FENWICK SOLAR FARM

Fenwick Solar Farm

EN010152

Applicant's Responses to Submissions Received at Deadline 1

Document Reference: EN010152/APP/8.20

Planning Act 2008
The Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010

May 2025
Revision Number: 00

2009

BOOM-POWER.CO.UK

BOOM POWER

Revision History

Revision Number	Date	Details
00	May 2025	Deadline 2

Prepared for:
Fenwick Solar Project Limited

Prepared by:
AECOM Limited

Table of Contents

1. Introduction 3
1.1 Purpose of this document 3
1.2 Structure of this Document 3
2. Applicant's Responses to Written Representations Received at Deadline 1 7
2.1 Statutory Consultees 7
2.2 Non-Statutory Consultees 23
2.3 Public/Land Interest 46
3. Applicants Responses to Written Summaries of Oral Submissions Made at Hearings at Deadline 1 86
3.1 Applicants Responses to Written Summaries of Oral Submissions Made at Hearings at Deadline 1 86

Tables

Table 2-1: List of Interested Parties that Submitted Responses at Deadline 1 4
Table 1-2: Abbreviations 4
Table 2-1: Applicant's Responses to Written Representations Received at Deadline 1 (Statutory Consultees) 7
Table 2-2: Applicant's Responses to Written Representations Received at Deadline 1 (Non-Statutory Consultees) 23
Table 2-3: Applicant's Responses to Written Representations Received at Deadline 1 (Public/Landowners) 46
Table 3-1 Applicants Responses to Written Summaries of Oral Submissions Made at Hearings at Deadline 1 86

1. Introduction

1.1 Purpose of this document

1.1.1 The purpose of this document is to provide Fenwick Solar Project Limited's (the Applicant) response to submissions made by Interested Parties at Deadline 1 of the Examination for the Fenwick Solar Farm (the Scheme).

1.1.2 The Development Consent Order (DCO) application (the Application) for Fenwick Solar Farm was submitted on 1 November 2024 and accepted for Examination on 29 November 2024. Deadline 1 of Examination was on the 30 April 2025.

1.1.3 A total of 68 submissions were submitted to the Examination at Deadline 1. 46 of these were from the Applicant, with 22 being from Interested Parties. To avoid repetition, the Applicant has focused on comments within those submissions that make points that have not been addressed previously, within the **Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations [REP1-031]**, or where the Applicant considers that further clarification may be useful.

1.2 Structure of this Document

1.2.1 This document provides responses from the Applicant to submissions received at Deadline 1, and is structured as follows:

a. Table 2-1: Applicant's Responses to Written Representations Received at Deadline 1 – Statutory Consultees.

b. Table 2-2: Applicant's Responses to Written Representations Received at Deadline 1 – Non-Statutory Consultees.

c. Table 2-3: Applicant's Responses to Written Representations Received at Deadline 1 – Public/Landowners.

d. Table 3-1: Applicant's Responses to Written Summaries of Oral Submissions Made at Hearings at Deadline 1.

1.2.2 Written Representations received by Interested Parties (set out in Tables 2-1, 2-2 and 2-3) are presented as verbatim text (unless indicated otherwise) and are then responded to by setting out the Applicant's latest position on the matter.

1.2.3 The written summaries of oral submissions made at hearings, set out in Table 3-1, focusses on comments that make points that have not been addressed previously, or where the Applicant considers that further clarification may be useful.

1.2.4 The reference number column in the tables below refers to the reference given to the submissions made by Interested Parties.

1.2.5 The documents submitted with the Application are also referenced in this document, using the reference number [APP/x.y], where the last two/three numbers are the application document number, as set out in the Examination Library. All documents are also presented in numerical order in the **Guide to the Application [REP1-002]**.

Table 1-1: List of Interested Parties that Submitted Responses at Deadline 1

RR/Examination Reference Number	Interested Party
REP1-047	City of Doncaster Council
REP1-049	Coal Authority
REP1-050	Historic England
REP1-051	National Grid Energy Transmission (NGET)
REP1-052	Natural England
REP1-053	Network Rail
REP1-054	Burnet Heritage Trust
REP1-055	Cathy Lindley
REP1-056	Christine Marshall
REP1-057	Broadfield Law UK LLP on behalf of Elba Securities and Able UK Ltd
REP1-058	Exolum
REP1-059	Fenwick Solar Farm Action Group
REP1-060	Jane Beastall
REP1-061	Janet Raynor
REP1-062	Joseph John Lindley
REP1-063	Mark Henstock
REP1-064	Moss and Fenwick Village Hall
REP1-065	Paul Connolly
REP1-066	Sarah Thompson
REP1-067	Thomas Benjamin Moyes
AS-007	David Thompson

1.2.6 For ease of reference, a table of acronyms used in this document is provided in Table 1-2 of this document.

Table 1-2: Abbreviations

Abbreviation	Definition
APA	Asset Protection Agreement
APP	Application
BESS	Battery Energy Storage System
BHT	Burnet Heritage Trust

Abbreviation	Definition
BMV	best and most versatile
BNG	Biodiversity Net Gain
BPM	Best Practice Measures
BRE	Building Research Establishment
BSMP	Battery Safety Management Plan
CBF	Community Benefit Fund
CCGT	Combined Cycle Gas Turbine
CCS	Carbon Capture and Storage
CCTV	Closed-Circuit Television
CDC	City of Doncaster Council
CEMP	Construction Environmental Management Plan
CTMP	Construction Traffic Management Plan
DCO	Development Consent Order
DEMP	Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan
DVRT	Don Valley Rivers Trust
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
ES	Environmental Statement
FLL	Functionally Linked Land
GHG	Greenhouse Gas
HGV	Heavy Goods Vehicle
HRA	Habitat Risk Assessment
LEMP	Landscape and Ecological Management Plan
LVIA	Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment
MP	Member of Parliament
NETS	National Electricity Transmission System
NFCC	National Fire Chiefs Council
NGET	National Grid Energy Transmission
NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
NPS	National Policy Statement
NR	Network Rail
NSER	No Significant Effects Report

Abbreviation	Definition
NSIP	Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project
OEMP	Operational Environmental Management Plan
OMH	Open Mosaic Habitat
ORR	Office of Rail and Road
PROW	Public Rights of Way.
PV	Photovoltaics
RCA	River condition assessment
RSPB	Royal Society for the Protection of Birds
SACO	Supplementary Advice on Conservation Objectives
SBM	Statutory Biodiversity Metric
SEN	Special Educational Needs
SMP	Soil Management Plan
SOCG	Statement of Common Ground
SPA	Special Protection Area
SSCEP	Supply Chain and Employment Plan
SSSI	Site of Special Scientific Interest
SYAS	South Yorkshire Archaeological Service
SYFRS	South Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Service
TBC	To be confirmed

2. Applicant's Responses to Written Representations Received at Deadline 1

2.1 Statutory Consultees

Table 2-1: Applicant's Responses to Written Representations Received at Deadline 1 (Statutory Consultees)

Examination Library Ref.	Name	Comment	Applicant's Response
REP1-052	Natural England	Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development. For any further advice on this consultation please contact the case officer @naturalengland.org.uk and copy to consultations@naturalengland.org.uk.	The Applicant notes this comment.
REP1-052	Natural England	Natural England considers that the Applicant has provided sufficient evidence and is satisfied that the following issues have been addressed; • Internationally designated sites – Potential loss of functionally linked land (FLL) for SPA/Ramsar birds. – Potential noise disturbance during construction to FLL for SPA/Ramsar birds. – Nightjar Foraging Distances – In-combination impacts • Biodiversity Net Gain – Statutory Biodiversity Metric – Assessment Boundary – Watercourse Baseline Data – Trading Rules • Protected Species – Badger exclusion zones	The Applicant welcomes Natural England's agreement that all matters have been addressed. A signed **Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) between Fenwick Solar Project Limited and Natural England [REP1-035]** was submitted for Deadline 1 of Examination which confirms that all matters have been agreed between the Parties.
REP1-052	Natural England	1.1 Natural England's advice in these Written Representations is based on information submitted by Fenwick Solar Project Limited ('the Applicant') in support of its application for a Development Consent Order ('DCO') in relation to Fenwick Solar Farm ('the project') and the agreed Statement of Common Ground signed by Natural England and Fenwick Solar Project Limited on 11 April 2025.	The Applicant's response to Natural England's updated position regarding each matter raised in the detailed advice section of their Written Representation is provided in rows below. The Applicant appreciates the engagement with Natural England undertaken to date and will continue to engage during and after the Examination to discuss the Scheme, if required. A signed **SoCG between Fenwick Solar Project Limited and Natural England [REP1-035]** was submitted for Deadline 1 of Examination which confirms that all matters have been agreed between the Parties.
REP1-052	Natural England	1.2 Part I of these Written Representations provides a summary (above) and overall conclusions of Natural England's advice. This advice identifies whether any progress in resolving issues has been made since submission of our Relevant Representations.	
REP1-052	Natural England	1.3 Our comments are set out against the following sub-headings which represent our key areas of remit: • Internationally and nationally designated sites • Biodiversity net gain • Protected species	

Examination Library Ref.	Name	Comment	Applicant's Response
REP1-052	Natural England	1.4 Our comments are flagged as red, amber, yellow, green or grey: Red are those where there are fundamental concerns which it may not be possible to overcome in their current form. Amber are those where further information is required to determine the impacts of the project and allow the Examining Authority to properly undertake its task and/or where further information is required on mitigation/compensation proposals in order to provide a sufficient degree of confidence as to their efficacy. Yellow are those where Natural England does not agree with the Applicant's position or approach. We would ideally like this to be addressed but are satisfied that for this particular project it is unlikely to make a material difference to our advice or the outcome of the decision-making process. However, we reserve the right to revise our opinion should further evidence be presented. It should be noted by interested parties that whilst these issues/comments are not raised as significant concerns in this instance, it should not be understood or inferred that Natural England would be of the same view in other cases or circumstances. Green are those which have been successfully resolved (subject always to the appropriate requirements being adequately secured). Grey are notes for Examiners and/or competent authority	
REP1-052	Natural England	Internationally designated sites 2.1 Our position regarding impacts on internationally designated sites has changed following discussion with the Applicant through our Discretionary Advice Service and the production of the Statement of Common Ground produced by the Applicant. Further detail on our reasoning for this is given against each impact pathway within Part II.	The Applicant has updated the **No Significant Effects Report (NSER)** (Revision 03) **[EN010152/APP/7.12]** NSER at Deadline 2 to address the remaining matters raised by Natural England on NE1.3 and NE3. The Applicant's response to Natural England's updated position on these matters in the detailed advice of their Written Representation is provided in rows below.
REP1-052	Natural England	2.2 On the basis of the information submitted, Natural England is now satisfied that the previously 'amber' issues identified in the text below have been satisfactorily addressed: • In-combination impacts on international designated sites (construction and operation) ('amber') [NE4]	The Applicant welcomes Natural England's agreement that these matters havebeen addressed. A signed **SoCG between Fenwick Solar Project Limited and Natural England [REP1-035]** was submitted for Deadline 1 of Examination which confirms that this matter has been agreed between the Parties.
REP1-052	Natural England	2.3 Natural England is also satisfied that the 'yellow' issues in relation to the Humber Estuary designated sites have also been addressed. Please find a summary of each 'yellow' issue raised during Relevant Representations below, and refer to Table 1 for further details: • Potential loss of functionally linked land (FLL) for the Humber Estuary SPA/Ramsar (construction and operation) ('yellow') [NE1] • Noise and visual disturbance during construction to FLL for the Humber Estuary SPA/Ramsar (construction) ('yellow') [NE2] • Nightjar foraging distances for the Thorne & Hatfield Moors SPA ('yellow') [NE3]	

Examination Library Ref.	Name	Comment	Applicant's Response
REP1-052	Natural England	Nationally designated sites 2.4 We note that the Humber Estuary Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and Thorne, Crowle and Goole Moors SSSI nationally designated site features that are affected by this proposal are broadly the same as the internationally designated site features and therefore all amber and yellow issues raised at Relevant Representations have now been addressed.	
REP1-052	Natural England	Biodiversity Net Gain 2.5 Natural England's position regarding provision of Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) is summarised below. Further detail on our reasoning for this is given in Part II: • It is recommended that the original excel file(s) for the BNG metric is shared as part of the submitted documents ('grey') (NE5A). • Natural England advises that the biodiversity baseline included within the metric is based upon all land within the development's order limits (red line boundary). This includes all areas required for environmental mitigation ('grey') (NE5B). • As outlined in the Statutory Biodiversity Metric Guide, watercourses (other than ditches and culverts) should be surveyed by conducting a river condition assessment (RCA) and this person should be RCA trained and accredited. It is not clear in the Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment whether this has been followed ('grey') (NE5C). • It is noted that the trading rules are not met for 'Urban – Open Mosaic Habitat of Previously Developed Land' (OMH). Comments on the use of the BNG metric for this development are provided in Table 1 ('grey') [NE5D]. • We recommend that the target increase in BNG is secured across all biodiversity unit types ('grey') [NE5]	The Applicant's response to Natural England's updated position on NE5 in the detailed advice of their Written Representation is provided in rows below.
REP1-052	Natural England	Protected species 2.6 Natural England's position regarding protected species is summarised below. Further detail on our reasoning for this is given in Part II: • Natural England advised at Relevant Representations that exclusion zones for badger are set at 30m for all heavy plant, Horizontal Drilling and excavations. The Applicant has agreed within the Statement of Common Ground to update Table 3-3 of the Framework CEMP for Deadline 1 to include a commitment of a hard 30m exclusion zone around badger setts. ('amber'). [NE6].	The Applicant submitted an updated Table 3-3 of the **Framework Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) [REP1-019]** at Deadline 1 of Examination to include text securing the implementation of at least 30 m buffer zones around badger setts to prevent construction works involving heavy machinery, horizontal directional drilling and heavy plant vehicles. The Applicant welcomes Natural England's agreement that this matter has been addressed. A signed **SoCG between Fenwick Solar Project Limited and Natural England [REP1-035]** was submitted for Deadline 1 of Examination which confirms that this matter has been agreed between the Parties.
REP1-052	Natural England	3.1 Natural England's advice is that there are a small number of matters which have not been resolved satisfactorily as part of the pre-application process that must be addressed by Fenwick Solar Project Ltd and the Examining Authority as part of the Examination and consenting process before development consent can be granted, as summarised in Section 2 above and outlined in further detail in Part II below.	The Applicant has updated the **NSER** (Revision 03) **[EN010152/APP/7.12]** at Deadline 2 to address the remaining matters raised by Natural England on NE1.3 and NE3. The Applicant's response to Natural England's updated position on these matters in the detailed advice of their Written Representation is provided in rows below.

