DBC is of the view that worst case should be illustrated where it is reasonable to do so. DBC considers this to be best practice, and it is a principle normally adopted for LVIA work. Notwithstanding this, DBC is concerned that the viewpoints presented around Great Stainton and the approach roads to the village are not representative views or typical views and cannot be relied upon to illustrate the nature of potential effects on these receptors. Further information is presented in the LIR.</p> <p>Following the appointment of landscape consultants to advise the Council, DBC expressed broad concern to the Applicant about the quality and representativeness of the viewpoint photographs presented in the Application documents. DBC provided limited examples of locations where additional/alternative photography would be helpful. The Applicant subsequently presented a limited number of additional viewpoints but did not undertake a comprehensive review of the photography. DBC maintains the position that the viewpoints presented in the ES do not reflect a reasonable worst case for all receptors and/or are not representative of views from all receptors and do not represent an acceptable range of lighting conditions which would affect the appearance of the solar farms. This is further expanded upon in the LIR. DBC is of the opinion that there was sufficient time to retake the photography presented in the ES to address these concerns.</p>	<p>The Applicant notes that Paragraph 4.3 of GLVIA relates to ‘Understanding the proposed development’ and specifically to design flexibility and the need to consider ‘worst case’ in terms of development parameters – it does not relate to viewpoint selection. A full baseline analysis carried out in accordance with relevant guidance, such as the Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment Third Edition (GLVIA3) is provided in ES Chapter 7 Landscape and Visual [APP-030]. The Applicant considers that the 34 viewpoints considered in the ES adequately cover and provide a representative assessment of the Proposed Development. ‘Worst case’ viewpoints are not a concept which is recognised by GLVIA3 guidance, which advises that representative viewpoints should be selected to “<i>represent the experience of different types of visual receptor, where larger numbers of viewpoints cannot all be included individually and where the significant effects are unlikely to differ</i>”. Viewpoints do not need to be selected in locations where mitigation would be ineffective and in line with the need to be representative of the effects a range of viewpoints have been selected including some where hedges would grow to screen views (of the solar panels and/or wider landscape), and others where this would not be the case.</p> <p>These were selected based on DBC’s response to the scoping request, and subsequent correspondence with DBC officers at which point it was the Applicant’s understanding that</p>	Not agreed

Row ID	Topic	DBC Position	Applicant Position	Status
			<p>matters raised by DBC in relation to viewpoints had been addressed. The discussion was re-opened by DBC in August 2023, 3 months after the PEIR was published. At that stage some additional viewpoints were agreed and some moved to reach the 34 representative viewpoints which inform the assessment provided in the ES.</p> <p>The Applicant has agreed to accommodate any supplementary viewpoints in an additional viewpoint analysis which can be provided to DBC, once DBC have identified which viewpoints they consider need adding based on the detailed landscape design. That viewpoint analysis could be submitted to PINS if requested. The Applicant does not consider that additional viewpoint analysis is necessary to assess the likely significant environmental effects of the scheme, which are adequately assessed through the ES.</p>	
DBC051	Landscape and Visual Assessment (LVIA)	DBC consider that the LVIA study area of 3km is adequate to identify all significant effects.	The Applicant notes the agreement of DBC in relation to the LVIA study area.	Agreed
DBC052	LVIA - guidance	All relevant guidance has been identified in the LVIA.	The Applicant notes the agreement of DBC in relation to the identification of relevant guidance within the LVIA.	Agreed
DBC053	LVIA - guidance	The LVIA and accompanying figures have been undertaken and prepared to the relevant guidance.	The Applicant notes the agreement of DBC in relation to the compliance of the LVIA and accompanying figures (see point DBC055) below with relevant guidance.	Agreed
DBC054	LVIA – methodology	It is agreed that the Methodology set out in Appendix 7.1 is broadly acceptable.	The Applicant notes the position of DBC.	Agreed

Row ID	Topic	DBC Position	Applicant Position	Status
DBC055	LVIA - photomontages	<p>DBC does have concerns about the appearance of the solar panels as presented in the photomontage views. 'Appearance' is addressed throughout Technical Guidance Note 06/19; Visual Representation of Development Proposals and highlighted in Table 2 of TGN 06/19 in relation to Type 3 and 4 visualizations. DBC is of the opinion that the appearance of the solar farms presented in the ES visualisations is not representative of the varied visual effects of solar panels normally observed in undulating topography in different light conditions. The LIR presents a number of photographs of a solar farm under construction to illustrate this point. DBC has raised concerns that the majority of the visualisations are presented as separate wireframe and photographs which are difficult to interpret and therefore of limited use. It would be more helpful to present these visualisations as photowire images with wireframe computer modelling overlaid on to the base photographs.</p>	<p>The Applicant notes that 'appearance' is mentioned at several points within TGN 06/19, but in each case simply in order to mention the purpose of visualisations in showing the appearance of a development. There is no mention in TGN 06/19 or GLVIA3 of depicting development in varied weather conditions.</p> <p>DBC has not expressed concern relating to the use of wirelines in the LIR (or appendix DBC2 to the LIR), and has not requested photowires prior to this point being added to this SoCG on 18/09/2024. As wirelines were used at the PEIR Stage, making this concern clear earlier may have enabled it to be addressed. Photowire formats were considered by the Applicant, but initial reviews indicated that the density of the lines within solar panel areas made the images hard to 'read' and tended to obscure the landscape shown in the photographs.</p> <p>The Applicant considers that the wirelines are adequate to inform understanding of the position and scale of the Proposed Development to inform judgements of effects. The photomontages supplement the wirelines by illustrating appearance - in the weather and lighting conditions of the photograph.</p>	Not agreed
DBC056	LVIA – identification of receptors	Effects on all relevant landscape and visual receptors have been considered in the LVIA.	The Applicant notes the agreement of DBC in relation to the identification of effects on all relevant landscape and visual receptors.	Agreed
DBC057	LVIA – operational effects	Where the ES identifies effects on receptors as being significant during operation, it is agreed that those effects would be significant.	The Applicant notes the agreement of DBC in relation to the operational effects of the Proposed Development in relation to landscape and visual.	Agreed

Row ID	Topic	DBC Position	Applicant Position	Status
DBC058	LVIA – significance of effects	<p>It is agreed that the following receptors would experience significant effects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Landscape effects on the setting of Great Stainton; ▪ Landscape effects on the setting of Bishopton; ▪ Visual effects on all Public Rights of Way within 1km of the Development 	The Applicant notes the agreement of DBC.	Agreed
DBC059	LVIA – significance of operational effects	<p>In each case DBC consider that effects on these receptors would be significant whereas the Applicant's LVIA identifies the effects as not significant:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ LCA7 Bishopton Vale; ▪ Character and setting of Brafferton; ▪ Views from Brafferton; ▪ The local road route connecting Brafferton to Bishopton (Lime Lane, Lodge Lane and the unnamed road between Great Stainton and Bishopton). 	<p>As identified and assessed in Chapter 7 Landscape and Visual [APP-130], the Applicant considers the effects to be as set out below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ LCA7 Bishopton Vale – ES 7.10.40-7.10.47; ▪ Character and setting of Brafferton - ES 7.10.54-7.10.59 ▪ Views from Brafferton – ES 7.10.84-7.10.91; ▪ The local road route connecting Brafferton to Bishopton (Lime Lane, Lodge Lane and the unnamed road between Great Station and Bishopton) - Moderate, Adverse, not significant – drawing on assessments provided at ES 7.10.118-119, 7.10.132 and 7.10.148. 	Not agreed
DBC060	LVIA	<p>DBC make no comment on the following matters; the absence of comment does not indicate either agreement or disagreement with the relevant aspects of the LVIA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The scale of visual effects at viewpoints. ▪ The technical accuracy of the visualisations and ZTV studies. ▪ Effects during construction and decommissioning. ▪ Effects due to underground cabling and substation connections. ▪ Effects due to the proposed sub-station and transmission mast. ▪ The findings in relation to visual effects on residential properties that are considered within the residential visual amenity assessment (RVAA) provided in Appendix 7.5 to the ES [APP-137]. 	The Applicant notes the position of DBC.	Agreed