Examination Library Ref.	Name	Comment	Applicant's Response
REP1-052	Natural England	3.2 There are several additional issues where Natural England does not agree with the applicant's approach which ideally should be addressed. However, these issues are unlikely to make a material difference to our advice or the outcome of the decision-making process.	
REP1-052	Natural England	3.3 There are also a number of notes for the Examiner and/or the competent authority included in the response.	The Applicant notes this comment.
REP1-052	Natural England	3.4 The specific issues and comments in relation to each are detailed in Part II.	The Applicant's response to Natural England's updated position regarding each matter raised in the detailed advice of their Written Representation is provided in rows below.
REP1-052	Natural England	NE1.1 International designated sites • Humber Estuary Special Protection Area (SPA) • Humber Estuary Ramsar Potential loss of functionally linked land (FLL) for the relevant qualifying bird features of the listed SPA/Ramsar sites. (C) and (O) Natural England's position at Written Representations: The Applicant has updated the NSER [APP-201] to reduce the reliance on generic Impact Risk Zones and utilised their survey specific data. It was also confirmed that the results reported were the maximum counts recorded across the entirety of fields within the Order Limits and not just parcels of more the 2ha. The Applicant has also confirmed that survey results for bird species are presented as a percentage of the most recent WeBs 5- year average count. The changes did not result in any increase to impacts on bird species. Natural England agrees that the updated information provided by the Applicant addresses these previous concerns. N/A Green	The Applicant welcomes Natural England's agreement that this matter has been addressed. A signed **SoCG between Fenwick Solar Project Limited and Natural England [REP1-035]** was submitted for Deadline 1 of Examination which confirms that this matter has been agreed between the Parties.
REP1-052	Natural England	NE1.2 International designated sites • Humber Estuary Special Protection Area (SPA) • Humber Estuary Ramsar Potential loss of functionally linked land (FLL) for the relevant qualifying bird features of the listed SPA/Ramsar sites. (C) and (O) Natural England's position at Written Representations:	The Applicant welcomes Natural England's agreement that this matter has been addressed. A signed **SoCG between Fenwick Solar Project Limited and Natural England [REP1-035]** was submitted for Deadline 1 of Examination which confirms that this matter has been agreed between the Parties.

Examination Library Ref.	Name	Comment	Applicant's Response
		It was confirmed that the results reported were the maximum counts recorded across the entirety of fields within the Order Limits and not just parcels of more the 2ha. Therefore, the survey count numbers remained below the 1% level. Natural England agrees that the updated information provided by the Applicant addresses this previous concern. N/A Green.	
REP1-052	Natural England	NE1.3 International designated sites • Humber Estuary Special Protection Area (SPA) • Humber Estuary Ramsar Disturbance displacement of functionally linked land (FLL) for the relevant qualifying bird features of the listed SPA/Ramsar sites. (O) Natural England's position at Written Representations: The Applicant has updated the NSER [APP-201] specifically to Paragraph 6.3.17 improving the justification for the conclusion of no significant effect to displacement due to loss of perceived openness. Natural England agrees that the updated information provided by the Applicant addresses this previous concern however it is still recommended that the information from the non-breeding report on lapwings and golden plover are incorporated to further support the conclusion. N/A Green	Paragraph 6.3.7 of the **NSER [REP1-025]** cites the maximum number of lapwing and golden plover recorded during non-breeding bird surveys. This states that *"never more than 38 birds (equivalent to 0.6% of the most recent 5 year peak mean for Lower Derwent Valley SPA according to WeBS data (2018/19-2022/23)), while a flock of 35 golden plover were recorded on a single occasion in January 2024 (equivalent to 1.4% of the most recent 5 year peak mean for Lower Derwent Valley SPA/Ramsar according to WeBS data (2018/19-2022/23))".*
REP1-052	Natural England	NE2 International designated sites • Humber Estuary Special Protection Area (SPA) • Humber Estuary Ramsar Noise and visual disturbance during construction to potential FLL for the relevant qualifying bird features of the listed SPA/Ramsar sites (C). Natural England's position at Written Representations: The Applicant has included a more detailed description of the information regarding the length of the construction phase to Paragraph 6.2.4 of the NSER [APP-201]. Additionally the numbers of relevant SPA birds present within the Order Limits have also been included as part of the justification to conclude there will be no significant effect. Natural England agrees that the updated information provided by the Applicant addresses this previous concern. N/A Green	The Applicant welcomes Natural England's agreement that this matter has been addressed. A signed **SoCG between Fenwick Solar Project Limited and Natural England [REP1-035]** was submitted for Deadline 1 of Examination which confirms that this matter has been agreed between the Parties.

Examination Library Ref.	Name	Comment	Applicant's Response
REP1-052	Natural England	NE3 International designated sites • Thorne & Hatfield Moors Special Protection Area (SPA) Nightjar Foraging Distances (C) (O) Comments on the No Significant Effects Report – Nightjar Foraging Distances Table 7 of the NSER details IRZs for different functional groups of birds including nightjar which states that nightjar may forage up to 4km from their roosts but prefer foraging in habitats that lie closer. The Supplementary Advice on Conservation Objectives (SACO) for Thorne and Hatfield Moors details foraging distance up to 5km for nightjar with the majority of foraging visits up to 3km. Natural England acknowledges that this does not affect the outcome of the assessment in this case, however it is worth noting in the assessment. N/A Grey	The SACO states that "*although many birds* [nightjar] *did utilise habitat fringing the SPA, very few flew more than 3km from the site boundary"*. However, the Applicant notes a reference earlier in the SACO to *"birds flying up to 5km from the site for feeding purposes".* The **NSER** (Revision 03) **[EN010152/APP/7.12]** has been updated at Deadline 2 to include reference to reference the foraging distance for nightjar of up to 5 km from Thorne and Hatfield Moors SPA.
REP1-052	Natural England	NE4 International designated sites All relevant international designated sites. In-combination Assessment. (C) (O) Natural England's position at Written Representations: A more detailed assessment of the potential impacts of each individual cumulative scheme, as well as the potential residual effects resulting from the Scheme in-combination with these cumulative schemes has been provided. The Applicant has now considered smaller effects of the Scheme that may not have been considered significant alone. Natural England requested further information in a meeting on 28 January 2025 to include bird survey results and assessments of cumulative effects which were not considered as significant alone. These amendments were included in an updated NSER for Deadline 1 which was shared with Natural England. Natural England agrees that the updated information provided by the Applicant addresses this previous concern. N/A Green	The Applicant welcomes Natural England's agreement that this matter has been addressed. A signed **SoCG between Fenwick Solar Project Limited and Natural England [REP1-035]** was submitted for Deadline 1 of Examination which confirms that this matter has been agreed between the Parties.
REP1-052	Natural England	NE5 Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Comments on the Biodiversity Net Gain Strategy. Comments on 7.11 Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment Natural England welcome the commitment to delivering BNG on this project. By reviewing the project's BNG assessment at this early stage, it gives us an opportunity to help maximise outcomes and reduce risks. We would like to highlight some areas	The Applicant notes that Natural England welcomes the commitment to deliver BNG on this Scheme, as set out in the **Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Assessment [REP1-023]**. The Applicant is committed to delivering BNG, with this commitment being secured in Requirement 7 in Schedule 2 of the **Draft Development Consent Order (DCO) [REP1-005]** which requires the Applicant to produce a BNG strategy substantially in accordance with the prescriptions set out in the **Framework Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) [REP1-029]**, which in turn, accord with the terms of the **BNG Assessment [REP1-023]**. A detailed LEMP must

Examination Library Ref.	Name	Comment	Applicant's Response
		within the current BNG proposals that could be improved to further enhance the project's overall environmental outcomes. • NE5a: Statutory Biodiversity Metric Natural England is encouraged to see the use of the Statutory Biodiversity Metric, for completeness it is recommended that the original excel file(s) is shared as part of the submitted documents. • NE5B: Assessment Boundary We advise that the biodiversity baseline included within the metric is based upon all land within the development's order limits (red line boundary). This includes all areas required for environmental mitigation. This presents a 'worst case scenario' approach and is consistent with the approach taken for other types of development, including Town and Country Planning Act. The baseline area will likely be refined over time and subsequent iterations of the metric calculations can then be used. We encourage developments to continue to maximise their potential biodiversity outcomes throughout the detailed design process. • NE5C: Watercourse Baseline Data As outlined in the Statutory Biodiversity Metric Guide, watercourses (other than ditches and culverts) should be surveyed by conducting a river condition assessment (RCA) and this person should be RCA trained and accredited. It is not clear in the Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment whether this has been followed. We recommend that developers adhere to the rules and principles set out within the metric guidance. • NE5D: Trading Rules It is noted that the trading rules are not met for 'Urban – Open Mosaic Habitat of Previously Developed Land' (OMH). Trading rules are established to ensure losses are compensated for through creating or enhancing habitats on a 'like-for-like' basis, and of equal or higher value. Although we recommend that the trading rules should be met to align with guidance and industry best practice, Natural England notes the justification provided that the proposed works are temporary, and the habitats will be reinstated. It is encouraging that the Scheme has sought to minimise the area affected and that there is an opportunity for the works to be beneficial to the habitat. Natural England also notes that OMH is a rare habitat and one which can be mis-identified. We are aware that it has not been possible for the developer to gain access to survey the specific area so is classifying the habitat as OMH on a precautionary basis. Natural England recommends that should the DCO be granted, the appropriate surveys are undertaken to determine whether the habitat is in fact OMH as this might alter the results of the adherence to the trading rules. • NE5E: Target increase in BNG across biodiversity unit types We note the LEMP states that *"The Applicant will provide at least 10% BNG as part of the Scheme."* However, we recommend that the target increase in BNG is secured across all biodiversity unit types	be approved by the relevant local authority prior to construction and is itself secured by Requirement 6 in Schedule 2 of the **Draft DCO [REP1-005]**. NE5a: Statutory Biodiversity Metric The Applicant provided Natural England with the original excel file of the Statutory Biodiversity Metric. This was shared with Natural England on 8 April 2025. NE5B: Assessment Boundary The deviation from the Town and County Planning Act methodology has only been applied in relation to the Grid Connection Corridor, with the approach being to focus on the Cable Construction Corridor. The reasoning behind this is that the Order limits in relation to the Grid Connection Corridor is larger than the eventual impact will be, to allow for flexibility in design route optioneering for the Grid Connection Cables. This approach has been accepted within other DCO applications that have been examined by the Planning Inspectorate, such as East Yorkshire Solar Farm and Tillbridge Solar Project. As is discussed in Section 2.2, Paragraph 2.2.1 of the **BNG Assessment [REP1-023]**, *"this approach is designed to focus on areas and habitats that are to be directly impacted by the Scheme and ensure that the proposed mitigation is proportionate to that impact. Therefore, areas that are not to be impacted will be excluded from the assessment (i.e. those areas where trenchless crossing methodology has been used to avoid impacts). This prevents the baseline habitat unit score from being inflated by areas of habitat that are not to be impacted and, therefore, does not disproportionately increase the required mitigation."* The Applicant will continue to explore ways to maximise the potential biodiversity outcomes of the Scheme throughout the detailed design process. NE5C: Watercourse Baseline Data The Applicant can confirm that the surveyors conducting the RCA were appropriately trained and accredited. NE5D: Trading Rules The Applicant notes and welcomes this comment. As noted in Paragraph 3.3.2 and 3.3.3 in the **BNG Assessment [REP1-023]**, whist there is a failure to meet the trading rules due to a loss of 'Urban – Open mosaic habitat, this is not considered significant as there is potential that the temporary disturbance could be beneficial, particularly if supplemented with wider management and enhancement of surrounding habitat present within the wider Order limits. The Applicant notes the comments regarding Open Mosaic Habitats on Previously Developed Land and confirms that prior to any works commencing further surveys will be undertaken to determine the value and condition of these habitats and the impact of the Scheme on these. As stated in Table 3-3 of the **Framework CEMP [REP1-019]**, pre-construction site walkovers will be undertaken in advance of mobilisation/any potential advance works to re-confirm the ecological baseline conditions and to identify any new ecological risks. NE5E: Target increase in BNG across biodiversity unit types

Examination Library Ref.	Name	Comment	Applicant's Response
		We welcome the inclusion of Schedule 2, Requirement 7 to secure the BNG Strategy, substantially in accordance with the Landscape and Ecological management Plan (LEMP). Grey	As set out in the **BNG Assessment [REP1-023]**, the Scheme is predicted to deliver a net gain of 36.46% for area habitat units, 62.75% for hedgerow units, and 24.97% for watercourse units. The **Framework LEMP** (Revision 02) **[EN010152/APP/7.14]** has been updated at Deadline 2 to confirm that the target increase of at least 10% BNG will be across all biodiversity unit types. This is secured through Requirement 6 in Schedule 2 in the **Draft DCO [REP1-005]**.
REP1-052	Natural England	NE6 Protected species Protected species – Badger Natural England's position at Written Representations: The Applicant has confirmed they will update the Construction Environmental Management Plan for Deadline 1. This update includes a hard 30m exclusion zone around badger setts preventing heavy machinery, horizontal drilling and heavy plant vehicle operations. Natural England agrees that this point is resolved, subject to the agreed update to the CEMP being submitted at D1. We note the dDCO secures the Construction Environmental Plan within Schedule 2, Requirement 11, and states that this will be in line with the Framework CEMP submitted to examination. N/A Green	The Applicant submitted an updated Table 3-3 of the **Framework CEMP [REP1-019]** at Deadline 1 of Examination to include text securing the implementation of at least 30 m buffer zones around badger setts to prevent construction works involving heavy machinery, horizontal directional drilling and heavy plant vehicles. The Applicant welcomes Natural England's agreement that this matter has been addressed. A signed **SoCG between Fenwick Solar Project Limited and Natural England [REP1-035]** was submitted for Deadline 1 of Examination which confirms that this matter has been agreed between the Parties.
REP1-050	Historic England	Thank you for your letter of 31st March 2025 consulting Historic England regarding application EN010152, for a Development Consent Order (DCO), which was accepted by the Planning Inspectorate for examination on 4th December 2024.	The Applicant notes this comment.
REP1-050	Historic England	As stated in our letter of 3rd March 2025 we have reviewed the draft DCO, Environmental Statement (ES) and supporting documents submitted to the Planning Inspectorate as part of the above-mentioned application and at this stage have no comments to make with regard to our remit. Specifically we concur with the findings of the ES with regard to the effects on designated heritage assets.	The Applicant notes this comment.
REP1-050	Historic England	We are further pleased that Historic England preapplication advice from March 2023 regarding the setting of the scheduled monument Fenwick Hall moated site has been implemented and enhanced in the submitted DCO documentation in the form of a 20m buffer zone.	The Applicant notes this comment.
REP1-050	Historic England	We do not consider it necessary for Historic England to make any further representations at Examination, however, if there are material changes to the proposals or the Planning Inspectorate or Examining Authority have specific questions regarding issues related to our remit, please contact us.	The Applicant appreciates the engagement with Historic England undertaken to date and will continue to engage during and after the Examination to discuss the Scheme, if required.

Examination Library Ref.	Name	Comment	Applicant's Response
REP1-053	Network Rail	We write further to Network Rail Infrastructure Limited's (Network Rail/NR) Section 56 Representation (submitted on 23 January 2025) which confirmed that Network Rail requires its standard protective provisions to be included in the draft Development Consent Order (Order). As currently drafted, the Draft Order (document reference number APP-014) does not contain the form of protective provisions considered by NR to sufficiently protect its assets and to ensure the safe and efficient operation of the railway (Protective Provisions).	The Applicant and Network Rail have agreed a form of bespoke protective provisions that have been included as Part 4 of Schedule 14 to the **Draft DCO [REP1-005]** at Deadline 1. The Applicant and Network Rail are also finalising a corresponding side agreement, with only one outstanding matter, which is anticipated to be agreed and signed shortly. Following this, the Applicant understands that Network Rail will be in a position to withdraw its objection to the Scheme and therefore the contents of Network Rail's representations will no longer be a matter for ongoing discussion.
REP1-053	Network Rail	The protective provisions that are included in the Draft Order at Schedule 14, Part 4 allow for compulsory acquisition powers to be exercised on land owned by Network Rail without any requirement to obtain NR's prior consent. There is a longstanding principle that any exercise of compulsory acquisition powers pursuant to a DCO in respect of railway property must be subject to NR's prior consent and a restriction to this effect must be included in the Protective Provisions. Network Rail's position is that an absence of such protection in the Protective Provisions will cause a serious detriment to Network Rail's ability to: a) carry out its statutory undertaking; b) comply with its Network Licence; and c) safely operate the railway network.	
REP1-053	Network Rail	Should NR and Fenwick Solar Project Limited (together the Parties) not be able to reach an agreement as to the inclusion of the Protective Provisions as part of the Order (should the Inspectorate be minded to grant the same), NR must maintain its objection to the DCO.	
REP1-053	Network Rail	We set out the reasons for Network Rail's position and a request for the inclusion of the necessary Protective Provisions on the Order in this submission.	
REP1-053	Network Rail	Protective Provisions The Application includes provisions which would, if granted, authorise the Applicant to carry out works on and in close proximity to operational railway land belonging to Network Rail, to use such land temporarily and to acquire permanent rights over such land. Network Rail must accordingly ensure that the Application is granted subject to the Protective Provisions which provide appropriate protection for the safe and efficient operation of the railway. The Application will also impact at least two level crossings (Askern Level Crossing and Moss Level Crossing), and should adequate protection not be put in place, there may be a detrimental impact on the safe operation of these crossings.	
REP1-053	Network Rail	The protective provisions that are afforded to NR at Schedule 14, Part 4 of the current draft Order crucially do not contain a restriction on the Applicant's use of compulsory acquisition powers without NR's prior consent (with such consent not being unreasonably withheld). The Applicant requires the deletion of the parts of NR's	

Examination Library Ref.	Name	Comment	Applicant's Response
		required form of Schedule 14, Part 4, sub paragraph 4 (as set out below), whereas NR requires the inclusion of these provisions: 4) (1) The undertaker must not exercise the powers conferred by— (a) article 3 (development consent granted by this Order); (b) article 5 (power to maintain the authorised development); (c) article 17 (discharge of water); (d) article 19 (authority to survey and investigate the land); (e) article 20 (compulsory acquisition of land); (f) article 22 (compulsory acquisition of rights); (g) article 25 (acquisition of subsoil); (h) article 26 (power to override easements and other rights); (i) article 29 (temporary use of land for constructing the authorised development); (j) article 30 (temporary use of land for maintaining the authorised development); (k) article 31 (statutory undertakers); (l) article 23 (private rights); (m) article 38 (felling or lopping of trees and removal of hedgerows); (n) the powers conferred by section 11(3) (power of entry) of the 1965 Act; (o) the powers conferred by section 203 (power to override easements and rights) of the Housing and Planning Act 2016; (p) the powers conferred by section 172 (right to enter and survey land) of the Housing and Planning Act 2016; (q) any powers under in respect of the temporary possession of land under the Neighbourhood Planning Act 2017; in respect of any railway property unless the exercise of such powers is with the consent of Network Rail. (2) The undertaker must not in the exercise of the powers conferred by this Order prevent pedestrian or vehicular access to any railway property, unless preventing such access is with the consent of Network Rail. (3) The undertaker must not exercise the powers conferred by sections 271 or 272 of the 1990 Act, article 31 (statutory undertakers), article 26 (power to override easements and other rights or private rights of way) or article 23 (private rights), in relation to any right of access of Network Rail to railway property, but such right of access may be diverted with the consent of Network Rail. (4) The undertaker must not under the powers of this Order acquire or use or acquire new rights over, or seek to impose any restrictive covenants over, any railway property, or extinguish any 10-100828808-1\43283-4832 existing rights of Network Rail in respect of any third party property, except with the consent of Network Rail.	

Examination Library Ref.	Name	Comment	Applicant's Response
		(5) The undertaker must not under the powers of this Order do anything which would result in railway property being incapable of being used or maintained or which would affect the safe running of trains on the railway. (6) Where Network Rail is asked to give its consent pursuant to this paragraph, such consent must not be unreasonably withheld but may be given subject to reasonable conditions but it shall never be unreasonable to withhold consent for reasons of operational or railway safety (such matters to be in Network Rail's absolute discretion). (7) The undertaker must enter into an asset protection agreement prior to the carrying out of any specified work.	
REP1-053	Network Rail	Paragraph 4(1) and (4) The Applicant proposes to compulsorily acquire permanent rights over the plots set out at Appendix 1.	
REP1-053	Network Rail	The Applicant also proposes to extinguish existing rights or restrictive covenants for the benefit of Network Rail (in so far as they are inconsistent with the new rights proposed to be acquired by the Applicant) in delivering the DCO scheme over the plots set out at Appendix 2.	
REP1-053	Network Rail	If NR's consent is not required to be obtained prior to such acquisition and temporary use of this land, it would give rise to a significant, unacceptable risk that the Applicant could compulsorily acquire a right over or temporarily use (as applicable to the respective plots) railway land which would not be subject to the approvals, conditions, limitations and restrictions necessarily required by NR (including any conditions deemed to be required by NR's engineers through its business and technical clearance process) to facilitate and ensure the safe and efficient operation of the railway. Such processes and protocols are implemented by Network Rail to regulate third party interference with the railway and any such interference must be subject to the requisite approvals in order for Network Rail to be in compliance with its Network Licence (as described in further detail below). It is inconceivable that the Applicant should have the powers to circumvent such protocols by way of exercising powers of compulsory acquisition.	
REP1-053	Network Rail	NR operates under a Network Licence granted by the Office of Rail and Road (ORR). Under its Network Licence, NR is obliged to ensure compliance with a wide number of standards imposed by the Rail Safety and Standards Board that pertain to maintaining the safe and efficient running of trains on the railway. In order to regulate its ability to comply with such standards, NR must retain stringent restrictions, controls and procedures over any interferences with the railway by third parties, including by reason of persons exercising rights on or over railway land. NR imposes such restrictions through a requirement to obtain its prior consent before rights are compulsorily acquired or railway land is temporarily used and by requiring third parties to enter into an asset protection agreement.	

Examination Library Ref.	Name	Comment	Applicant's Response
REP1-053	Network Rail	Accordingly, where a right is compulsorily acquired and may be exercised over railway land which is not subject to NR's prior consent, such a right is created outside of NR's control and would not be subject to the necessary restrictions and conditions that NR would regard as sufficient so as to enable it to comply with its Network Licence. For example, NR may require that rights granted to the Applicant are subject to reservations allowing NR to interrupt the exercise of such right in certain circumstances (such as enabling NR to deal with emergencies on the railway or carry out necessary works or the exercise of such rights or such temporary possession may not be safe to be exercised at certain times). Where NR's prior consent is not required before exercising these powers over railway land, there is a risk that any such rights or such temporary possession would not be subject to the required restrictions and as a result NR's control over its ability to appropriately manage the safety of the railway would be compromised. The consequences of NR not being able to effectively manage the safety of the railway could be catastrophic, especially in instances where Level Crossings are impacted. Moreover, this could lead to a failure by NR to comply with its Network Licence which is not position which can be accepted by NR, nor would it be acceptable to the ORR as NR's regulator.	
REP1-053	Network Rail	Network Rail is of course willing to engage with the Applicant to agree the terms of the rights sought and is required by its proposed Protective provisions at paragraph 4(6) above to act reasonably in doing so. It cannot however relinquish this degree of control over rights being exercised on the railway where the consequences of doing so could be so significantly adverse. Network Rail is in discussions with the Applicant to agree the grant of the necessary rights through private agreement, but these negotiations are still in the early stages and so the relevant agreements are not yet in place.	
REP1-053	Network Rail	A restriction on the compulsory acquisition of rights over railway land is a widely accepted and longstanding principle which has been accepted by the Examining Authority and Secretary of State on numerous DCOs including but not limited to: the A47/A11 Thickthorn Junction DCO, Thurrock Flexible Generation Plant DCO, Yorkshire and Humber CCS Cross Country Pipeline DCO, Sunnica Energy Farm DCO, Longfield Solar Farm DCO and South Humber Bank Energy Centre DCO. The purpose of this restriction is not to impede the implementation of the Applicant's scheme, but to secure the necessary protection to NR as a statutory undertaker in order that it can properly regulate the rights to be exercised over its railway network and which is appropriate function and purpose of protective provisions.	
REP1-053	Network Rail	Paragraph 4(2) Network Rail is required to maintain strict safety protocols under its Network Licence that is granted by the ORR. As previously mentioned, NR is required to ensure compliance with a number of safety standards. For Network Rail to ensure compliance with such standards, Network Rail employees and contractors must have the ability to access to railway property and this access cannot be impeded without NR's consent as it could result in a breach of NR's Network Licence. Network Rail requires the inclusion of paragraph 4(2) in the Protective Provisions for this reason.	

Examination Library Ref.	Name	Comment	Applicant's Response
REP1-053	Network Rail	Paragraph 4(3)-(6) Network Rail not only has a duty to ensure the safe and efficient running of the railway for employees, third parties, members of the public and all others who come into contact with the railway; it also has an overarching duty to preserve the integrity of the railway. Compulsory acquisition of land is for this reason not appropriate where said acquisition concerns operational railway land and must therefore be subject to Network Rail's prior written consent. Should rights be acquired over railway land without such consent being obtained then the right is created outside the control of Network Rail and may not be subject to the necessary restrictions and conditions that Network Rail would regard as sufficient so as to enable it to comply with the Network Licence and its wider statutory undertaker responsibilities.	
REP1-053	Network Rail	Similarly, where proposed compulsory acquisition is of rights over railway land where Network Rail has the benefit of easements and other rights, such acquisition would not be subject to Network Rails usual process of obtaining both business and technical clearance (a process by which network rail engineers assess the detriment to the railway). If such rights are acquired outside of this process implications are that Network Rail could be in a position where the railway is unsafe (with catastrophic consequences), and Network Rail are compromised in both it's position as statutory undertaker and ability to ensure the sage and efficient running of trains on the railway.	
REP1-053	Network Rail	Network Rail are willing to engage with the Applicant to agree the terms and extent of the rights being sought. In doing so (and discussed above), Network Rail are under a duty to act reasonably in their role as statutory undertaker. However, Network Rail cannot be placed in a position where they are to relinquish the degree of control over the railway being sought by the Applicant as the consequences of doing so are significantly adverse.	
REP1-053	Network Rail	Paragraph 4(7) An Asset Protection Agreement (APA) is required to be entered into in order to support the review of the design of a specified work and to facilitate access on to railway land. An APA is a contracting agreement between Network Rail and an outside party to allow interaction and to establish roles, responsibilities and liabilities of a project over, under or adjacent to the railway. The APA enables NR's Asset Protection Team to regulate managing access, site safety management, engineering services, and possession arrangements as necessary. The Protective Provisions must include a requirement for the Applicant to enter into an APA in order for NR to fulfil its statutory duty to protect the railway in accordance with the terms of its Network Licence. It is therefore submitted that Network Rail would be acting reasonably in requiring that any such required APA be entered in to before any specified work is carried out. For the reasons set out above, NR must maintain its objection to the application for the DCO and must insist on the inclusion of the form of provision 4 set out in this submission and the DCO should not be granted in its current form	

Examination Library Ref.	Name	Comment	Applicant's Response
REP1-053	Network Rail	S.127 of the Planning Act 2008 In addition to the points set out above, without the inclusion of paragraph 4 of Network Rail's standard Protective Provisions, NR must also maintain its objection to the DCO on the basis that the proposed compulsory acquisition of rights over railway property does not satisfy the test in section 127 of the Planning Act 2008 in that: (a) the right cannot be acquired without serious detriment to the carrying on of the undertaking; and (b) such detriment cannot be made good by Network Rail by use of other railway property. The reason for which is that: 1) all of the plots (over which rights are proposed to be compulsorily acquired and temporary possession is proposed to be taken) comprise an operational railway line, or is in respect of railway or equipment or is in respect of a restriction on title against disposition by reason of the same; 2) unless NR has the ability to require its prior consent and/or require the Applicant to enter into an asset protection agreement prior to the acquisition of such rights/temporary possession in order to ensure any such rights can be carried out in harmony with the operational railway (as is provided for in provision 4), the compulsory acquisition of such rights/temporary use would be adverse to the operational railway and would cause a serious detriment to the carrying on of NR's undertaking as it could interfere with the operational railway line and the safe running of trains out with Network Rail's control; and 3) as this is an operational railway line such detriment cannot be made good as the line cannot be relocated to other land in the possession of NR (and not least to say requiring NR to relocate its operational railway to facilitate such rights would be entirely disproportionate both in cost and nature).	
REP1-053	Network Rail	Accordingly, in order for such proposed compulsory acquisition and temporary possession of the plots referred to at Appendix 1 and 2 below to satisfy the test in section 127 Planning Act 2008, paragraph 4 of Network Rail's standard Protective Provisions (and particularly paragraph 4(1) requiring NR's consent to be sought before powers authorising the compulsory acquisition of such rights are exercised) must be included in the draft Order. Network Rail's position is that in the absence of paragraph 4, the test in section 127 is not satisfied.	
REP1-053	Network Rail	Network Rail is investigating the extent of rights and restrictions for the benefit of Network Rail which are proposed to be extinguished in delivering the proposed development. On this basis, Network Rail reserves its position in regards to whether or not the test in section 138 of the Planning Act 2008 is satisfied. Network Rail hopes to confirm its position on these matters within the next 28 days.	

Examination Library Ref.	Name	Comment	Applicant's Response
REP1-053	Network Rail	Appendix 1 Permanent Acquisition	

Plot of Land	Description
5/03	Permanent acquisition of new rights over 5059 square metres of public highway (Moss Road), verge, drain (Copley Spring) and level crossing over railway (East Coast Main Line), Moss, Doncaster, and overhead cables.
9/09	(in respect of sub-soil) - Permanent acquisition of new rights over 21352 square metres of public highway (Thorpe Bank), verge, and bridge structures over drains (Thorpe Marsh Engine Drain, Thorpe Marsh Drain), Barnby Dun, Doncaster, and overhead cables.
10/01	Permanent acquisition of new rights over 3594 square metres of trees, shrubbery, drain and culvert, west of Thorpe Lane, Barnby Dun, Doncaster.
10/02	Permanent acquisition of new rights over 3279 square metres of railway line (CJS Carcroft Junction to Stainforth Junction Line), Barnby Dun, Doncaster.
10/04	Permanent acquisition of new rights over 9080 square metres of disused railway line, hardstanding, grassland, trees and shrubbery, west of Thorpe Lane, Barnby Dun, Doncaster.
11/07	Permanent acquisition of new rights over 6661 square metres of public highway (Station Road), footway and level crossing over railway (in respect of a level crossing).