Row ID	Topic	DBC Position	Applicant Position	Status
DBC061	Cultural Heritage and Archaeology – significance of effects	The application appropriately assesses the impacts of the proposed development on designated and non-designated heritage assets. While some harm is identified to the Bishopton Conservation Area this is considered to be less than significant and at the lower end of the scale of harm.	The Applicant notes the agreement of DBC in relation to the findings of the assessment on Cultural Heritage and Archaeology.	Agreed
DBC062	Archaeological Management Strategy	The Archaeological Management Strategy (AMS) submitted with the application is appropriate for the development and has previously been agreed with Durham County Council Archaeology Section (providing advice to Darlington Borough Council on Archaeology matters) and Tees Archaeology (advising Stockton Borough Council).	The Applicant notes the agreement of DBC in relation to the AMS.	Agreed
DBC063	Archaeological Management Strategy	<p>DBC, in conjunction with Durham County Council Archaeology Section, would request that further additional information is secured as part of requirement 17:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 17(4) “No part of an individual phase of the development as set out in the agreed programme of archaeological works shall be brought into operation until the post investigation assessment has been completed in accordance with the approved Written Scheme of Investigation. The provision made for analysis, publication and dissemination of results, and archive deposition, should be confirmed in writing to, and approved by, the Local Planning Authority” • 17(5) “For each phase of works, following investigative archaeological works, an update to the Archaeological Management Strategy will be produced, setting out any mitigation measures to be 	The Applicant has reviewed the request from DBC and does not agree to amending the wording of Requirement 17. The Applicant considers that the wording of Requirement 17 as currently stated secures the information sought by DBC. Requirement 17 already requires that a written scheme of investigation is approved prior to commencement, in accordance with the outline archaeological management strategy (AMS)[APP-149] . That AMS includes a section on post-excavation activities and secures the requirement of the Applicant to produce a post-excavation assessment report, including details of deposition and publication, which would be subject to approval by the archaeological curators (i.e. the archaeological advisors of the relevant local authorities). This aspect of the AMS therefore already fulfils what is being requested under suggested paragraph 17(4).	Agreed

Row ID	Topic	DBC Position	Applicant Position	Status
		<p>put in place. The development will then be carried out in line with this update”</p> <p>The intention of the additional requirement 17(4) is to allow some flexibility to the applicant since it is not possible to easily set out the various processes fully within a Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI), when aspects of the work won’t be known until the WSI is implemented. For example, how much analysis and reporting is needed, and whether publication is needed, depending on what is found during the fieldwork, so fully detailing this in the WSI is difficult. The additional requirement allows for this detail to be finalised after the fieldwork has happened. That said, including details in the WSI is not impossible, but makes things more complex for all to manage. DBC in conjunction with DCC Archaeology can agree to 17(4) not being applied providing it is understood what this will mean in terms of producing WSIs required under Requirement 17(1). If the requirement for detailed timescales in the WSIs is accepted then we can agree that requirement 17(4) is not required,</p> <p>Milestones are in place in the AMS, which would also be secured by requirement. DBC/DCC Archaeology can therefore agree that this is covered and there is no further requirement for requirement 17(5).</p>	<p>Whilst the Applicant recognises the preference of DBC that the mechanism for further iteration/approval of the publication and reporting of fieldwork is secured via the ‘face’ of the DCO in Requirement 17, the Applicant does not consider this necessary as it would duplicates the mechanism secured via the outline AMS. It is understood that this is a matter of preference and the Applicant and DBC are agreed that the requirement is adequate in securing the approvals necessary.</p> <p>The AMS also secures a procedure for consulting the archaeological curators on the mitigation proposals at milestones during the construction process, with approval to be sought for iterations to the WSI. This aspect of the AMS therefore already fulfils what is being requested under suggested paragraph 17(5).</p>	
DBC064	Agricultural Land – operational assessment	<p>Furthermore, the Council does not agree that the assessment of impacts relating to the loss of agricultural land during the operational period should be scoped out and requires further consideration, particularly as the ES in both Chapters 6 (Land Use and Socioeconomics) (APP-032) and 13 (Cumulative Effects) (APP-036) acknowledges that there would be</p>	<p>As acknowledged by DBC, in its Scoping Opinion [APP-121] the Planning Inspectorate agreed to scope out an assessment of the impacts on agricultural land during the operational stage of the Proposed Development. This was wholly on the basis that the loss would occur at the time of</p>	Agreed

Row ID	Topic	DBC Position	Applicant Position	Status
		<p>a significant cumulative effect relating to the temporary loss of agricultural land.</p> <p>The Council acknowledges the position that the loss of agricultural land during the operational period was scoped out of the ES by the Planning Inspectorate.</p>	<p>construction, and to consider it again during operation would double count the effect.</p> <p>The Planning Statement [APP-163] and the Policy Compliance Document [APP-164] sets out the Proposed Development's accordance with Policy IN9. The 15 May 2024 WMS reiterates the importance of balancing the dual needs of maintaining Best and Most Versatile (BMV) agricultural land for food security and achieving net zero through solar energy development. It did not make any policy changes, including to any policy in the January 2024 designated Energy NPSs. The Planning Statement [APP-163] demonstrates that the Proposed Development is in accordance with the Energy NPS in relation to matters of agricultural land. The new SoS has also since made a statement on 18 July 2024 which set out that solar energy is not a significant threat to food security in comparison to climate change, and reiterated the urgent need for clean energy: "Credible external estimates suggest that ground-mounted solar used just 0.1% of our land in 2022. The biggest threat to nature and food security and to our rural communities is not solar panels or onshore wind; it is the climate crisis, which threatens our best farmland, food production and the livelihoods of farmers." This statement in full is provided as Appendix A1 to the Comments on Relevant Representations [REP1-004] submitted at Deadline 1. Whilst the application for the Proposed Development was submitted</p>	

Row ID	Topic	DBC Position	Applicant Position	Status
			prior to the WMS of 15 May 2024, the Applicant considers that it does not change the position of the Proposed Development in relation to agricultural land, or the manner in which this matter should be evaluated by the SoS in determining the case for development consent.	
DBC065	Agricultural Land – use of BMV	<p>DBC considers that little or no justification has been provided for the use of BMV land within the development proposals as required by the recent WMS.</p> <p>The Council acknowledges the views of Natural England [RR-373] and [REP2-055]; that the permanent loss of BMV agricultural land is not considered to be significant, subject to appropriate soil management techniques being employed during the construction and decommissioning phases relating to the panels and to ensure that more invasive construction techniques required for more ‘permanent’ structures takes place on lower quality agricultural land within the Order Limits.</p> <p>As discussed at ISH6 the Council would wish to ensure that reference is made to Natural England within the wording of Requirement 10 to allow the Council to consult with them on any information submitted in this regard.</p> <p>DBC acknowledges the inclusion of Natural England within Requirement 10 as requested.</p>	<p>The position of the Applicant in relation to policy compliance and the need to use a small proportion (6.1%) of BMV is set out above in response to paragraphs 5.13.1-5.13.2 of the DBC LIR. The scope of the agricultural land assessment, including scoping out the loss of agricultural land during the operational period, was agreed with the Planning Inspectorate and other consultees, including DBC. Natural England was regularly engaged with throughout the pre-application period and at the time of DCO application, reflected in the Relevant Representation from NE [RR-373] which concludes that NE is ‘satisfied with the proposals and considers that there are no significant matters to resolve’.</p> <p>The Applicant has updated the DCO at Deadline 5 [REP5-002/3] to include for NE as a consultee on Requirement 10.</p>	Agreed
DBC066	Public Rights of Way (PRoW)	Subject to not all the affected routes being legally diverted, the PRoW management plan must also include detail of:	Regarding points a), b) and c), the Applicant has produced an Outline PRoW Management Plan [REP5-022] as part of the DCO submission, which includes the timescales for diversions and	Agreed