REP1-053	Network Rail	Appendix 2 Extinguishment of Existing Rights	

Plot of Land	Description
plot 8/14	in respect of a restrictive covenant on title SYK26546;
plot 9/02	in respect of a restrictive covenant on title SYK490734;
plot 9/04	in respect of a restrictive covenant on title SYK490734;
plot 9/07	in respect of a restrictive covenant on title SYK110502;
plot 9/10	in respect of rights;
plot 10/03	in respect of a restrictive covenant on title SYK364907; and
plot 10/09	in respect of a restrictive covenant on title SYK432770
plot 9/10	in respect of rights;
plot 10/03	in respect of a restrictive covenant on title SYK364907; and

REP1-049	Coal Authority	Thank you for your notification of 31 March 2025 seeking the views of the Coal Authority on the above. The Coal Authority is a non-departmental public body sponsored by the Department for Energy Security and Net Zero. As a statutory consultee, the Coal Authority has a duty to respond to planning applications and development plans in order to protect the public and the environment in mining areas.	The Applicant notes this comment.
REP1-049	Coal Authority	We have reviewed the site location plan provided and can confirm that the site falls within the Coal Authority's defined Development Low Risk Area. On this basis we have no specific comments to make. However, in the interest of public safety, it is requested that the Coal Authority's Standing Advice note is drawn to the applicant's attention, where relevant.	The Applicant notes this comment and has considered the Coal Authority's Standing Advice Note.
REP1-051	NGET	We are writing on behalf of National Grid Electricity Transmission Plc ('NGET') in respect of the Fenwick Solar Farm DCO Application. We can confirm that NGET and the Applicant have now agreed protective provisions for NGET's benefit which we understand have been included in the draft DCO for Deadline 1. On the basis that the agreed form of protective provisions (as attached to this email) are secured on the face of the DCO, NGET withdraws its objection to the DCO	The Applicant welcomes National Grid Electricity Transmission's (NGET) withdrawal of their objection regarding the Scheme. The Applicant appreciates the engagement with NGET undertaken to date and will continue to engage during and after the Examination to discuss the Scheme, if required.

Examination Library Ref.	Name	Comment	Applicant's Response
		Application. Please do not hesitate to contact us if you have any queries or need any further information.	

2.2 Non-Statutory Consultees

Table 2-2: Applicant's Responses to Written Representations Received at Deadline 1 (Non-Statutory Consultees)

Examination Library Ref.	Name	Comment	Applicant's Response
REP1-054	Burnet Heritage Trust	1.1 The Burnet Heritage Trust The Burnet Heritage Trust (BHT) is a small wildlife conservation charity engaged in the preservation, conservation, and public access of highly biodiverse damp grasslands in the Humberhead Levels. The Trust currently owns over 25 acres of lowland riparian wetlands along the River Went at Topham, which is immediately adjacent to the proposed Fenwick Solar site. The trust liaises with landowners regarding the sensitive management of another 70 acres. The trust has begun to provide increased public amenities at Topham, including a permissive footpath and a publicly accessible bird-watching hide. Our trustees include a professional ecologist with extensive practical knowledge of the region, a PhD ecologist with an extensive track record of both international research publications and conducting baseline surveys for clean energy infrastructure, and a countryside access officer.	The Applicant notes this comment.
REP1-054	Burnet Heritage Trust	1.2 Failure to incorporate or address any previous concerns The Trust has attempted to engage with BOOM Power from the perspective that, despite the scale of the proposed development and its proximity to the BHT's holdings, it is possible to create a project that has an overall benefit to both biodiversity and the local community. We aimed to remain open-minded that this could be achieved through sufficient ecological mitigation measures. During extensive pre-statutory consultation meetings, BHT presented various concerns and potential mitigation measures to BOOM (see document: EN010152-000293-Fenwick Solar Farm_BHT_Statutory Consultation Response 20.05.24.pdf). It is the position of BHT, that not a single additional suggestion or additional ecological mitigation measure was implemented between pre-statutory consultation and submission to the planning inspectorate. Whilst we did not expect the adoption of all our suggestions, we are disappointed by the approach BOOM has chosen to adopt. In the period since submission to the Planning Inspectorate, we have attempted to allay our concerns through the Statement of Common Ground procedure. However, at each stage of this process, our statements and concerns have simply been redirected to BOOM's PINs submission.	The Applicant has engaged with the Burnet Heritage Trust throughout the preparation, submission and examination of the DCO Application. A record of engagement between the Applicant and the Burnet Heritage Trust is provided in Table 2-1 of the **Draft SoCG between Fenwick Solar Project Limited and the Burnet Heritage Trust [REP1-036]**. The Applicant does not consider the statement that the Burnet Heritage Trust's concerns have been redirected to the DCO Application to be accurate. While the DCO Application may be referenced, where relevant, it has not been used as a blanket response. Instead, the Applicant has consistently engaged with the Burnet Heritage Trust, offering specific clarifications and justifications in regard to the Scheme. The Applicant's design team has worked collaboratively to provide an integrated and responsive design which has been informed by the process of Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), statutory consultation and wide-ranging stakeholder engagement. All comments received from stakeholders regarding the design of the Scheme have been considered by the Applicant and, where practicable, incorporated. The Applicant has undertaken a detailed assessment of the potential impacts of the Scheme on ecology and this has informed the requirement for any specific mitigation measures required to avoid or reduce potentially significant effects on important ecological features identified as part of the baseline characterisation of the Order limits. The detailed assessment and specific mitigation measures are set out in **ES Volume I, Chapter 8: Ecology [APP-060]**. The Applicant has clearly set out the process followed in undertaking this assessment and provided detailed rationale as to what and where specific mitigation measures are provided. As such, the Applicant considers that any mitigation measures incorporated into the Scheme design are proportionate to the magnitude of impact identified.
REP1-054	Burnet Heritage Trust	2.1 SSSI-equivalent status of adjoining land not acknowledged Whilst the area around Topham has not yet formally been awarded SSSI status, the BHT has submitted documentation to Natural England demonstrating that the site	The Applicant notes that the Burnet Heritage Trust has put forward their land, as well as an additional surrounding area including the Order limits which is not currently managed by the Burnet Heritage Trust (shown in the Burnet Heritage Trust's Written

Examination Library Ref.	Name	Comment	Applicant's Response
		qualifies as SSSI based on the criteria for "*Lowland Damp Grassland*" and "*Lowland Open Waters and their margins*" (see accompanying Document; BHT SSSI application). That these areas meet SSSI-level thresholds was previously demonstrated to BOOM at the pre-statutory consultation stage. The trust requests that an appropriate assessment be presented to the Inspectorate, assessing impact on the basis that the BHT submitted application should be effectively considered SSSI and treated as such in all assessments.	Representation **[REP1-054]**) as a proposed SSSI. However, regardless of consultation with the Burnet Heritage Trust and Natural England and due to the lack of information available regarding the application for a SSSI in the public domain, it was not possible to locate further details on the submission, including the boundary of the area to be designated and the habitats and species assemblages to form the citation, prior to the Application. The Applicant also notes that a 'candidate' SSSI is not an official designation. As such, a specific assessment of this potential designated site was not able to be undertaken. However, the assessment presented in **ES Volume I, Chapter 8: Ecology [APP-060]** does consider the impacts on all relevant habitats and species which are likely to comprise the proposed SSSI and so while no assessment of the proposed SSSI itself is presented, the impacts to the relevant component features, are assessed (where located within a potential zone of influence of the Scheme). The Applicant subsequently received correspondence from Natural England regarding the proposed SSSI designation on 22 May 2025. This confirmed that the SSSI application was submitted in late April 2025 and that Natural England would not be taking forward any investigation into the designation of the area at this point. Therefore, the Applicant is confident that the assessment presented in **ES Volume I, Chapter 8: Ecology [APP-060]** is appropriate and that the conclusions reached remain valid. All of the bird species listed on 'Lowland Damp Grassland' and 'Lowland Open Water and their margins', are predominantly associated with the wetland areas outside of the Order limits, i.e., Topham Ferry Bridge/Topham Ferry Flashes. Where these areas (or the specific bird species) are within the zone of influence from an impact pathway associated with the Scheme, e.g., disturbance during construction, then they have been considered and where necessary, assessed as such, within **ES Volume I, Chapter 8: Ecology [APP-060**]. The Applicant has set out in detail, in their response to the BHT Relevant Representation **[REP1-031]**, specific species information. Whilst no specific assessment of a potential SSSI has been undertaken all the component elements of the breeding bird assemblages for which the SSSI is being proposed, have been assessed, where a potential impact pathway exists, within **ES Volume I, Chapter 8: Ecology [APP-060**]. As such, the Applicant maintains, that even in the event of SSSI designation, the relevant assessments have been undertaken to determine potential impacts on the breeding bird assemblages which would constitute the qualifying features of a potential SSSI.
REP1-054	Burnet Heritage Trust	2.2 Functionally linked land and bird populations The BHT supports the position of Natural England that despite "the claim in section 5.3.7 [of the 7.12 No Significant Effects Report [APP-201]], it should be noted that the total area of smaller sites that support SPA birds could in combination support in excess of the 1% 'rule of thumb'. Whilst NE state that "this is not anticipated to fundamentally affect the outcomes of the assessment", it is the position of BHT that one or more species exceeds >1% (most notably Eurasian Marsh Harrier and Eurasian Teal) of the totals of the Humber Estuary SPA/RAMSAR and that totals of the former may approach nationally significant levels given appropriate survey methodologies (see following sections for more detail).	The Applicant clarified with Natural England that number of birds reported in the **NSER [REP1-025]** are the maximum recorded across all fields within the Order limits, not just parcels of more than 2 ha. This matter has been agreed with Natural England as recorded in the **SoCG between Fenwick Solar Project Limited and Natural England [REP1-035]**. Specific comments on Eurasian Marsh Harrier and Eurasian Teal are provided in the rows below.

Examination Library Ref.	Name	Comment	Applicant's Response
REP1-054	Burnet Heritage Trust	2.3 Specific species information 2.3.1 Eurasian Marsh Harrier At the last assessment (2015) the Humber Estuary SPA/Ramsar population of Marsh Harrier Circus aeruginosus was around 27 pairs. Despite a ~36% population increase 2008-2018, at most the Estuary does not exceed 50 pairs. In this context, the observation of up to 4 individuals on the proposed Fenwick site constitutes ~4% of the Humber Estuary RAMSAR population. It is important to note that, given their wide-ranging feeding habits, it is unusual to note significant counts of non-breeding Marsh Harrier together away from evening roost sites, even where they occur at high densities. Therefore, without systematic assessments of nearby roost sites, observations of four individuals on a single visit likely represent a significant under-counting of the number of individuals utilising the area. As such it is not unreasonable to suspect that as many as a dozen birds (i.e >1% of the national population) utilise the DCO area. No additional appropriate assessment targeting this species is mentioned in the applicant's report. Natural England has also flagged this in the context of site size and BHT regards the following quote from (EN010152-000277-EN010152 Fenwick Solar Farm - Natural England Relevant Representations 23.01.25 Final [RR-006]) highly relevant in this context: *"For information, Natural England has generally advised that if ≥1% of a Humber Estuary bird species population could be affected by a proposal, alone or in combination with other plans or projects, then further consideration is required. However, where species are particularly vulnerable due to declines in the Humber population, then it may not be appropriate to rely on the 1% of the estuary population as the critical threshold. Mitigation measures may be required where lower numbers of vulnerable species are using a site that is proposed for development."*	Marsh Harrier is a qualifying feature of the Humber Estuary SPA due to the Order limits supporting important breeding populations of this Annex 1 species. The Order limits are approximately 14.2 km southwest of the SPA. Whilst it is accepted that Marsh Harrier may forage outside the physical boundaries of the designated site, when considering what constitutes functionally-linked land it is necessary to determine whether particular habitats or areas of land are of crucial importance to the maintenance of the qualifying population (i.e. a breeding population of Marsh Harrier). Although Marsh Harrier was recorded during breeding bird surveys (see **Volume III, Appendix 8-7: Breeding Bird Report [APP-152 and APP-153]**), at a distance of 14.2km the Order limits are beyond the core foraging range for breeding pairs of Marsh Harrier occurring within the Humber Estuary SPA. In addition, the majority of the Order limits and, as such the foraging habitat available to Marsh Harrier, consists of arable farmland which is a habitat prevalent in areas surrounding the Humber Estuary SPA. Therefore, the Order limits do not support habitats which are crucial to the maintenance of the breeding Marsh Harrier population associated with the Humber Estuary SPA. Due to the absence of a potential impact pathway, i.e., presence of functionally linked land, breeding Marsh Harrier are not screened into the Habitat Risk Assessment (HRA) and not considered in the **NSER [REP1-025]**. Irrespective of the assessment presented in the **NSER [REP1-025]**, which focuses on compliance with Habitats Regulations, the creation of grassland areas throughout the Order limits and enhancement to riparian corridors is expected to benefit foraging Marsh Harrier. As presented in the **SoCG between Fenwick Solar Project Limited and Natural England [REP1-035]**, Natural England are in agreement that all their concerns regarding the Scheme's impact on qualifying functionally linked land for qualifying bird features of the Humber Estuary SPA/Ramsar have been appropriately addressed.
REP1-054	Burnet Heritage Trust	2.3.2 Eurasian Curlew The BHT has repeatedly raised concerns that 2 pairs regularly breed around the Northeastern section of the Fenwick Solar site DCO. This area previously consisted of semiimproved permanent pasture until autumn 2022 when the site was illegally sprayed and ploughed. This action by the farmer was apparently an unfortunate coincidence with the lease approach for the site by BOOM, but should, in the view of the trust, be considered a disruption of the true ecological baseline state of the site, before the influence of the proposed NSIP. BHT is happy to provide evidence demonstrating the previous habitat context, the timing of conversion, and that complaints were made by both BHT and Don Valley Rivers Trust (DVRT) to Natural England at the time. Despite the sudden change in habitat, Eurasian Curlews have continued to hold territory on the site. This, for some reason, has not been registered during breeding bird surveys, besides a single record in April 2023 (**Volume III, Appendix 8-7 Breeding Bird Report [APP-152]**). Two additional Curlew recorded in March 2024 are considered as non-breeding birds, despite the species arriving on the territory in early March and laying eggs by mid-April (6.3 Environmental Statement - Volume III Appendix 8-8: Non-Breeding Bird Report. [APP-153]).	As set out in the response to the Burnet Heritage Trust in the **Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations Relevant Representation [REP1-031]**, the Applicant acknowledges that the Order limits are likely to be part of a Curlew breeding territory; however, factors such as land management are likely hampering breeding success. As stated in **Volume III, Appendix 8-7 Breeding Bird Report [APP-152 and APP-153]**, a single Curlew was recorded within the Order limits in April 2023 and no further observations were made during surveys between May and July 2023. This suggests either that individual had established a breeding territory early on in the breeding season and failed to attract a mate, or was possibly breeding within the wider landscape. No indication of a breeding attempt was noted on subsequent visits. Irrespective of this, the provision of extensive areas of undeveloped land consisting of neutral grassland specifically managed for ground-nesting birds, management of riparian grasslands, and creation of scrapes along the River Went corridor will provide a consistent nesting resource preserving Curlew nesting habitat within the Order limits for the design life of the Scheme. This is currently absent from the area as evidenced by the change in land use from grassland to arable. **ES Volume I, Chapter 8: Ecology [APP-060]** provides a detailed assessment of the ecological baseline of the Order limits, as at the point of survey. However, the

Examination Library Ref.	Name	Comment	Applicant's Response
		Given that this is a large-bodied, obvious species which ecologists from BHT continue to hear and see regularly within the DCO area (despite observing from outside), we are struggling to explain how this species could not have been regularly observed. As of March–April 2025 Eurasian Curlew display call has continued to be heard emanating from within the site DCO on every single visit to adjacent areas. Despite stating repeatedly in non-statutory consultation with BHT that 2022 would be assumed as the environmental baseline for the scheme, BOOM most recently stated during SOGC consultation that *"[Eurasian Curlew habitat] is currently absent from the site as evidenced by the change in land use from grassland to arable."* Given that Eurasian Curlew populations vacate the Fenwick area August-February, it is likely that this breeding population is functionally linked to that of the Humber Estuary SPA and RAMSAR site, as is demonstrated by ringing recoveries of breeding birds in nearby East Yorkshire.	assessments do draw upon existing datasets of recent ecological data to provide context to the findings of specific surveys undertaken for the Application. The Applicant currently has no control or influence over how landowners choose to manage their land in any given year. However, should Development Consent be granted, the management of the Order limits will strictly follow the prescriptions set out in the **Framework LEMP [REP1-029]** which include measures maintaining areas of relevant habitat, including wet grassland and wetlands scrapes. Curlew is a qualifying feature of the Humber Estuary SPA due to the Order limits supporting important wintering populations of this Annex 1 species. The Order limits are approximately 14.2 km southwest of the SPA. Whilst it is accepted that Curlew may forage outside the physical boundaries of the designated site, when considering what constitutes functionally-linked land it is necessary to determine whether particular habitats or areas of land are of crucial importance to the maintenance of the qualifying population (i.e. a wintering population of Curlew). At a distance of 14.2 km, the Order limits are beyond the core foraging range for wintering Curlew occurring within the Humber Estuary SPA. In addition, the majority of the Order limits and, as such the habitat available to Curlew, consists of arable farmland which is a habitat prevalent in areas surrounding the Humber Estuary SPA. As such, the Order limits do not support habitats which are crucial to the maintenance of the wintering Curlew population associated with the Humber Estuary SPA. Due to the absence of a potential impact pathway, wintering Curlew are not screened into the HRA and not considered in the **NSER [REP1-025]**. As presented in the **SoCG between Fenwick Solar Project Limited and Natural England [REP1-035]**, Natural England are in agreement that all their concerns regarding the Scheme's impact on qualifying functionally linked land for qualifying bird features of the Humber Estuary SPA/Ramsar have been appropriately addressed.
REP1-054	Burnet Heritage Trust	2.3.3 Pink-footed Goose Whilst the applicant notes a few records of Pink-footed Goose, both within the DCO and survey area, the BHT believes, based on more extensive recording, that much larger numbers have used the DCO area in certain years, depending on crop rotations and available pasture. Even within the short recording statutory recording period, the species was recorded in a reasonable number utilising the area. For example, in October 2023 "*a flock of 28 individuals in a pasture field in the northeast of the Order limits and a flock of 39 individuals in an arable field in the south of the Order limits*". (6.3 Environmental Statement - Volume III Appendix 8-8: Non-Breeding Bird Report. [APP-153]). Despite no reported survey work after Sept 2024, up to 770 birds were present for two weeks in the survey area (just outside the DCO area) between 2nd and 15th October 2024, ranging from Topham to Southfield Reservoir (data available from www.doncasterbirding.co.uk). Given the number seen regularly flying over and dropping down within the DCO, it is likely that these birds were regularly feeding within the DCO area. At least 300 were observed dropping onto the DCO area from Topham on 14th October 2024 (www.ebird.org Checklist S19891715), with a total of 3500+ flying over (either continuing or potentially landing). A significant proportion of these birds roost around	The **NSER [REP1-025]** considers in detail the impacts to wintering Pink-footed Goose populations associated with the Humber Estuary SPA, based on surveys undertaken by the Applicant. The Applicant considers the observations presented by the Burnet Heritage Trust to support the conclusions presented in the **NSER [REP1-025]** and findings of the Applicant's surveys. This being that Pink-footed Goose occur widely across the agricultural landscape surrounding the Humber Estuary, utilising suitable habitat as it becomes available in any given year, including on occasion the fields within the Order limits and immediate surrounds. However, as noted by the Burnet Heritage Trust, there are significant seasonal movements and occurrence of birds across the wider area beyond the Order limits. As such, the conclusion that the fields within the Order limits are not of crucial importance to maintaining the population of wintering Pink-footed Goose associated with the Humber Estuary SPA (i.e. they are not supporting regular usage by important numbers of individuals and that the Order limits are not functionally linked remains true).

Examination Library Ref.	Name	Comment	Applicant's Response
		the Humberhead Levels NNR and the Humber Estuary SPA & RAMSAR, suggesting an important contribution to the functionally linked populations. Maximum roosting totals include 6,000 on Thorne Moors NNR (www.ebird.org Checklist S121158258), 12,000 on Hatfield Moors NNR (www.ebird.org Checklist S121442283), and 24,000 on Read's Island RSPB within the Humber Estuary SPA & RAMSAR site (www.ebird.org Checklist S198652369). Considering these sightings, it is the view of the BHT that the DCO area constitutes a periodically important foraging area for the Pink-footed Goose population of the region, with potentially as much as 0.6% of the UK population (7% of the Humber Estuary SPA/Humberhead Levels NNR population) using the area as an important stopover.	
REP1-054	Burnet Heritage Trust	2.3.4 European Golden Plover During a single winter of coverage 2023-24, a flock of 35 birds was recorded on the ground within the DCO limits. This is more than at the East Yorkshire Solar Farm, where a single flock of 30 birds was recorded. However, the species is "*nomadic […] during winter in response to annual variations in crop rotations and weather conditions*." Similar areas of arable farmland, such as around Southfield Reservoir, where access is available and observer coverage is regular recorded totals of up to 4000 birds and annual winter totals of at 100+ each year, suggesting regular coverage would reveal more substantial numbers around the DCO (www.ebird.org Checklist S79356651).	As with Pink-footed Goose, the Applicant considers the observations presented by the Burnet Heritage Trust to support the conclusions presented in the **NSER [REP1-025]** and findings of the Applicant's surveys. This being that Golden Plover occur widely across the agricultural landscape surrounding the Humber Estuary, utilising suitable habitat as it becomes available in any given year, including on occasion the fields within the Order limits and immediate surrounds but, as noted by the Burnet Heritage Trust, other areas seem to regularly record larger numbers of the species and so are presumably preferable to fields within the Order limits (as supported by the Applicant's surveys). As such, the conclusion that the fields within the Order limits are not of crucial importance to maintaining the population of wintering Golden Plover associated with the Lower Derwent Valley SPA and Humber Estuary SPA (i.e. they are not supporting regular usage by important numbers of individuals and that the Order limits are not functionally linked remains true).
REP1-054	Burnet Heritage Trust	2.3.5 Eurasian Teal Winter totals identified during the non-breeding bird survey (6.3 Environmental Statement - Volume III Appendix 8-8: Non-Breeding Bird Report. [APP-153]) include a peak of 310 individuals, whilst counts on the adjacent land at Topham have exceeded 190 birds on several occasions. Totals at Norton Common (<2km West of the DCO limits) have also exceeded 300. A total of 310 would represent over 5% of the Humber Estuary SPA population, to which these birds are very likely functionally linked.	The Applicant notes the information presented by the Burnet Heritage Trust, however, the Order limits are approximately 14.2 km southwest of the Humber Estuary SPA and, at this distance, are well beyond the core foraging range distances for wintering Teal associated with the Humber Estuary SPA. Irrespective of this, impacts to non-SPA populations of water birds using the River Went corridor are assessed in **ES Volume I, Chapter 8: Ecology [APP-060]**. Norton Common is also beyond the Zone of Influence of the Scheme (e.g. potential for disturbance arising from construction are not expected).
REP1-054	Burnet Heritage Trust	2.3 Significant and frequent errors in ecological assessment The number of systematic and consistent errors in the breeding bird assessment is a serious cause for concern. These range from complete misunderstandings of species habitat requirements to utterly inexplicable omissions and undercounts of species. The following is a list of examples identified by the BHT in a short appraisal and should in no way be considered an exhaustive list of errors. Several ecological misunderstandings are also stated, for example Cuckoo – "*the habitat within the Order limits is not suitable to support these species*".	The Applicant accepts that suitable breeding habitat for Cuckoo is present within the Order limits (i.e. host bird species, such as Meadow Pipit and Dunnock are present) and an assessment of potential impacts on the general breeding bird assemblage, which includes species such as Meadow Pipit and Dunnock, is presented in **ES Volume I, Chapter 8: Ecology [APP-060]**. This assessment concludes that there will be no significant adverse effects, with moderate beneficial effects predicted for many species due to habitat creation and enhancement of existing habitat. As such, no significant effect on breeding Cuckoo will occur, with beneficial effects on host species such as Meadow Pipit and Dunnock predicted.

Examination Library Ref.	Name	Comment	Applicant's Response
REP1-054	Burnet Heritage Trust	Volume III, Appendix 8-7 Breeding Bird Report [APP-152]) The species hosted include Meadow Pipit and Dunnock, both of which are common breeding species within the order limits, and the listed habitats include 'Meadows' (including improved grassland – Payne et al., 2020). Ecologists from BHT have seen Cuckoo foraging within 20m of the edge of the order limits, and birds wander significantly when foraging: "*Female may forage 2–3 km from laying sites; male feeds at up to 4 km from singing site*" (Payne et al., 2020). We are similarly perplexed by the Breeding Bird Report Annex C Data Search Records from within 2 km. Not a single species (even ubiquitous birds such as Blue Tit) was found within 2km of the data search more recently than 2018. This suggests either a fundamental error or potentially the omission of material shared by BHT with BOOM. A detailed, database of over 10,000 records of 150 species (2 hidden due to species sensitivity) recorded with 300m of the DCO limits has been signposted to BOOM multiple times at the non-statutory consultation stage (summary data freely accessible here: www.ebird.org Hotspot L1582647); full data easily available on request), none of these records appear to be reflected in the material submitted to the Planning Inspectorate. A further 15,000+ ornithological records are also publicly available via the same platform for the site at Norton Common (www.ebird.org Hotspot L9892249). In the view of BHT, several field assessments of commoner species, such as those for the number of Meadow Pipit territories in the study area (12), are simply implausibly low, even for areas of intensive agriculture. The undercounting of breeding birds appears systematic and is a cause for concern.	With regards to data presented in Annex C of the **ES Volume III, Appendix 8-7 Breeding Bird Report [APP-152, APP-153]**, Paragraph 3.2.1 states that *"Records of protected and notable bird species within a 2 km radius of the Order limits were obtained…"*. As such, records of common and widespread species with no elevated conservation status, such as Blue Tit, were not sought. This is a proportionate approach given that, if present, these are likely to have been recorded by project specific surveys and that populations of these species are likely to be sufficiently large to be resilient to any potential impacts that may arise from the Scheme.
REP1-054	Burnet Heritage Trust	2.4 Approach inconsistent with mitigation for other similar Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects The totals of Pink-footed Goose observed foraging within the proposed Fenwick solar site DCO are markedly higher than those noted at the East Yorkshire Solar Farm, where over 203 acres (82 ha) were explicitly designated as 'Goose Mitigation Zone' (Non-breeding bird survey: EN010143-000304-6.2 Appendix 8-6 Survey Report for Non-Breeding Birds.pdf [APP-089], Site plan with indicative goose mitigation zone: EN010143-000352- 6.3 Fig 2-3 Indicative Site Layout.pdf [APP-138]). At the 3000-acre East Yorkshire Solar Farm, an additional 130 acres (53 ha) have been provided as 'Golden Plover mitigation'. This non-breeding bird survey also revealed fewer birds having been recorded within the limits of the DCO (30 individuals; EN010143- 000304-6.2 Appendix 8-6 Survey Report for Non-Breeding Birds.pdf [APP-089]) than at the Fenwick site (35 individuals; 6.3 Environmental Statement - Volume III Appendix 8-8: Non-Breeding Bird Report. [APP-153]). The similarly sized Cleave Hill solar farm created 139 acres (56 ha) of ecological mitigation for overwintering Geese, Golden Plover, and Marsh Harrier (Cleve Hill Solar Farm 6.4.5.2 Environmental Statement - Landscape Biodiversity Management Plan [APP-203]. It is the position of the BHT that the Fenwick solar farm lies adjacent to similarly important bird communities and populations, as demonstrated by the species breakdown presented here. Given the levels of mitigation offered for similar schemes elsewhere, and the high abundance of nationally and regionally threatened species (Eurasian Curlew, Marsh	The Applicant would firstly make clear that any requirements for mitigation, and what that consists of, are highly project and site related, i.e. there are specific reasons why specific mitigation was required and this is therefore not directly comparable between schemes. However, a few points are made below on the mitigation solutions provided by other projects. East Yorkshire Solar Farm – the mitigation provided by East Yorkshire Solar Farm was to specifically to avoid adverse effects on the wintering Pink-footed Goose population associated with the Humber Estuary SPA and wintering Golden Plover population associated with the Lower Derwent Valley SPA. The Lower Derwent Valley SPA is 1.3km from that project and the Humber Estuary SPA is 3.4km. This placed that project within the core foraging ranges for some of the qualifying species. Surveys recorded the equivalent of 2% of the Humber Estuary SPA wintering Pink-footed Goose population and the equivalent of 14.7% of the Lower Derwent Valley SPA wintering Golden Plover population occurring within the Order limits and as such, Natural England considered the Order limits to be functionally linked to the aforementioned designated sites. That project, therefore, provided specific mitigation to compensate for the loss of functionally linked land. It should be noted that the actual mitigation provisions were a minimum of 15ha for Pink-footed Goose and 28.75ha for Golden Plover. However, these were to be rotated around a larger area, to allow landowners to continue arable farming.