Row ID	Topic	DBC Position	Applicant Position	Status
		<p>a) The creation of the permissive routes to meet the legislation and standard of the respective PROW designation.</p> <p>b) The removal of the current definitive lines, including all related PROW infrastructure</p> <p>c) Routes that are being legally diverted and updates to related infrastructure.</p> <p>d) Maintenance of the permissive routes for the lifetime of the project, however long that may be, to the legislation and standard of the respective PROW designation (including to any updates to them).</p> <p>e) Termination of the project: the removal of the permissive routes and the re-opening of the definitive lines as defined prior to the project to the legislation and standard at the time of re-opening.</p> <p>DBC is satisfied with this approach</p>	<p>provisions of permissive paths, the nature of temporary closures and user safeguarding during construction. The routes that the Applicant is proposing to permanently divert are being legally diverted. There are some which will be managed and maintained during construction, all of which will be secured via requirement 14 of the DCO and are detailed within the Outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan [REP5-022] and the DCO (Schedule 4). Should development consent be granted, an updated Public Rights of Way Management Plan will be produced by the contractor, as secured via requirement 14 of the DCO and will be subject to consultation with DBC and the relevant landowners.</p> <p>With regards to point d) specifically, the maintenance of the proposed permissive routes will be subject to an updated Public Rights of Way Management Plan, to be produced by the appointed contractor should development consent be granted.</p> <p>With regards to point e) specifically, a separate Decommissioning Public Rights of Way Management Plan will be produced by the appointed contractor at that time, as secured via requirement 5 of the DCO, which will be done so in consultation with the relevant landowners and DBC.</p>	

Row ID	Topic	DBC Position	Applicant Position	Status
DBC067	Permissive paths	The provision of ~3,600m of permissive paths in principle is a welcome addition to the path network for the lifetime of the development.	The Applicant notes the agreement of DBC in relation to the provision of permissive paths.	Agreed
DBC068	Permanent PRoW diversions	DBC have requested to be consulted on the final diversions during the detailed design stage of the Proposed Development.	The Applicant discussed the proposed permanent PRoW diversions with the previous PRoW Officer, and this informed the proposed alignments at the time of application submission. The Applicant is happy to review these with the current PRoW Officer as part of the detailed design process, alongside agreement on temporary management measures required during construction. This is reflected in a commitment within the updated PRoW Management Plan submitted on 18 October as part of the Applicant's Change Application.	Agreed
DBC069	Minerals Safeguarding	Parts of the Order Limits fall within a Minerals Safeguarding area (limestone (shallow) and sand and gravel (shallow)) as defined in the Tees Valley Minerals and Waste Core Strategy DPD (2011). Given the 'temporary' nature of the proposed development this would not sterilise resources and they would remain capable of extraction in the future.	ES Chapter 9 Land Use and Socioeconomics [APP-032] includes an assessment of the potential effects of the Proposed Development on the identified mineral resource of limestone within parts of Panel Area C and D. This is presented at Section 9.10.20 and concludes a Minor Adverse effect on the resource which is not considered to be significant. This effect arises through temporary sterilisation of the resource; however it would remain in situ and could be extracted following decommissioning of the Proposed Development.	Agreed
DBC070	Sequential Test	The comments of the Environment Agency in their relevant representation dated 17 May 2024 are noted; that the development has not considered the sequential test in respect of parts of the site being located within Flood Zones 2 and 3 and has gone	An updated Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy [REP5-018] which now includes the Sequential and Exception Tests was submitted as part of Deadline 2.	Agreed

Row ID	Topic	DBC Position	Applicant Position	Status
		<p>straight to the exceptions test. As such, the development would not comply with DLP Policy DC2.</p> <p>DBC has considered the updated Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy [REP2-013] submitted at Deadline 2, which now includes the Sequential and Exception Tests. In accordance with NPS EN-1 it should be demonstrated as part of the exception test that (a) the development would provide wider benefits for the sustainability of the community.</p> <p>DBC has considered the updated Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy [REP4-004] submitted at Deadline 4 which has been updated to address omissions to the Exceptions Test in an earlier version.</p> <p>The FRA sets out that most of the proposed development is located within Flood Zone 1 with the exception of a small area of solar panels within Panel Area D (field D02), two existing access routes and two underground cable crossings. No critical infrastructure (electrical infrastructure excluding solar PV modules) would be placed within the mapped fluvial and pluvial flood zones. Where solar panels are to be sited in Flood Zones 2 and 3 hydraulic modelling has been developed to demonstrate that only the legs of the PV modules will be submerged, which will not impact flood risk outside of the site. The access routes are existing accesses and the point at which the proposed cable route crosses the flood zones will be located underground below the waterbodies.</p>	<p>Recognising the further comment received regarding the wider benefits of the Proposed Development in the context of the Exception Test, the Applicant has further updated the FRA to reflect this. This is provided at Deadline 4 of the Examination in an updated Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy [REP5-018].</p> <p>The Applicant has accepted that additional control should be included within the outline CEMP to address this concern, which was included in an update to the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) [REP5-013] and now includes commitment HFR2-CEMP which includes a commitment to produce a Construction Surface Water Management Plan (CSWMP) as part of the CEMP.</p> <p>The final iteration of the oCEMP will be a certified document under the dDCO, and there is therefore no need for any further amendment to be made to Requirement 4(2).</p> <p>This position is also agreed with the Environment Agency, as per the SoCG submitted at Deadline 6 (Document Reference 8.4.6, Rev 3).</p>	

Row ID	Topic	DBC Position	Applicant Position	Status
		<p>DBC considers that the Sequential Test has been passed with respect to those elements of the proposed development within Flood Zone 1. As it is not possible for the development to be located in zones with a lower probability of flooding, the Exception Test must be applied.</p> <p>As required by NPS EN-1 the FRA states that the scheme will provide wider sustainability benefits which outweigh flood risk and appropriate mitigation has been considered to ensure the scheme remains operational and safe during its lifetime and without increasing flood risk elsewhere. DBC therefore agree that it has been demonstrated that the Exception Test has also been met.</p> <p>DBC acting as Lead Local Flood Authority do not raise any specific concerns regarding surface water drainage matters. It is noted at paragraph 4.8 of the FRA & DS [REP4-004] that a Construction Surface Water Management Plan (CSWMP) will be secured by Requirement 4 of the draft Development Consent Order, the principles of which are set out in the outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP).</p> <p>It is noted that a commitment to submitting a CSWMP is included in the latest version of the oCEMP [REP5-012] (ID HFR2-CEMP).</p>		
DBC071	Noise and Vibration	Noise from the construction, operational and decommissioning phases of the development was scoped in to the Environmental Impact Assessment and is considered in Chapter 11 of the Environmental Statement (ES). Chapter 11 details the assessment methodology considering the impact in terms of the sensitivity of the receptor in determining the	The agreement of DBC with regards to the noise assessment methodology is acknowledged.	Agreed