Examination Library Ref.	Name	Comment	Applicant's Response
		Harrier, Pink-footed Goose, Golden Plover), it is the position of BHT that the current ecological mitigation provisions are far below the expected level for such a large scheme. Additionally, the scheme is close to important wetlands and land supporting SSSI-level bird communities, which is functionally linked to populations of threatened birds within nearby SPA and RAMSAR sites.	Cleve Hill Solar Park – that project is located immediately adjacent to the Swale Estuary SPA/Ramsar and was found to be regularly used by waterbirds moving between the intertidal areas of the estuary and the arable fields within the Order limits. In particular, Dark-bellied Brent Goose, Golden Plover and Lapwing were regularly recorded roosting and foraging. Given the proximity of that project to the designated sites and regular occurrence of significant numbers of birds associated with those designated sites, specific habitat was required to mitigate for the loss of this functionally linked land. Fenwick Solar Farm is 14.2km from the Humber Estuary SPA/Ramsar/SSSI. As set out in the responses above and detailed in the **NSER [REP1-025]**, Fenwick Solar Farm is not functionally linked to any European sites and as such, specific mitigation to avoid adverse effects on integrity is not required. As presented in the **SoCG between Fenwick Solar Project Limited and Natural England [REP1-035]**, this is a position that has been agreed in consultation with Natural England.
REP1-054	Burnet Heritage Trust	Misrepresentation of claimed Biodiversity Net Gain In our non-statutory consultations with BOOM we highlighted how Biodiversity Net Gain is understood as a poor measure when applied to Solar Farm projects, since biodiversity gain can be claimed for land under solar panels without reference to the actual conditions of the habitat immediately beneath the panels, particularly the effects of shading (Rampling et al., 2024). We are disappointed by BOOM's response to this which is to refer to a statement within guidance from the Building Research Establishment (BRE), which is unrelated to how Biodiversity Net Gain is assessed, but simply a context statement provided in a guidance document for sustainable approaches to building. Additionally, the quote has been removed from its context, with only the italicised section included in 7.11 Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment [APP-200]). *"Normally only 25-40% of the surface is oversailed by panels. Because panels are raised above the ground on posts greater than 95% of a field utilised for solar farm development is still accessible for plant growth and potentially for wildlife enhancements and complementary agricultural activities such as conservation grazing."* Recent examinations caution against the inclusion of areas under panels within any assessments of Biodiversity Net Gain. Rampling et al., (2024) state the following regarding biodiversity gains on solar farms in relation to the Net Gain framework: *"the success of such biodiversity interventions is highly dependent on species shade tolerance (Lambert et al., 2022), the project's vegetation management regime, and the availability of resources for long-term monitoring (Remazeilles et al., 2022). In addition, initial avoidance of damage to biodiversity-rich land cover is the most reliable and costeffective way to reduce biodiversity risk of solar farms (TBC, 2020)."* The entire basis of the Fenwick scheme's claimed 10% Biodiversity Net Gain rests on the basis that the land under the panels itself represents biodiversity uplift. In fact, of the proposed scheme's 831.61 biodiversity units a total of 517.46 units will come from "Other neutral grassland" (i.e 62 %). From this 415.98 units (47.27ha) is of "Other neutral grassland" retained from before the baseline of the scheme (7.11 Biodiversity	The Applicant has used the Statutory Biodiversity Metric (SBM) to measure the level of proposed habitat loss, retention, enhancement and/or creation delivered by the Scheme. This has been undertaken in accordance with the SBM User Guide (Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, 2023) and BNG good practice principles for development (The Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environmental Management , The Institute for Environmental Management and Assessment and ciria, 2019). Whilst DCO applications are not currently subject to mandatory BNG requirements, they will be required to achieve 10% net gain in biodiversity units relative to the Site's baseline biodiversity value by November 2025 under Section 98 and 99 of the Environment Act 2021. The **BNG Assessment [REP1-023]** conforms to these upcoming legal requirements. The Applicant has been careful not to overstate the habitats potentially achievable nor their targeted condition and as such has taken a reasonably precautious approach to calculating the BNG to be delivered by the Scheme. For example, where the current baseline conditions are arable farmland, the targeted grassland is 'modified grassland' of 'moderate' condition. This balances factors such as shading which may reduce plant species diversity (but not necessarily wider biodiversity function) in areas over sailed by panels, with areas between rows where diversity will be greater. Whilst it is noted that the creation of grasslands under panels is highly dependent on the species and management regime, Rampling et al. (2024) do not necessarily caution against the inclusion of such areas in assessments of Biodiversity Net Gain, but rather, *"It may be possible to enhance shaded areas beneath solar panels to achieve species-rich grasslands (TBC, 2020)."* and *"Further research will be required to confirm whether the gains we found are credible or an artifact of the metric".* There is now a growing body of evidence (e.g. Solar Habitat 2025, Solar Energy UK 2025) that well-managed solar farms do deliver diverse species-rich grasslands and that areas which are subject to greater levels of shade also play their part in delivering this.

Examination Library Ref.	Name	Comment	Applicant's Response
		Net Gain Assessment [APP-200]). Of this, around 50% is shown on plans as being oversailed by panels, and as such, is unlikely to deliver significant biodiversity gains. Incredibly, the same area of grassland is also considered "change[d] in land use from grassland to arable" according to BOOM's proposed SOCG regarding suitability for Eurasian Curlew. The vast majority of this 47.27 ha was converted to arable in Sept 2022. It was heavily sprayed with herbicide and ploughed to around 9 inches in depth (for the first time in over 25 years), destroying the grassland flora (Fig. 1). This occurred after the lease agreements between BOOM and landowners were arranged. While the trust does not believe that BOOM necessarily had the power to affect this change in land use, it seems likely that the changing incentive structures of a forthcoming long-term lease may have played a part in the conversion. Even with proper management, the recovery of a similar floral community can take up to 20 years (Walker et al., 2004). Document 7.11 Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment [APP-200]) lists the BNG good practice principles for development and states that assessment "has adhered to this step-by-step process to ensure that good practices are followed". These include being inclusive, equitable, and transparent, producing the best outcomes for biodiversity, and seeking outcomes that are both additive and have a lasting impact (see 7.11 Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment [APP-200] – Appendix E). It is the position of the BHT that these principles have not been met. [Image]	
REP1-054	Burnet Heritage Trust	Suggested additional mitigation The trust is of the view that through the following actions, it would be possible to provide adequate ecological and amenity mitigation of the whole scheme. The geographic context and further details of these suggestions are provided in Figures 2 and 3. I) An additional 39ha of mitigation adjacent to most sensitive areas (7% of the total 540ha footprint of the scheme in a context where an expansion of ~190ha between scoping and pre-application has already taken place). II) Engagement with BHT to effectively manage areas of ecological mitigation in a way that maximises biodiversity. III) Creation of a new (screened) permissive footpath through the Solar Farm, linking to the existing public footpath network and facilitating connection of Fenwick, Topham and Sykehouse away from busy highways and creating a new public amenity. IV) A new community amenity in the form of a bird hide overlooking newly created scrapes, which BOOM has committed to. V) A commitment to work with BHT and YWT to ensure that mitigation areas are protected in perpetuity at the decommissioning stage of the scheme. VI) Management of the overall site in consultation with BHT and other conservation organisations, with provisions for planting (and repeated replanting of) nectar and wild seed mix strips as well as comparatively reduced stocking levels to allow for both panel maintenance and biodiversity enhancement.	The Applicant appreciates the detailed proposals put forward by the Burnet Heritage Trust regarding potential ecological and amenity mitigation measures and provides the below responses. I) As stated in **Paragraph 2.6.46 of ES Volume I, Chapter 2: The Scheme [APP-054]**, an Ecology Mitigation Area will be provided along the River Went and the Fleet Drain, and Heritage Buffer Area will be provided along the Fleet Drain. This is shown in Appendix A of this document and **ES Volume II, Figure 2-3: Indicative Site Layout Plan [APP-074]**. This area will not include any Solar Photovoltaics (PV) Panels and associated infrastructure installed, and the land will be managed to create high quality habitat for priority bird species; provide setting buffer for the Scheduled Monument Fenwick Hall moated site; and preserve the ridge and furrow and preserve in situ areas of archaeological interest identified from the geophysical survey. The Ecological Mitigation Area encompasses a total area of approximately 49 ha. II) Details of habitat creation and enhancements are set out in the **Framework LEMP [REP1-029]** and illustrated on the Indicative Landscape Masterplan included as Appendix A of that document. A detailed LEMP (which must substantially accord with the **Framework LEMP [REP1-029]**) will need to be approved prior to construction with the relevant local planning authority and this is secured by Requirement 6 in Schedule 2 to the **Draft DCO [REP1-005].** The Applicant will continue to engage with the Burnet Heritage Trust regarding the management of ecological mitigation. III) The Scheme does not include any permissive footpaths within the Solar PV Site; however, the existing Public Rights of Way (PRoW) passing through or running adjacent to the Order limits are expected to be unaffected, aside from Sykehouse 29, Moss 6 and Fenwick 14 which will be permanently diverted. Where the potential for

Examination Library Ref.	Name	Comment	Applicant's Response
		Fig. 2 Existing AECOM plan of the site with additional mitigation areas (green starred, black outline) added. [Image] Fig. 3 Proposed additional mitigation measures resulting in enhanced public amenity and real-world biodiversity gain. [Image]	adverse visual effects has been identified, landscape mitigation, including vegetative screening, has been embedded within the design of the Scheme to reduce these effects as far as possible. Buffers between PRoW and perimeter fencing have also been included in the design, with fencing being installed a minimum distance of 20 m either side of the centre of the PRoW where solar infrastructure lies to both sides (creating a 40 m wide corridor between the fence lines), or 15 m from the PRoW centreline if solar infrastructure is to one side only. Details of the proposed landscape mitigation can be found within the **Framework LEMP [REP1-029]**, as well as the Indicative Landscape Masterplan within Appendix A of that document. IV) The Scheme does not include the creation of a new bird hide; however, various enhancements have been included. These are detailed within the **Framework LEMP [REP1-029]** and illustrated on the Indicative Landscape Masterplan in Appendix A of this document. V) At the end of the 40 years, the Solar PV Site will be decommissioned and returned back to its former condition and land use. Some areas of habitat and biodiversity mitigation and enhancement may be left for species protection, but this will be up to the landowners at the time. As noted above, property agreements have already been established confirming only temporary rights over the land within the Order limits. Further details are set out in the **Framework Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP) [REP1-021]**. This is secured through Requirement 18 of Schedule 2 to the **Draft DCO [REP1-005]**). However, the Applicant remains open to engaging with the Burnet Heritage Trust and Yorkshire Wildlife Trust on the mitigation proposed and its ongoing management. The Applicant remains open to suggestions from the Burnet Heritage Trust and Yorkshire Wildlife Trust for ideas to integrate into the community benefit scheme which could enhance the local environment. VI) The **Framework LEMP [REP1-029]** sets out management prescriptions for the successful establishment and future maintenance of biodiversity and landscaping works associated with the development and operation and maintenance of the Scheme. The Applicant remains open to engaging with the Burnet Heritage Trust regarding the mitigation proposed and its ongoing management.
REP1-059	Fenwick Solar Farm Action Group	Our group Fenwick Solar Farm action group need to resubmit our objections against this project in our Village of Fenwick and Moss. I previous provided links for alternative places, and links for reasons why we object to this proposal but have been informed, only Government links can be used, however, as the Government would not supply any links to either alternative places/issues the public would have on these projects, is a biased view on the Government in their own favour of allowing solar and wind farms no matter what the public feel about them. However, here are further objections by our members who are residents of Fenwick and Moss which are affected by the project.	The Applicant notes this comment and provides a full response to each specific issue raised by the Fenwick Solar Farm Action Group in the rows below.
REP1-059	Fenwick Solar Farm Action Group	1. Community spirit is now none existent due to mixed feelings within the residents, between the land owner/profiters and residents who have to live with the damage/change to the villages and lives, reduced house prices and mental health issues being suffered by residents worrying about the place where we all live and what	The Applicant appreciates that the potential for the Scheme to have adverse effects creates uncertainly and anxiety for local residents. The comprehensive and detailed approach to consultation, Scheme design and the EIA process has allowed any adverse effects to be identified early and the effects to be mitigated, where practicable

Examination Library Ref.	Name	Comment	Applicant's Response
		the future holds for homes and families living long term with the huge change to health and quality of life and futures during and after the build if it is granted.	and as far as practicable, such as through the buffers and vegetation screening proposed as part of the Scheme. The Applicant is committed to ongoing consultation with the community so that anxieties can be communicated and as far as possible addressed throughout all stages of the Scheme. The implementation of Requirement 3 in Schedule 2 of the **Draft DCO [REP1-005]** will allow feedback on impacts of the Scheme and mitigation measures to be considered and acted upon if required. Paragraph 2.1.14 of the **Framework CEMP [REP1-019]** confirms that a Community Liaison Group will also be set up and a Community Liaison Officer (or alternative role) established during construction to facilitate liaison between representatives of people living in the vicinity of the Order limits and other relevant organisations in relation to the impacts of the Scheme. The Applicant will produce a detailed CEMP post consent which will be in accordance with the **Framework CEMP [REP1-019]**, as secured by Requirement 11 of Schedule 2 in the **Draft DCO [REP1-005]**.
REP1-059	Fenwick Solar Farm Action Group	2. Road damage to already unrepaired, unsuitable, poorly upkept by DMBC, already in use by large numbers of vehicles, heavy goods, farm traffic, information of number of vehicles using local roads have been collated by DMBC.	A full and detailed assessment of potential traffic and transport impacts at sensitive receptors has been undertaken within **Volume I, Chapter 13: Transport and Access [REP1-015]**. Consideration has been given to traffic routing, timing, and access points to the Scheme during construction. Traffic during the operation and maintenance phase would be minimal. The **Transport Assessment [APP-179]** and **Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) [APP-206 and APP-207]** provide full details of embedded mitigation measures that are proposed to prevent or reduce potential adverse effects associated with construction traffic on local roads. This includes measures such as suitable agreed heavy goods vehicle HGV routes and timing restrictions, the use of traffic marshals at site accesses and crossing points, and the development of a communications strategy for those working on the Scheme. A detailed CTMP (which must substantially accord with the **Framework CTMP [APP-206, APP-207]**) will need to be approved post consent prior to construction with the relevant local authorities, a process which is secured by Requirement 13 in Schedule 2 to the **Draft DCO [REP1-005]**. In addition, pre and post construction road condition surveys will be undertaken at identified locations in coordination with the relevant Local Highway Authority, as referenced in Section 5.2 of the **Framework CTMP [APP-206, APP-207]**. Where these surveys identify upgrades needed to undertake the construction of the Scheme, or following the construction phase then these works will be undertaken.
REP1-059	Fenwick Solar Farm Action Group	3. Rail lines - two major lines in the area between Askern, Fenwick & Moss, often closed for repairs, breakdown and damage, the alternative route is a 15 mile round trip which NO ONE uses, but uses local single track lanes as a rat run. These lanes have NO verges or passing places and become extremely dangerous to use by pedestrians, walkers, riders and would become UNUSABLE.	As detailed in the response above, a full and detailed assessment of potential traffic and transport impacts at sensitive receptors has been undertaken within **Volume I, Chapter 13: Transport and Access [REP1-015]** which considered traffic routing, timing, and access points. Proposed embedded mitigation measures are set out in the **Transport Assessment [APP-179]** and **Framework CTMP [APP-206, APP-207]**. Indicative routing of construction traffic is set out in **Volume II, Figure 13-3: Indicative HGV Routing [APP-230]**. It is acknowledged that there are railway lines crossing these routes; however, appropriate mitigation would be implemented to manage these.