Row ID	Topic	DBC Position	Applicant Position	Status
		magnitude of change in operational noise, road traffic noise, construction and vibration. The Council's Environmental Health Manager is satisfied with the assessment methodology used.		
DBC072	Noise and Vibration – identification of ESRs	<p>There is a lack of ESRs in the northern area of Panel F and West House Farm, as well as Downland Farm and Cobby Castle Forge (the latter has a predicted daytime noise level of 25dB but is situated within a contour showing levels in the region of 35-40 dB) would appear not to have been identified as an ESR subject to a BS4142 assessment. Section 11.6 of ES Chapter 11 makes reference for the purpose of the noise assessment that the study area consisted of the Order Limits and within a radius of up to 300m beyond the Order limits for robustness. These properties would look to be within 300m of the Order Limits and clarification is therefore sought as to why these properties have not been included as an ESR.</p> <p>Further noise work has been commissioned. A meeting is to be organised by the Applicant, Noise Consultant, Darlington Borough Council and Stockton on Tees Borough Council.</p> <p>The Council has considered the ES Chapter 11 Noise and Vibration Addendum – Construction Noise [REP4-012] which considers construction noise rather than issues with operational noise which was raised in the SoCG.</p> <p>The addendum however refers to revised versions of ES Figure 11.1 Sensitive Receptor Location Plan (Document reference 3.11.1, Revision 2) and ES</p>	<p>At Deadline 4, the Applicant provided an update to its ES Appendix 11.4 6.4.11.4 Environmental Statement Appendix 11.4 BS4142 Assessment Calculations [REP4-005], which provides an assessment of the noise from the Proposed Development as received at ESRs during the daytime and night-time, including ES40 (Cobby Castle Forge). This was supported by an update to ES Figure 11.1 Sensitive Receptor Location Plan, which identifies ES40 as Cobby Castle Forge.</p> <p>Regarding operational noise, the Figure 11.8 shows the existing noise level of 25dB as stated in the key. The noise contour levels reflect the daytime and nighttime average of ES Appendix 11.4 BS4142 Assessment Calculations [REP4-005]. This is 39dB for ESR40.</p>	Agreed

Row ID	Topic	DBC Position	Applicant Position	Status
		<p>Appendix 11.4 BS4142 Assessment Calculations (Document Reference 6.4.11.4, Revision 2).</p> <p>Additional ESRs 36 – 43 (Panel Area F) have been included in the updated version of ES Appendix 11.4 BS4142 Assessment Calculations October 2024, the BS4142 calculations for which demonstrate that the rating level is below the background noise levels both during the day and night. There is discussion in Section 1.4 of RWE 8.17 ES Addendum – Construction Noise, October 2024 relating to construction noise levels at ESR40 (Cobby Castle Forge) but the issue raised with this location related to seeking clarification on operational noise and the noise rating level at this location which does not appear to have been addressed.</p> <p>DBC is satisfied with the explanation now given regarding operational noise at ESR40 (Cobby Castle Forge).</p>		
DBC073	Noise and vibration – operational impacts	DBC agrees with the context explanation that the absolute sound levels are more relevant at night and as such it would be difficult to justify such a request if the impact on the noise sensitive receptor is likely to be negligible.	The Applicant notes the summary provided by DBC and the agreement with the operational noise assessment.	Agreed
DBC074	Traffic and transport – construction deliveries	Chapter 12 of the ES sets out that an average of six deliveries per day (12 movements per day) per Panel Area during construction will be expected. The draft requirements/outline CEMP do not however seek to control delivery times. The Council would request that consideration be given to including deliveries within those activities to be time limited to ensure such activities do not adversely impact on nearby sensitive receptors.	The outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [REP5-017] details that deliveries will be scheduled to avoid morning and evening peak hours. This will be secured via Requirement 6 of the DCO [REP5-002]. Requirement 6 ensures that No phase of the authorised development is to be commenced until a CTMP covering that phase and in accordance with the outline CTMP for that phase has been	Agreed

Row ID	Topic	DBC Position	Applicant Position	Status
		DBC is satisfied that construction delivery times can be controlled by Requirement 6 of the draft DCO that requires a CTMP to be submitted and approved for each phase of the development such that this would address potential concerns regarding such activities adversely impacting nearby sensitive receptors.	submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority in consultation with the highway authority for the highway(s) to which the CTMP for that phase relates.	
DBC075	Traffic and transport – construction working hours	<p>Requirement 15(3) also seeks to allow certain permitted work to take place outside the construction hours which do not cause noise that is audible at the boundary of the Order limits. It would be preferable if reference could be made to such activities not being audible at any of the noise sensitive receptors as some of these receptors are within the Order Limits.</p> <p>DBC is satisfied that there are no sensitive receptors within the Order Limits and agrees to the wording of Requirement 15(3) of the draft DCO.</p>	There are no sensitive receptors located within the Order Limits. The Applicant does not consider this amendment is necessary. Working hours and other noise control measures are secured via the outline CEMP [REP5-012]. A change to construction practices which would have the potential to impact on noise sensitive receptors would be required to ensure it does not give rise to materially new or materially different environmental effects, as per requirement 19 of the DCO [REP5-002].	Agreed
Reference not used				
DBC077	Traffic and transport	The Transport Statement (TS) (APP-159) states that based on recently developed sites, there is an estimate of 36 trips (72 two-way trips) across the development proposals, and these trips have been distributed across each Panel Area proportional to its approximate size to understand how many trips each Panel Area could generate. HGV trips are presented as a 'daily average' and not considered within the respective Morning and Evening Peak hours. As such it is not possible to determine hourly HGV movements and the resultant impact of HGVs on the efficient operation of the Local Road Network (LRN).	Table 3-1 in the Transport Statement [APP-159] provides details on the expected number of deliveries for each Panel Area. This ranges from 2 to 8 HGV trips per day, based on the size of each site. Given the quantity of trips expected, it is reasonable to assume that the Site Manager will be able to manage the arrival and departure of trips to avoid the network peaks, and other local peak periods such as the school run in Bishopton. Paragraph 7.5.1 of the Outline CTMP [REP5-017] confirms that there will be a dedicated Site Manager who will be	Not agreed

Row ID	Topic	DBC Position	Applicant Position	Status
		<p>It is stated that it is expected that three sites will be constructed at any given time during the construction phase of the development proposals, and that each site could require up to 100 employees (300 on site at any one time). In a similar approach to the delivery trips, it is stated that based on similar sites constructed elsewhere, employees are expected to travel to site in groups, with other sites suggesting large cars or minibuses are generally used to transport staff. An average vehicle occupancy of seven staff per vehicle has been assumed, and this is forecast to result in approximately 15 car/LGV trips to each site (30 two-way movements). As previously set out, no evidence from previous sites has been provided to justify this. The figures presented as the 'daily average' are not considered within the Morning and Evening Peak hours. It is stated that staff trips will arrive before the network Morning Peak and depart after the network Evening Peak due to the proposed working hours, although no shift patterns or details are provided. As such, it is not possible to determine hourly movements and the resultant impact of employee trips on the operation of the LRN. Options for travelling to the site via public transport are limited owing to the rural location of each panel area. There is however a rural on demand minibus service (Tees Flex). Presently funding for the Tees Flex on demand bus service within rural Darlington wards is only secure until March 2025, and as such cannot be relied on as a viable means of providing access to the site during the construction phase. It is therefore likely that workers will travel to the site by private car or vehicle. Further evidence is required before acceptance of trip numbers, and occupancy, as the applicant has assumed use of 7-seater cars and car</p>	<p>responsible for the management of the delivery booking system during the construction phase. The Outline CTMP [REP5-017] also highlights (in Section 7.6) the importance of a communications strategy which will be developed and led by a Community Liaison Officer, who will be responsible for speaking to the local community and ensuring any queries or complaints are actioned to minimise the impact of construction traffic on local residents. The trip generation analysis has been based on the assumption that up to three Panel Areas will be constructed at any given time. The programme will be confirmed with the Principal Contractor and detailed in the updated CTMP which will need be agreed with the Highway Authorities prior to commencement of construction. With regards to the impact on the Local Road Network, the Transport Statement [APP-159] provides information on baseline traffic flows on the Local Road Network derived from traffic surveys undertaken in 2023. Paragraph 2.2.5 in the Transport Statement [APP-159] reports that the busiest local road in the study area is Elstob Lane / Bishopton Lane which has approximately 3,000 vehicles, per day, travelling in each direction. The Design Manual for Roads and Bridges TA79/99 Traffic Capacity of Urban Roads was withdrawn in 2020. However, it is still a helpful reference for understanding the scale of link capacities for single carriageway roads based on the type of road and width of carriageway. For a 40 – 60mph road with limited frontages, and carrying predominantly</p>	

Row ID	Topic	DBC Position	Applicant Position	Status
		<p>sharing. This raises further concerns regarding highway safety and the impact of overspill parking where just 15 car parking spaces are to be provided for each panel area. Any resultant overspill parking is likely to be on unlit national speed limit roads with employees then accessing the site on foot both of which raises significant safety concerns. The TS states that an assumption of the assessment is that a maximum of three Panel Areas will be constructed at any given time, although it is not known which three Panel Areas might be constructed at once. The assessment assumes trips for all Panel Areas, with each road capped to the average trips of three Panel Areas, to assess the impact. More certainty of the construction phasing should be provided by the applicant as the application emerges. As such, the average trips of three Panel Areas for construction delivery trips produces a cap of 18 HGVs (36 two-way movements) per day, although it is acknowledged in the TS that if the three largest Panel Areas were constructed at once, each expected to generate eight HGV trips, a maximum of 24 HGV trips (48 two-way movements) could travel to the study area each day. Furthermore, it is stated that across three sites, the employee trips could generate 45 car trips (90 two-way movements); and therefore, the total forecast HGV and staff trips to three Panel Areas would be 63 vehicles (126 two-way movements) on average, during the construction phase. In the very worst case where the three largest Panel Areas are built simultaneously, it is stated that 69 vehicles (138 two-way movements) could be expected within the network. Whilst this is presented, due regard should be made to the comments regarding the approach to trip generation and how this relates to Morning and Evening Peak</p>	<p>through traffic, TA79/99 suggests a flow capacity in each direction of between 1,020 and 1,860 per hour. With the busiest local road in the study area recording 3,000 trips across the day, it is reasonable to conclude that the Local Road Network has capacity to accommodate the forecast number of trips during the construction period. For reference, peak hour data from the surveys has now been extracted and provided in the following figures in the updated Transport Statement (Document Reference 6.4.12.1, Revision 2):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appendix A1.1. – Baseline Traffic Network Diagram - 12 hour, 7 day average Appendix A1.2. – Baseline Traffic Network Diagram – Morning Peak Hour 08:00 – 09:00, 7 day average Appendix A1.3. – Baseline Traffic Network Diagram – Evening Peak Hour 17:00 – 18:00, 7 day average <p>The proposed use of minibuses to transport staff to/from site has been informed by the methods used to construct other solar farm sites in the UK. This approach is detailed in the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) [REP5-017]. An updated CTMP will be produced following appointment of the Principal Contractor (PC) and will need be agreed with the Highway Authorities prior to commencement of construction. Measures to ensure compliance and enforcement are outlined in the CTMP, and adherence to agreed working practices will be the responsibility of the Principal Contractor.</p>	

Row ID	Topic	DBC Position	Applicant Position	Status
		<p>impacts. Further analysis and breakdown of trip distribution to each site access would also be useful in determining local highway impacts, particularly where trips are routed through any sensitive areas with residential properties or limited access.</p> <p>The capacity of road within the Order Limits means that additional HGV trips on the local highway network is unlikely to be a problem. The assumptions regarding car sharing and the use of minibuses or other high occupancy vehicles is weak and DBC requires more robust evidence that there is sufficient parking at each of the construction sites to addresses inherent concerns regarding overspill parking on unlit rural roads. In the absence of such evidence DBC is unable to conclude that the parking proposals as set out in the oCTMP [REP5-016] would be sufficient.</p>		
DBC078	Traffic and transport – operational assessment	<p>The operational phase of solar farm developments is considered to have a de minimis impact on the local highway network as traffic generation associated with the post construction operational phase is limited to occasional vehicle visits for inspection, repair, and maintenance, in respect of traffic generation, both in terms of the number of trips generated and the size of vehicles involved. It is accepted that the decommissioning phase requirements and impacts can be addressed at a later stage closer to the time of decommissioning, due to the potential for changes in the highway environment over the operational lifetime of the development. The submission of a Traffic Management Plan for the appropriate phase(s) of development would be secured by Requirement 5.</p>	The Applicant is in agreement with this statement.	Agreed

Row ID	Topic	DBC Position	Applicant Position	Status
DBC079	Traffic and transport – access safety	<p>Further consideration and evidence should be presented for each access point, including visibility plays, and swept path analysis to demonstrate that the access points are able to safely accommodate the 16.5m HGVs which require access. Precise details of each access point are also needed to demonstrate how safe access and egress will be provided and maintained for the operational life of the development. This must demonstrate a safe level of visibility, given that temporary speed limits and signage will no longer be considered appropriate post construction phase. On-site turning and parking provision should be made for the largest vehicles accessing the site for maintenance. Access gates must also be set back sufficiently to enable vehicles to pull clear of the highway in the interests of highway safety.</p> <p>Having reviewed updated access drawings, DBC Highways has confirmed that they are content in principle with the proposed accesses</p>	<p>Safe access and egress have been considered in the design of the Proposed Development, including swept path analysis of the vehicle manoeuvres. Access will be gained to each Panel Area using established vehicular access points which currently accommodate farm traffic. The details requested in the comments provided by DBC are points of detailed design, which would be confirmed through the discharge of Requirement 3 of the DCO [REP5-002] prior to commencement and would require approval of the relevant planning authority, in consultation with the relevant Local Highway Authority.</p> <p>The Applicant submitted detailed access drawings at Deadline 5 [REP5-016/17] that were produced in consultation with DBC Highways. The Applicant understands that the accesses are now agreed in principle.</p>	Agreed
DBC080	Traffic and transport – section 59 agreement	<p>It is therefore sought that the applicant shall enter into an agreement with the LHA under Section 59 of the Highways Act 1980 prior to the commencement of works on site, where DBC acting as the LHA, wish to safeguard the public highway from damage caused by any construction traffic serving the development. A precommencement condition survey and regular inspection of HGV routes to each site area should be agreed and undertaken. This matter is not addressed as part of the outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (APP-112) and as such could not be secured by Requirement 5. DBC would request that this be included as part of an updated outline CTMP so that any CTMP submitted under Requirement 5</p>	<p>The Applicant notes the request to enter into a Section 59 Agreement. The Applicant does not consider it likely that traffic associated with the construction of the Proposed Development would pose an additional maintenance burden, or that HGV movements are to be considered extraordinary. However, the Applicant is willing to commit to undertaking pre-commencement condition surveys and regular inspections of the HGV routes to site. The outline CTMP [REP5-017] will be updated to include this requirement, alongside a commitment for the Principal Contractor to advise DBC of any deterioration of the HGV routes attributable to</p>	Not agreed