Examination Library Ref.	Name	Comment	Applicant's Response
			Construction HGV will not deviate from the defined routes which will be confirmed post consent. **Volume I, Chapter 13 Transport and Access [REP1-015]** includes a comprehensive assessment of the impact of construction traffic. Paragraph 13.7.29 onward sets out the assessment in terms of road safety, including consideration of road users and pedestrians. Table 13-24 demonstrates that the magnitude of safety impact of the Scheme would be very low which is not a significant impact. As detailed in Section 5.5 of the **Framework CTMP [APP-206 and APP-207]**, a Traffic Safety Control Officer will be appointed by the Applicant to develop, implement, and manage the detailed CTMP.
REP1-059	Fenwick Solar Farm Action Group	4. Loss of wildlife in the area including protected species, bats, we are under a geese migration route, along with swans, owls, badgers, foxes, deer, which once they have been forced out of the area, will NOT return and many deaths due to trying to land on glass which looks like water.	**Volume I, Chapter 8: Ecology [APP-060]** provides an assessment of the Scheme's impact on important ecological features and is supported by extensive survey work which confirms the ecological habitats and species likely to be affected by the Scheme. The Scheme avoids and mitigates all significant adverse effects on internationally, nationally and locally designated biodiversity sites and other important ecological features such as protected species and habitats, and veteran trees, during the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases. This has been achieved through a considered and iterative design informed by a design team with qualified professional ecologists and includes avoidance, buffers and mitigation measures that will be secured through the various management plan requirements included in Schedule 2 of the **Draft DCO [REP1-005].** As detailed in the **BNG Assessment [REP1-023]**, the Scheme is predicted to exceed the BNG target of 10%. The Framework LEMP (Revision 02) **[EN010152/APP/7.14]** has been updated at Deadline 2 to confirm that the target increase of at least 10% BNG will be across all biodiversity unit types. This is secured through Requirement 6 in Schedule 2 in the **Draft DCO [REP1-005]**.
REP1-059	Fenwick Solar Farm Action Group	5. Footpaths being lost or re-routed, changing the assess ability to walkers and riders.	The Applicant will maintain PRoW connectivity during the construction phase of the Solar PV Site and Grid Connection Corridor. Access locations for construction vehicles have been selected to minimise any interactions with PRoW and robust procedures would be put in place to ensure the safety of PRoW users. All PRoW to be temporarily closed will have a suitable localised diversion in place to allow continued use by the local community. These mitigation measures are set out in the **Framework Public Rights of Way Management Plan (PRoWMP) [REP1-027]** and **Framework CTMP [APP-206, APP-207]** which will be developed into detailed management plans post consent. The detailed management plans must be substantially in accordance with the framework management plans and require approval from City of Doncaster Council prior to construction. This is secured by Requirements 13 and 17 in Schedule 2 to the **Draft DCO [REP1-005]**. During the operation and maintenance phase of the Scheme, the existing PRoW passing through or running adjacent to the Order limits are expected to be unaffected, aside from Sykehouse 29, Moss 6 and Fenwick 14 that will be permanently diverted. The permanent diversions of these PRoW would increase their journey length by minimal distances (less than 50 m) and no significant effects on PRoW users are therefore anticipated.

Examination Library Ref.	Name	Comment	Applicant's Response
REP1-059	Fenwick Solar Farm Action Group	6. BESS - increased risks of fire, explosions and fumes - with a possibility of having to be evacuated from homes, health issues following fumes and smoke damage to homes. We have livestock in fields, cows, sheep and horses, surrounding this site and would need to evacuate the animals along with residents.	As confirmed in the **Outline Design Parameters Statement [APP-193]**, the BESS Area was selected to accommodate a minimum buffer zone of at least 500 m from any residential properties. This will ensure that any disruption to the local community is minimised in the unlikely event that BESS Container failure should occur. Paragraph 2.1.4 of the **Framework Battery Safety Management Plan (BSMP) [APP-205]** confirms the BESS Area will be designed to address prevailing industry standards and good practice at a time of detailed design and implementation. This document also extensively documents how the probability of a BESS Container failure incident is minimised by the design and proposed operating procedures, and that if a failure occurs these ensure this will be limited to one BESS Container. The **Framework BSMP [APP-205]** sets out the controls in place to ensure that, in the unlikely event a fire did occur, any impacts arising from the fire (such as fumes, or water run off) will be managed so there are no impacts on local communities beyond the Order limits. As secured in Paragraph 3.5.5, an ERP will be developed post consent to facilitate effective and safe emergency response. This will follow UK (National Fire Chiefs Council) NFCC and NFPA 855 guidelines and will be finalised in consultation with South Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Service (SYFRS). Requirement 5 of Schedule 2 of the **Draft DCO [REP1-005]** requires the submission and approval of a detailed BSMP, which must be substantially in accordance with the **Framework BSMP [APP-205].**
REP1-059	Fenwick Solar Farm Action Group	7. Noise pollution - months of piling installation for the support of the panels can be heard miles away, reducing the use of outdoor spaces all year round for residents.	As set out in **ES Volume I, Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [APP-063]**, measures to minimise effects from noise as a result of the construction phase of the Scheme are secured in the **Framework CEMP [REP1-019]** which includes Best Practice Measures (BPM) to be applied, as far as reasonably practicable. Construction of the Solar PV Site will require an estimated 24 months covering an area of approximately 407 ha so construction works would not occur at any one location for extended periods of time. The erection of the Solar PV Mounting Structures will typically consist of driving the mounts directly into the ground using a small, tracked post driver (see Plate 2-11 of **ES Volume I, Chapter 2: The Scheme [APP-054]**), followed by Solar PV Panels being attached by hand. An assessment of noise effects during the construction of the Solar PV Site is provided in **Volume I, Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [APP-063]**. Table 11-10 presents worst-case levels of construction noise when activities are taking place within the Solar PV Site in close proximity to sensitive receptors. No adverse construction noise effects are identified so, whilst construction noise may result in temporary effect on the acoustic character of the area, no changes to quality of life are expected. The core working hours are defined in the **Framework CEMP [REP1-019]**. Noise generating activities near residential properties, such as use of power tools or piling, would be limited to the hours between 08:00 and 18:00 from Monday to Friday and between 08:00 and 13:00 on Saturday. A construction noise monitoring scheme shall be developed and agreed with the relevant local authorities following appointment of a Contractor and prior to commencement of construction works. A detailed CEMP, which must be substantially in accordance with the Framework CEMP, will need to be approved prior to construction by the relevant local planning authority and is secured through Requirement 11 of Schedule 2 to the **Draft DCO [REP1-005]**.

Examination Library Ref.	Name	Comment	Applicant's Response
REP1-059	Fenwick Solar Farm Action Group	8. Storm damage to panels - the danger of broke panels flying over fencing into private properties.	The Scheme has been designed to withstand the weather experienced in the UK. As detailed in Section 2.2 of the **Framework Operational Environmental Management Plan (OEMP) [APP-197]**, it is anticipated that regular maintenance and servicing would take place during the operation and maintenance phase, including the inspection, removal, reconstruction, refurbishment or replacement of faulty or broken equipment. This will ensure the continued safe and effective operation and maintenance of the Scheme. An assessment of Major Accidents and Disasters, which includes extreme weather events, is set out in **ES Volume I, Chapter 14: Other Environmental Topics [APP-066]**. This concludes that there is the potential for significant effects if an event does occur, however, the risk of such events occurring is low for the Scheme and significant effects on the environment are therefore not anticipated.
REP1-059	Fenwick Solar Farm Action Group	9. Panels need replacing every 10 yrs, so this will continue to effect the residents for 40 yrs plus, the length of the first period and no doubt, longer.	The design life of the key components of the Scheme, including the Solar PV Panels, are set out in Table 2-3 of **ES Volume I, Chapter 2: The Scheme [APP-054]**. This outlines how many times these components may need to be replaced, during the design life of the Scheme. This commits that there will be no wholesale replacement of Solar PV Panels, although replacement of any individual faulty or damaged individual Solar PV Panels will occur as part of normal maintenance of the Scheme. As explained in the **Statement of Need [APP-192]**, solar power generation has global momentum, and various large-scale schemes are being developed in the UK. Solar is a proven technology and is already delivering as part of the UK's electricity system and will continue to deliver further critical benefits to consumers through the urgent and continued decarbonisation, security of supply, and affordability of energy. Solar power generation has undergone significant technological advances in scale and commercial efficiency and solar panel efficiency is expected to continue improving over the course of the 2020s. It is therefore important to make best use of this natural, renewable energy resource to meet the UK's legal carbon emission reduction obligations. The Scheme would utilise a fixed south facing system for the Solar PV Panels which are the most common approach for utility scale solar PV facilities in the UK to date and involve installing Solar PV Panels to fixed tables, arranged in rows facing south. The Scheme design retains flexibility to allow for the selection of the most efficient technology as solar generation technology is developing at a fast pace, with better, more efficient and more cost-effective technologies coming to the market. The Applicant is therefore seeking to retain the flexibility to choose the precise technology close to the point of the construction of the Scheme. This will enable the optimum production of renewable energy, reduce the requirement for replacement, and subsequently reduce cost for the end user. The final technology installed will be required to remain within the parameters defined by the **Works Plan [APP-214]** and **Outline Design Parameters Statement [APP-193]**. There is an opportunity for the examination Authority to raise questions regarding the Scheme design during Examination.

Examination Library Ref.	Name	Comment	Applicant's Response
REP1-059	Fenwick Solar Farm Action Group	10. There are so many other alternative places for panels, roof tops, warehouse roofs, all public buildings, schools, colleges, hospitals, motorway sides, multi storey car parks, to name but a few. Other countries, IE Italy have already banned solar farms from being built, why are we not asking WHY that is?	The Solar PV Site has been chosen through a thorough site selection process which is explained in **ES Volume I, Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution [APP-055]** and assessed against relevant planning policy in the **Planning Statement [APP-190]**. The Government has identified through its energy policy, most recently in the National Policy Statement (NPS) EN-1 and NPS EN-3, that there is an urgent need for large scale capacity low-carbon energy generation in the UK. As discussed in the Applicant's **Planning Statement [APP-246]** and **Statement of Need [APP-192]**, EN-1 and EN-3 identify large-scale solar energy generation, such as the Scheme, as being required to meet this need. The **Statement of Need [APP-192]** also notes that, whilst decentralised generation has an important role to play in decarbonisation, on its own, smaller scale solar, including rooftop solar, is not likely to deliver a sufficient total capacity at the required pace and at an affordable cost to meet the Government's targets. Therefore, smaller scale solar, including rooftop solar, must be considered as additional to, as opposed to instead of, the need for large-scale, ground-mounted solar like this Scheme. Brownfield land was considered for the Scheme following a review of the local authority brownfield land register. However, it was concluded that there was no available or suitable brownfield land for the Scheme as it would compete or be in conflict with local planning policy seeking to deliver housing and mixed-use developments, and the land next to the Existing National Grid Thorpe Marsh Substation was being developed for another energy project. This is explained in **ES Volume I, Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution [APP-055]**.
REP1-059	Fenwick Solar Farm Action Group	11. The Netzero project is being rushed forward at a breakneck speed to tick boxes by the Government, and will end up being another HS2 disaster, with the public footing the bill with NO benefit and lives ruined.	The Government has identified through its energy policy, most recently in the NPS EN-1 and the NPS EN-3, that there is an urgent need for large scale capacity low-carbon energy generation in the UK. As discussed in the Applicant's **Planning Statement [APP-246]** and **Statement of Need [APP-192]**, EN-1 and EN-3 identify large-scale solar energy generation, such as the Scheme, as being required to meet this need. Developing the Scheme at its proposed size and with its substantial benefits will therefore be an important contribution to meeting this urgent need and, as such, there is a clear and accepted case for the Scheme.
REP1-059	Fenwick Solar Farm Action Group	12. The projects will be sold off to foreign investors to build and any profits will go out of UK along with any input in how these company work or the price of power being charged back to the public. We will still be held to ransum by these companies.	The Applicant is a wholly owned subsidiary of BOOM Developments Limited who specialise in non-subsidised solar and battery storage projects. BOOM Developments Limited was founded in 2020, and the name BOOM is an acronym for Build Own Operate Maintain. This reflects the organisation's ongoing intentions to be involved in sustainable energy projects from inception to operation. Further information on BOOM Developments Limited can be found in the **Funding Statement [APP-019]**. The Applicant currently has no intention to sell the Scheme to external investors and all electricity produced will be distributed around the UK via the National Grid. This will contribute to the UK government's target of reaching a net-zero carbon electricity grid by 2035 and an overall net-zero carbon economy by 2050.

Examination Library Ref.	Name	Comment	Applicant's Response
REP1-059	Fenwick Solar Farm Action Group	13. Increase in thefts - [redacted]	As described in **ES Volume I, Chapter 2: The Scheme [APP-054]**, the Scheme incorporates various security measures, including fencing and CCTV with 24-hour response personnel, which will mitigate against the risk of criminal activity. The perimeter of the Solar PV Site would be secured with a stock proof mesh-type security fence with wooden posts. Palisade fencing would be used around the BESS Area and On-Site Substation which would provide an added layer of security. These measures are considered to be appropriate for a scheme of this nature, similar to other consented solar schemes, and are in line with what will be required by the insurer of the Scheme.
REP1-064	Moss and Fenwick Village Hall	Executive Summary This document presents a comprehensive case against the proposed Fenwick solar farm development. Based on thorough analysis of local impact reports and relevant planning considerations, we strongly urge the Planning Inspectorate to reject this application. The proposal fails to meet critical planning standards and would impose substantial, long-term harm to the rural character, agricultural landscape, local environment, community well-being, and regional economic interests.	The Applicant notes this comment and provides a full response to each specific issue raised by Moss and Fenwick Village Hall in the rows below.
REP1-064	Moss and Fenwick Village Hall	Loss of Productive Agricultural Land • The proposal would result in the loss of approximately 325 hectares of productive agricultural land (Grade 2 and 3a), contrary to National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) guidance on preserving the nation's food security • Local impact assessments confirm this land currently contributes significantly to regional food production, which would be irreversibly compromised for decades • The rural economy in Fenwick relies heavily on agricultural activities that would be permanently disrupted • The applicant has failed to adequately demonstrate why alternative, lower-grade agricultural land or brownfield sites were not selected	The NPPF at Paragraph 187 (b) sets out that planning decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by *"recognising …the wider benefits from natural capital and ecosystem services – including the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land…"*. It goes onto state in footnote 65 of Paragraph 188 that *"where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, areas of poorer quality land should be preferred to those of a higher quality"*. The Solar PV Site has been chosen through a thorough site selection process which is explained in **ES Volume I, Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution [APP-055]** and assessed against relevant planning policy in the **Planning Statement [APP-190]**. In identifying areas that could be suitable for a Solar PV Site, the Applicant considered locations that would avoid (best and most versatile) BMV agricultural land in accordance with the NPPF. The results of this exercise are set out in **ES Volume I, Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution [APP-055]**. As set out in **ES Volume I, Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use [REP1-013]**, an agricultural land survey was undertaken and categorised 7% of the Solar PV Site as BMV land. With the exception of a relatively small area of BMV land proposed for structural planting, impacts on this BMV land will be temporary and reversible. In addition, due to the small scale of this BMV land, it is not currently farmed for high-quality agricultural food production and was recently used for biomass crops. Within the Solar PV Site, fields currently used to grow arable crops (with some grazing) would cease to be part of a working farm during construction and operation, although there is potential for grazing by sheep for management of the grassland. The Grid Connection Corridor, if required, would also intersect a number of agricultural land holdings, but will be available for agricultural use again post construction, given cables will be buried at sufficient depth to enable agricultural activities to continue on the surface. Further information can be found in the **Framework Soil Management Plan (SMP) [APP-199]**.