Row ID	Topic	DBC Position	Applicant Position	Status
		<p>can address the issue of any damage caused by HGVs accessing the panel areas.</p> <p>The principle of undertaking pre-commencement surveys as set out in the oCTMP [REP5-016] is acceptable, however in the absence of the applicant entering into a Section 59 agreement with the LHA this would offer no safeguard to the Council that the principal contractor would report and seek to rectify any deterioration to the Council's satisfaction</p>	<p>the actions of the undertaker, and to resolve any damage either through payment of reasonable and proportionate compensation, or through acting as DBC's agent to rectify the highway directly. This is set out in the ES Errata and Management Plans Proposed Updates document [REP5-030]. A separate Section 59 agreement is not required with this commitment made in the outline CTMP [REP5-017].</p>	
DBC081	Traffic and transport – underground cable routes	<p>The LHA's preferred option is therefore that cable routing should not be within the highway where practicable. Significant reconstruction and resurfacing of the highway is also likely to be needed within rural roads owing to unknown construction makeup.</p>	<p>The Applicant is in agreement with DBC that the preferred option is off-road cable routes. The Applicant continues to pursue voluntary agreements with relevant land owners to enable delivery of this preferred option as far as possible. The routes are depicted on ES Figure 2.13 Underground Cable Routes [REP2-022].</p>	Agreed
DBC082	Measures to Prohibit Debris and Detritus on the Highway	<p>Robust measures must be included in the Construction Traffic Management Plan (CMP) to ensure that mud and other debris does not end up on the public highway. The focus must be on prevention rather than reactive cleansing and sweeping. A wheel wash must therefore be provided at each point of egress, with additional assurance that regular inspection and, where appropriate, road cleaning will be undertaken. The measures put forward in the application (outline CTMP) are insufficient as it is simply proposed that "Wheel washing facilities will consist of a water bowser with pressure washer" in lieu of proper wheel washing plant. DBC would request that this be addressed so that appropriate wheel washing measures can be secured as part of the CTMP submitted under Requirement 6.</p>	<p>Details of the wheel washing facilities would be developed prior to construction once a contractor is appointed, and would be located where they would be effective. However, in recognition of the point raised by DBC, the information in the outline CTMP [REP5-017] will be amended to require consideration of the need for further wheel washing plant as part of detailed design. This is set out in the ES Errata and Management Plans Proposed Updates (Document Reference 8.11, Revision 4) and will be reflected in the CTMP submitted at Deadline 8. The details of measures to prohibit debris and detritus on the highway would be confirmed through the discharge of Requirement 6 of the DCO [REP5-002] prior to commencement and would require approval</p>	Agreed

Row ID	Topic	DBC Position	Applicant Position	Status
		DBC would maintain that the measures outlined to date are not sufficient for a project of this scale. The use of a water bowser and pressure washer are more suited to smaller-scale development and the proposal may require the use of specific wheel washing plant, and is dependent upon several factors including site characteristics, weather conditions etc. DBC notes however the commitment of the applicant to explore the need for further provision of wheel washing as part of the detailed design, although would request that this commitment is strengthened in the oCTMP to reflect the concerns of the Council.	of the relevant planning authority, in consultation with the highway authority.	
DBC083	Glint and Glare – number of dwellings assessed	<p>The PEIR version of the Glint and Glare Study dated May 2023 identified 310 dwellings for assessment. DBC would seek clarification as to the reason for the reduction in the number of dwellings but assume that this is due to a reduction in some of the panel areas, some dwellings being excluded due to their location to the north of the site, and/or positioning of the solar panel areas.</p> <p>DBC is satisfied with the clarification provided and the reason for the reduction in the number of dwellings assessed in ES Appendix 2.2 [APP-106].</p> <p>To note, DBC received clarification from ExA at ISH4 and is satisfied that the appropriate guidance to be used is ‘PagerPower Solar Photovoltaic and Building Development – Glint and Glare Guidance Fourth Edition September 2022.’</p>	The version of the glint and glare study dated May 2023 was based on a single axis tracking panel layout. This has a larger study area for ground-based receptors, because it includes receptors to the north of the solar panels. Fixed solar panels do not require assessment of receptors at ground level to the north, and therefore the number of dwelling receptors considered decreased. This change can be seen from Figure 15 in Section 4.1.3 of the May 2023 Report to Figure 11 in 5.1.3 in ES Appendix 2.2 [APP-106].	Agreed
DBC084	Glint and Glare – securing proposed mitigation	In terms of the proposed development, the report states that a moderate impact where a solar reflection is geometrically possible is predicted on ten dwellings (87 – 88, 98, 101, 111 -115) due to the	The Glint and Glare assessment was undertaken to consider potential effects and inform the design and required mitigation. The mitigation requirements identified, included in	Not Agreed

Row ID	Topic	DBC Position	Applicant Position	Status
		<p>duration of effects (greater than 3 months per year), and the lack of sufficient mitigating factors. Assuming that the height of proposed hedgerow/tree planting along reflecting panel boundaries for these dwellings will be managed so that relevant reflecting areas are obscured from view, so that the impact would be reduced to low/none, no further mitigation is recommended. While references to landscaping and boundary treatment/means of enclosure are made within requirements 3, 12, 13 and 16 it is not clear how this would specifically secure the required mitigation for the lifetime of the development, or within the appropriate timescale, such that the LPA could agree with the conclusions of the report in respect of these dwellings.</p> <p>Having considered the information set out in the Environmental Masterplan [REP6b-008] Revision 4 and oLEMP [REP-020] alongside the ES Appendix [APP-106] DBC is now satisfied that these mitigation measures can be secured by Requirements 3 and 12. For those receptors where a moderate impact is predicted such impact will however exist until the embedded mitigation reaches the heights set out on the oLEMP.</p> <p>Although the applicant states that these measures would be secured for the lifetime of the development by Requirement 12, this is not explicitly stated. The oLEMP at paras. 5.1.12 – 5.1.14 sets out that there would be a 5-year aftercare period following completion of development for soft-landscaping works and that habitat enhancement and creation measures would be managed for 40 years.</p> <p>Requirement 12(2)(b) refers to new native hedgerow planting as being habitat creation works (and secured</p>	<p>Table 3 of Appendix 2.2, were then reviewed collaboratively with the landscape design lead. Mitigation proposed for landscape and visual purposes was then embedded into the glint and glare assessment (and the design) and residual effects reported in Table 3 of Appendix 2.2. This demonstrates that no further mitigation beyond that embedded (proposed for landscape and visual purposes) is required to mitigate glint and glare impacts.</p> <p>The mitigation is secured via the LEMP and Environmental Masterplan and will be confirmed with the LPA through the discharge of Requirements 3 (Detailed design) and 12 (LEMP). The detailed design of the Proposed Development must be in accordance with the environmental masterplan and principles of the Environmental Statement (amongst other things). The LPA will have an opportunity to further review mitigation proposals through the discharge of Requirement 3.</p> <p>The Applicant clarifies that the measures in the oLEMP [REP5-020] are secured for the operational lifetime of the Proposed Development as set out in Requirement 12 of the dDCO. Requirement 13 specifically relates to replacing any planting that is removed, dies or becomes diseased within the first 5 years of planting and is a standard provision of DCOs. The height of planting is specified in the oLEMP such as at paragraph 5.5.3 and 5.5.10.</p> <p>R12(2) is a non-exhaustive list of what the LEMP must include. R12(1) states that the LEMP needs to be in accordance with the</p>	

Row ID	Topic	DBC Position	Applicant Position	Status
		<p>for the lifetime of the development/40 years) but only where 'adjacent to proposed security fencing along the line of the existing footpath'. By default any other landscape planting would fall under Requirement 12(2)(e) which Requirement 13 and the oLEMP only require to be maintained for a 5-year period.</p> <p>Whilst DBC recognise the clarification regarding the wording of R12(1)(b), DBC remains concerned as to why this reference is so specific with regard to hedgerow planting. It is suggested by DBC that the Requirement should not be worded in such a specific manner if its intention is to secure all habitat creation referred to in the oLEMP.</p> <p>DBC would therefore request that the oLEMP and the wording of Requirement 12 is strengthened to reflect these concerns to ensure that all the embedded mitigation is maintained and managed for the lifetime of the development.</p>	<p>oLEMP. The oLEMP secures how maintenance of screening features will be undertaken and secured beyond the initial 5 year period, including native woodland planting long term maintenance (5.3.12 of the oLEMP), individual and hedgerow trees (5.4.4), native hedgerow (5.5.9 to 5.5.10). The LEMP is then to be implemented as approved under R12(3).</p> <p>The oLEMP says how maintenance needs to be carried out – for the life of the development – and the LEMP (to be approved) will repeat those obligations. Once approved, those obligations will need to be met under R12. Whilst the Applicant recognises the point raised by DBC on the specific examples provided in R12(b), the Applicant reiterates this is a non-exhaustive list. This approach is standard practice – the drafting of R12 has been taken from existing made DCOs.</p>	
Reference not used				
DBC086	Glint and Glare – change of significance of effect	<p>In the case of dwellings 84 (previously 83), 119 (previously 120), 121 (previously 122) and 201 (previously 200) the PEIR version identified the impact as moderate but for these properties in this assessment the impact is considered low. Clarification is also requested as to why the level of impact has changed to allow Environmental Health to consider this matter further.</p> <p>DBC accepts the explanation regarding the change in significance of effects between the PEIR and application. DBC maintains concerns relating to the wording of Requirement 12 which secures relevant</p>	<p>The glint and glare modelling for the PEIR version of the report was completed for a single-axis tracking panel layout. The solar panel layout was later changed to a fixed, south-facing configuration. The panel layout affects when, and where glare would be possible, and therefore affects the impact classification. The latest report reflects these changes. The latest analysis provided in ES Appendix 2.2 [APP-106] took into account the detail provided in the Environmental Masterplan [AS-016], whereas this was not available to be considered within the PEIR version of the report. Proposed</p>	Agreed

Row ID	Topic	DBC Position	Applicant Position	Status
		mitigation for glint and glare effects, as set out in DBC084.	screening is considered within the analysis, and this affects the impact classification. It is mainly these two factors, either in isolation or as a combination, that explain why the level of impact has changed for these receptors.	
DBC087	Air quality	It was agreed at the EIA Scoping stage that air quality could be scoped out as emissions are likely to be restricted to the construction and decommissioning phases with negligible exhaust emissions from construction road traffic and non-road mobile machinery. The low number of vehicle trips during the operational phase will not exceed the criteria set out in EPUK/IAQM's Land Use Planning and Development Control: Planning for Air Quality. The outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) includes a construction dust assessment using the IAQM's Guidance on the Assessment of Dust from Demolition and Construction. This would be secured by Requirement 4 (CEMP).	This comment is noted and agreed with.	Agreed
DBC088	Battery Fire Safety Management Plan (BSMP)	Requirement 11 (Battery Safety Management) requires a battery fire safety management plan (BSMP) to be submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority (11(1)) which should substantially accord with the outline BSMP. Requirement 11 (and Explanatory Memorandum) further sets out at 11(3) that should any BSMP be submitted which proposes changes to the outline BSMP this must not be approved by the relevant planning authority until it has consulted with the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) and relevant Fire and Rescue Service (being the County Durham and Darlington Fire and Rescue Service (CDDFRS)). Should the views of the HSE and	Requirement 11 of the draft DCO [REP5-002] does not require consultation with the HSE and CDDFRS in relation to the initial plan, as the outline BSMP [APP-117] was produced in consultation with CDDFRS and under Requirement 11, the detailed BSMP must accord with the outline plan. The Health and Safety Executive (HSE) were consulted on the application as a statutory consultee at EIA Scoping stage and as part of statutory pre-application consultation. No comments were made relating to fire risk in the response to EIA Scoping as set out in ES Appendix 4.3 EIA Scoping Response Matrix [APP-122] and no	Agreed

Row ID	Topic	DBC Position	Applicant Position	Status
		<p>CDDFRS not be sought on the outline BSMP at this stage, DBC would request they be identified as appropriate third parties with which they can consult in relation to any documents submitted under this requirement, as set out in the Explanatory Memorandum accompanying the DCO.</p> <p>DBC is satisfied that the outline BSMP was produced in consultation with CDDFRS and that the HSE were part of the statutory consultation.</p>	response was received in relation to statutory consultation.	
DBC089	Delivery of the Darlington Northern Link Road	<p>DBC commented as part of the applicant's pre-application statutory consultation that the location of the proposed development is potentially prejudicial to the delivery of the Darlington Northern Link Road (DNLR). Although the route is not yet of fixed design or alignment, we would ask that it be considered as part of the determination process of the application, and welcome engagement with both the applicant and all key stakeholders such as National Highways and the Tees Valley Combined Authority to ensure that we can protect the land required to deliver this key highway infrastructure".</p> <p>The position of the Tees Valley Combined Authority (TVCA) in the Statement of Common Ground [REP2-026] is noted. As set out in the Council's response to ExQ2 [REP5-037] (TT.2.1) while the Darlington Northern Link Road (DNLR) remains a strategic priority for the area and has been allocated funding, the project is not at such an advanced stage whereas the design or alignment of the road is likely to be known before the end of the examination period. Should any such</p>	<p>A signed Statement of Common Ground has been produced between the Applicant and the Tees Valley Combined Authority at Deadline 2 (Document Reference 8.4.4) with all matters 'agreed', such that all matters are resolved.</p> <p>In summary, The Applicant and TVCA agreed that Byers Gill Solar development proposals are more progressed than that of the Link Road, given that the Link Road does not yet have a formal preferred route. There is no safeguarding direction or equivalent instrument for the purposes of the Link Road. There is no current obligation for Byers Gill Solar to accommodate a potential future Link Road. While there is no certainty of its route, or that it will be consented, in the event that during the Examination, TVCA notifies the Applicant that the recommended option for approval by relevant Authorities impacts on land comprising Byers Gill Solar, the Applicant agrees to enter discussions with TVCA regarding potential impacts on the operation of the solar farm and regarding any reasonable protections and/or</p>	Agreed

Row ID	Topic	DBC Position	Applicant Position	Status
		information come to light during the course of the Examination, DBC would welcome the Applicant's agreement to enter into discussion with the TVCA regarding potential impacts on the operation of the solar farm and/or land to avoid prejudice to the delivery of the DNLR.	land to avoid prejudice to the delivery of the Darlington Northern Link Road.	
DBC090	Contaminated Land	<p>A Preliminary Risk Assessment (Desk Top Study) (APP-105) has been submitted with the application which concludes that the risk to human health is very low to low, taking into account mitigation for construction workers which would be secured as part of the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP). The Desk Top Study recommends that an intrusive site investigation is carried out and any contamination present which poses a risk to groundwater should be remediated. Additionally, due to the presence of potentially backfilled ground workings and historic landfills, further intrusive site investigation and ground gas monitoring is also recommended across the site, to inform appropriate levels of gas protection measures, where necessary. This site investigation work does not however appear to be secured specifically within the draft DCO and associated requirements.</p> <p>This is still under discussion and the DBC will consider and review the updated outline Construction Environmental Management Plan.</p> <p>Given the low to very low risk classification DBC is satisfied that the additional site investigation works can be addressed as set out in commitment LUSE5-CEMP of Table 4-5 of the outline CEMP [REP-012/013]. DBC would however request that the wording be amended to read 'potential for land</p>	The Applicant recognises that the further ground investigations were not specifically secured via Requirement as they were not included in CEMP commitments. This was in error and therefore, further ground investigations were added to the outline CEMP [REP5-012/013] at Deadline 5, under new commitment LUSE5-CEMP of Table 4-5. The Applicant will amend commitment LUSE5-CEMP at Deadline 8 in line with the suggested wording of DBC. This is reflected in ES Errata and Management Plans Proposed Updates (Document Reference 8.11, Revision 4).	Agreed

Row ID	Topic	DBC Position	Applicant Position	Status
		contamination and radon gas exposure' since it is not just radon gas that may require consideration.		
DBC091	Contaminated Land	Requirement 4(2) requires the production of a CEMP for each phase of the development. Point (i) specifically relates to a 'protocol requiring construction with the Environment Agency in the event that unexpected contaminated land is identified during ground investigation or construction'. The Environment Agency is not a statutory consultee on land contamination and as such there is a possibility that they will not provide comment on any information submitted in respect of this requirement, particularly if they have not been consulted on the protocol in the first instance. DBC would welcome clarification on this matter.	This comment is noted and the draft DCO has been amended [REP5-002] to require consultation with DBC instead of the Environment Agency as appropriate and necessary for the contamination found.	Agreed
DBC092	Materials Management Plan	Requirement 8(1) requires the submission of a Materials Management Plan for each phase of the development. DBC agree with this requirement however this would not normally be subject to further approval by the Local Planning Authority. The CL:Aire Definition of Waste Code of Practice requires that the material management plan be signed off/declaration be made by a qualified person (as defined in the Code of Practice) independent to the project which is then submitted to the Environment Agency. Accepting that this matter should be the subject of a requirement DBC requests that the Environment Agency is identified as an appropriate third party with which they can consult in relation to any documents submitted under this requirement, as set out in the Explanatory Memorandum accompanying the DCO.	This comment is noted and the draft DCO has been amended [REP5-002] to require consultation with DBC instead of the Environment Agency as appropriate.	Agreed

Row ID	Topic	DBC Position	Applicant Position	Status
DBC093	Draft DCO	DBC, in conjunction with SBC highways, has raised concern regarding the disapplication of the 1991 Act under Article 10 and has provided comments on Articles 11 to 17 of the dDCO. Following revisions to the draft DCO at Deadline 7a, DBC is content that this matter is resolved through the provision of the requested amendments.	The Applicant has amended the draft DCO as submitted on 8 January 2025 to address all points raised by DBC, including the removal of Article 10(4) such that provisions of the 1991 Act are no longer disapplied.	Agreed
DBC094	Detailed design and potential for panel area reduction	DBC will be the discharging authority for the detailed design under Requirement 3, which requires the design is in accordance with the Design Approach Document (DAD). The DAD allows for potential reduction in panel areas should advancement in technologies allow this to occur. DBC requests that further parameters are provided to define the approach to any potential reduction, taking into account the views of the communities at Bishopton and Great Stainton as reflected in drawings of priority areas provided in their Statements of Common Ground.	The Applicant has discussed this matter with DBC and has agreed further detail of the approach to be taken should a reduction in panel area be possible at detailed design stage. This will be secured via the updated DAD to be provided to Examination at Deadline 9, and which is secured via Requirement 3. The updated DAD will also include the various proposed panel area reduction focus areas as presented by Great Stainton Parish Meeting, Bishopton Villages Action Group (BVAG) and the Applicant.	Agreed


A.1 Record of Engagement

Date	Method of engagement	Purpose / Description
04/08/2022	Meeting (virtual) with DBC planning officer	Introduction to project
18/08/2022	Email to DBC ecology officer	Introductory email
21/09/2022	Meeting (virtual) with DCC, SBC, DBC planning officers	Introductory meeting on approach to consultation
31/10/2022	Briefing to elected members	Project briefing
24/11/2022	Codesign workshops	Officers from DBC attended codesign workshops
16/01/2023	Meeting with DBC planning officer	Discussion of LVIA scope
14/02/2023	Meeting with DBC PROW officer (and related emails)	Discussion on proposals for PROW
02/2023 – 04/2023	Emails and meetings (virtual)	Engagement and consultation on the Statement of Community Consultation (SoCC).
6/04/2023	Project newsletter	Newsletter issued to co-design workshop invitees to provide update on application.
05/2023 – 6/2023	Statutory consultation	DCC notified of statutory consultation
04/08/2023	Email to DBC planning officer	Issued project programme, as part of Early Adopter's Programme (EAP) trial
23/08/2023	Email to DBC planning officer	Draft Policy Compliance Document (PCD) and Design Approach Document (DAD) shared with DBC as part of EAP.
24/08/2023	Email from DBC planning officer	DBC provided comments on the LVIA from their landscape consultant
11/09/2023	Meeting (hybrid) with DBC planning and landscape officers	Meeting to discuss DBC position on LVIA
14/09/2023	Meeting with DBC Deputy Leader	Briefing on project, upcoming engagement activities, and community fund.
09/2023 – 10/2023	Various emails and one meeting (virtual) with DBC PROW officer	Discussions and clarifications around PROW proposals and the mechanisms of the DCO in rerouting footpaths.
11/10/2023	Email to DBC planning officer	Draft of outline control documents for comment, as part of EAP
06/11/2023	Email to DBC planning officer	Issue of updated PADS
27/11/2023	Meeting (virtual) with DBC planning officer	Update meeting followed by written minutes of discussion
12/12/2023	Meeting (virtual) with DBC planning officer	Update meeting followed by written minutes of discussion
22/01/2024	Meeting (virtual) with DBC planning officer	Update meeting followed by written minutes of discussion and updated PADS
24/01/2024	Email from DBC flood risk officer	Confirmed no concerns with the use of concrete pad foundations and content with protective provisions regarding land drainage.
06/02/2024	Email from DBC planning officer	DBC provided updated PADS
29/02/2024	Meeting (virtual) with various DBC councillors	Project update and councillor briefing
26/03/2024	Email to DBC planning officer	Invitation to meet regarding project and discuss outstanding PADS matters
08/04/2024	Email to DBC planning officer	Follow up on invitation to meet regarding project and discuss outstanding PADS matters
16/04/2024	Email to DBC planning officer	Follow up on invitation to meet regarding project and discuss outstanding PADS matters
29/04/2024	Email from DBC planning officer	Written update on PADS matters and request to meet with PROW officer and have wider Examination briefing.

Date	Method of engagement	Purpose / Description
30/04/2024	Email to DBC planning officer	Response to matters raised regarding PROW
14/05/2024	Email to DBC planning officer	Request for update regarding PROW and landscape matters
17/06/2024	Email to DBC planning officer	Request for update regarding PROW and landscape matters
03/07/2024	Email to DBC planning officer	Request feedback on proposed response to the Examination timetable in the Rule 6 Letter
08/07/2024	Email from DBC planning officer	Response from DBC planning officer on suggested amends to the proposed Examination timetable in the Rule 6 Letter
13/08/2024	DBC to ExA	DBC submitted their Local Impact Report and Appendices at Deadline 1
19/08/2024	Meeting (face to face) with DBC planning officer and landscape consultant	The Applicant and DBC met to discuss DBC's Local Impact Report and landscape appendix
20/08/2024	Email to DBC planning officer	The Applicant provided DBC with a summary of notes and actions from the meeting above, and an updated draft SoCG for review and comment
04/09/2024	Email to DBC planning officer	The Applicant provided DBC with an updated SoCG following its submission of comments on Local Impact Report(s), to include the Applicant's position and response on matters raised by DBC
02/10/2024	Meeting with DBC planning officer and Environmental Health Officer	The Applicant and DBC met to discuss outstanding matters relating to environmental health
8/10/2024	Meeting with DBC planning officer and highways officer	The Applicant and DBC met to discuss outstanding highways matters
11/10/2024	Meeting with DBC planning officer and PROW officer	The Applicant and DBC met to discuss outstanding PROW Matters
15/10/2024	Meeting with DBC landscape specialist	The Applicant and DBC met to discuss outstanding landscape matters
29/10/2024	Email to DBC planning officer	The Applicant provided DBC with an updated SoCG following its Deadline 4 submissions and updates following recent meetings with officers
05/12/2024	Meeting with DBC ecologist	The Applicant and DBC met to discuss outstanding ecology matters
05/12/2024	Emails between the Applicant and DBC planning officer	Both parties exchanged updated drafts of the SoCG to agree a version for submission at Deadline 6. Updates with regards to Highways, Noise, Landscape and Glint and Glare will be provided at Deadline 7.
11/12/2024	Meeting with DBC and SBC highways and legal teams	The Applicant, DBC and SBC discussed the provisions of the DCO including Articles 10-17
08/01/2025	Meeting with DBC planning and EHO officers	The Applicant and DBC met to discuss outstanding SoCG Matters
15/01/2025	Meeting with DBC planning officer	Meeting to discuss final SOCG matters and provision for further commitment in the DAD regarding approach to panel reduction post-consent.

A.2 Signing Sheet

Signature	
Name	Dave Coates
Position	Head of Planning Development and Environmental Health
On behalf of	Darlington Borough Council
Date	16/01/2025

Signature	
Name	Michael Baker
Position	Development Project Manager
On behalf of	RWE
Date	15/01/2025