Examination Library Ref.	Name	Comment	Applicant's Response
			Prior to the start of construction, a detailed SMP will be submitted to and approved by the local authority (as outlined in the **Framework CEMP [REP1-019]** and secured by Requirement 15 of Schedule 2 to the **Draft DCO [REP1-005]**). This will ensure soils are not degraded and farming activities can re-commence following completion of the construction phase along the Grid Connection Corridor and decommissioning phase within the Solar PV Site.
REP1-064	Moss and Fenwick Village Hall	Conflict with Local Land Development Plans • The proposal directly contradicts the established Local Development Plan, which designates this area for agricultural use and rural character preservation • The Fenwick Local Plan, which represents years of community consultation and careful planning, has been completely ignored by the applicant • This disregard for locally-determined planning priorities undermines the principle of local decision-making that is central to the planning system • The scale of industrial development represents an unprecedented incursion into designated rural landscape	The Doncaster Local Plan proposals map identifies that the Site falls within an area identified as 'Countryside Policy Area'. Policy 25 of the Doncaster Local Plan is relevant and is addressed at Section 10.1 of the **Applicant's Response to the City of Doncaster Local Impact Report [EN010152/APP/8.22]** and a wider assessment of relevant planning policy is included within the **Planning Statement [APP-190]**. The Statement details the extent to which the Scheme complies with national and local policy and applies a planning balance which overwhelmingly weighs in favour of granting development consent for the Scheme. The Applicant has been unable to locate a document titled the 'Fenwick Local Plan' and is therefore unable to comment on its content or status. It is noted that the Examining Authority has raised a similar question at Section 1.2.9 of **The Examining Authority's First Written Questions (ExQ1) [PD-007]**. An independent and impartial Examining Authority has been appointed by the Planning Inspectorate to gather evidence and test information during the Examination of the application. During examination, as during the statutory consultation, parties are given the opportunity to comment on the submitted application, either in writing or in-person (such as at the Open Floor Hearing on 19 March 2025). The process also involves the submission of a Local Impact Report by the host authority giving details of the likely impact of the Scheme on the authority's area and the local communities affected. The City of Doncaster Council submitted its **Local Impact Report [REP1-048]** at Deadline 1 and the **Applicant's Response to the City of Doncaster Local Impact Report [EN010152/APP/8.22]** is provided at Deadline 2. The Examining Authority and the Secretary of State must have regard to the Local Impact Report and submissions made during Examination when deciding the application. The impact of the Scheme on the rural landscape is considered under the 'Visual and Rural Character Impact' section of **[REP1-064]** below.
REP1-064	Moss and Fenwick Village Hall	Traffic and Road Infrastructure Impact • The construction phase would generate an estimated significant increase in heavy vehicle movements on local roads. • The affected roads are classified as C roads, which were never designed for industrial-scale traffic volumes. • These rural roads are already in a state of major disrepair with numerous potholes, crumbling edges, and inadequate drainage. • The structural integrity of these roads would be further compromised by heavy construction vehicles.	A full and detailed assessment of potential traffic and transport impacts from construction at sensitive receptors has been undertaken within **ES Volume I, Chapter 13: Transport and Access [REP1-015]**. Consideration has been given to traffic routing, timing, and access points to the Scheme during construction and traffic during the operation and maintenance phase would be minimal. The **Transport Assessment [APP-179]** and **Framework CTMP [APP-206, APP-207]** provide full details of embedded mitigation measures that are proposed to prevent or reduce potential adverse effects associated with construction traffic on local roads. This includes measures such as suitable agreed HGV routes and timing restrictions, the use of traffic marshals at site accesses and crossing points, and the development of a communications strategy for those working on the Scheme. A detailed CTMP (which must substantially accord with the **Framework CTMP [APP-206, APP-207]**) will need to be approved post consent prior to construction with the relevant local

Examination Library Ref.	Name	Comment	Applicant's Response
		• The narrow width of these roads creates serious safety concerns when large vehicles attempt to pass. • The applicant's traffic management plan fails to adequately address: – Increased carbon emissions from construction traffic. – Air quality impacts on nearby residents from dust and diesel particulates. – Noise pollution affecting wildlife habitats and residential areas. – Runoff of pollutants from roads into local watercourses. • Local highway authorities have expressed significant concerns about the suitability of the proposed access routes. • The applicant has provided no viable plan for road repairs or maintenance during and after the construction phase.	authorities and this is secured by Requirement 13 in Schedule 2 to the **Draft DCO [REP1-005]**. In addition, pre and post construction road condition surveys will be undertaken at identified locations in coordination with the relevant Local Highway Authority, as referenced in Section 5.2 of the **Framework CTMP [APP-206, APP-207]**. Where these surveys identify upgrades needed to undertake the construction of the Scheme, or following the construction phase then these works will be undertaken. **ES Volume I, Chapter 13 Transport and Access [REP1-015]** includes a comprehensive assessment of the impact of construction traffic. Paragraph 13.7.29 onward sets out the assessment in terms of road safety, including consideration of road users and pedestrians. Table 13-24 demonstrates that the magnitude of safety impact of the Scheme would be very low which is not a significant impact. As detailed in Section 5.5 of the **Framework CTMP [APP-206, APP-207]**, a Traffic Safety Control Officer will be appointed by the Applicant to develop, implement, and manage the detailed CTMP. Noise effects from construction traffic are assessed in **ES Volume I, Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [APP-063]**. Paragraph 11.8.37 confirms that temporary changes in road traffic noise due to construction traffic are identified as, at worst, negligible and not significant. Air quality effects from construction traffic are assessed in **ES Volume I, Chapter 14: Other Environmental Topics [APP-066]**. Paragraph 14.2.22 to 14.2.24 confirm that construction phase traffic has been modelled and compared against the relevant screening criteria. As construction phase road traffic volumes are not expected to meet the thresholds above for which detailed modelling is required, there are no likely significant air quality impacts from traffic predicted during the construction phase. Due to the nature of the Scheme, a significant change to traffic flows is not anticipated to occur during the operation and maintenance phase of the Scheme and, therefore, no likely significant noise and vibration or air quality impacts are anticipated.
REP1-064	Moss and Fenwick Village Hall	Ecological Disruption • Local wildlife surveys have identified [specific protected species] on and adjacent to the site. • The Environmental Impact Assessment has significant methodological flaws in its biodiversity net gain calculations. • Local environmental authorities have documented concerns about fragmentation of wildlife corridors and destruction of habitat	**ES Volume I, Chapter 8: Ecology [APP-060]** provides an assessment of the Scheme's impact on important ecological features and is supported by extensive survey work which confirms the ecological habitats and species likely to be affected by the Scheme. The Scheme avoids and mitigates all significant adverse effects on internationally, nationally and locally designated biodiversity sites and other important ecological features such as protected species and habitats, and veteran trees, during the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases. This has been achieved through a considered and iterative design informed by a design team with qualified professional ecologists and includes avoidance, buffers and mitigation measures that will be secured through the various management plan requirements included in Schedule 2 of the **Draft DCO [REP1-005**]. As detailed in the **BNG Assessment [REP1-023]**, the Scheme is predicted to exceed the BNG target of 10% and this is predicted for each habitat type. The Applicant therefore commits to achieving a minimum 10% BNG for all habitat types as secured by the **Framework LEMP [REP1-029]** and requirement 6 in Schedule 2 in the **Draft DCO [REP1-005**].

Examination Library Ref.	Name	Comment	Applicant's Response
REP1-064	Moss and Fenwick Village Hall	Flood Risk and Drainage Issues • The proposed site is partially located within Flood Zone 2, with historical flooding incidents documented by the Environment Agency. • Local authority engineers have expressed significant concerns about altered drainage patterns impacting neighbouring properties. • The submitted Flood Risk Assessment fails to adequately address cumulative runoff impacts of panel installation and access road construction	The Applicant acknowledges that some areas of the Order limits are located within Flood Zone 2 and Flood Zone 3. **Volume III, Appendix 9-3: Flood Risk Assessment** (Revision 01) **[EN10152/APP/6.3]** has therefore been produced for the Scheme and updated at Deadline 2. It considers risk both to, and arising from, the Solar PV Site and the Grid Connection Corridor. As part of **Volume III, Appendix 9-3: Flood Risk Assessment** (Revision 01) **[EN10152/APP/6.3]** , mitigation is proposed to manage the potential impacts of flood risk so that the Scheme does not increase or exacerbate flood risk to others. Solar PV Panels have been located in accordance with the Sequential Test to avoid areas of high fluvial flood risk and would be raised to a sufficient height to avoid floodwater. Field Stations have also been sequentially located to avoid high fluvial flood risk areas and raised to a sufficient height to avoid floodwater. While some Solar PV Panels and Field Stations are located within Flood Zone 3, the BESS Area and On-Site Substation will be located outside of Flood Zone 3. As secured in the **Framework CEMP [REP1-019]**, all construction compounds will be located outside of the 3.3% Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP) flood extent (i.e. Flood Zone 3b) and temporary works will be designed in a way to ensure they are resilient to flooding, whilst also minimising flood risk impacts to third parties. An Emergency Response Plan (ERP) will also be developed as part of the detailed CEMP which would provide detail of the response to an impending flood. This mitigation has been informed by site-specific hydraulic modelling which takes into account any increases in flooding due to climate change expected during the lifetime of the development. **ES Volume III, Appendix 9-4: Framework Drainage Strategy [APP-160]** has been prepared to support the DCO which considers runoff from the Scheme. This will be developed into a detailed Drainage Strategy post consent, following the detailed design of the BESS Area and On-site Substation, informed by infiltration testing. The detailed Drainage Strategy must substantially accord with **ES Volume III, Appendix 9-4: Framework Drainage Strategy [APP-160]** and must be approved by the relevant planning authority, as secured in Requirement 9 in Schedule 2 of the Draft DCO **[REP1-005]**. Section 7.2 of **ES Volume III, Appendix 9-3: Flood Risk Assessment [APP-158, APP-159]** states that the Solar PV Panels will be held above the ground surface on Solar PV Mounting Structures. This will avoid sealing the ground with impermeable surfaces. As a result, it is assumed that the impermeable area will remain largely consistent with its pre-development state. The areas surrounding the Solar PV Panels will be planted with native grassland to intercept and absorb rainfall running off the Solar PV Panels, preventing it from concentrating and potentially forming channels in the ground. Access tracks will use permeable materials such as crushed rock/gravel and localised SuDS, such as swales and infiltration trenches, to control runoff where required. The Applicant is not aware of significant concerns about altered drainage patterns impacting neighbouring properties raised by local authority engineers. The Applicant has engaged with City of Doncaster Council engineers and received feedback that the **ES Volume III, Appendix 9-4: Framework Drainage Strategy [APP-160]** is in keeping with their expectations and that overall is a well-considered document for a low-risk development. No significant concerns have been raised in the **Local Impact**

Examination Library Ref.	Name	Comment	Applicant's Response
			Reports from Local Authorities [REP1-048] produced by City of Doncaster Council at Deadline 1.
REP1-064	Moss and Fenwick Village Hall	Visual and Rural Character Impact • The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) significantly underestimates the visual harm from multiple viewpoints identified by local landscape officers. • The proposed mitigation measures are wholly inadequate to screen industrial-scale development in this open, elevated rural landscape. • The development would fundamentally alter the traditional rural character that has defined this area for generations. • The industrialization of prime countryside directly contradicts national and local policies designed to protect rural landscapes. • The development would be clearly visible from [specific heritage sites, public rights of way, or residential areas]	**Volume I, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity [APP-062]** recognises that there will be landscape and visual impacts during the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases of the Scheme. Whilst some impacts will remain at year 15 of operation, they will largely be screened or filtered by existing vegetation or proposed planting. Where the potential for adverse visual impacts has been identified, landscape mitigation, including vegetative screening, has been embedded within the design of the Scheme to reduce these impacts as far as possible. Proposed mitigation has been designed to integrate with the existing landscape character of the Solar PV Site. Details of the proposed screening and buffers including existing vegetation to be retained and proposed planting are provided in the **Framework LEMP [REP1-029]** and illustrated on the Indicative Landscape Masterplan included as Appendix A. Existing hedgerows will be retained as far as practicable. Buffers of grassland, native scrub and woodland will be created around the edge of the Solar PV Site and other larger areas of grassland will be created, which will offer habitat for wildlife, including foraging habitat for a number of species. These buffers minimise the potential for adverse impacts.
REP1-064	Moss and Fenwick Village Hall	Impact on Public Footpaths • The scheme will affect the majority of the public footpaths in the area which is unacceptable. • The public will no longer benefit from walks through open countryside but be forced to put up with industrialised landscape. • There should be no need to close or relocate any of the footpaths in the pursuit of cost saving or an easier option. • We strongly advocate the keeping open of all footpaths. • Noise pollution will also increase.	The Applicant will maintain PRoW connectivity during the construction phase of the Solar PV Site and Grid Connection Corridor. Access locations for construction vehicles have been selected to minimise any interactions with PRoW and robust procedures would be put in place to ensure the safety of PRoW users. All PRoW to be temporarily closed will have a suitable localised diversion in place to allow continued use by the local community. These mitigation measures are set out in the **Framework PRoWMP [REP1-027]** and **Framework CTMP [APP-206 and APP-207]** which will be developed into detailed management plans post consent. The detailed management plans must be substantially in accordance with the framework management plans and require approval from City of Doncaster Council prior to construction. This is secured by Requirements 13 and 17 in Schedule 2 to the **Draft DCO [REP1-005]**. During the operation and maintenance phase of the Scheme, the existing PRoW passing through or running adjacent to the Order limits are expected to be unaffected, aside from Sykehouse 29, Moss 6 and Fenwick 14 that will be permanently diverted. The permanent diversions of these PRoW would increase their journey length by minimal distances (less than 50 m) and no significant effects on PRoW users are therefore anticipated. Buffers between PRoW and perimeter fencing have also been included in the design, with fencing being installed a minimum distance of 20 m either side of the centre of the PRoW where solar infrastructure lies to both sides (creating a 40 m wide corridor between the fence lines), or 15 m from the PRoW centreline if solar infrastructure is to one side only. Details of the proposed landscape mitigation can be found within the

Examination Library Ref.	Name	Comment	Applicant's Response
			Framework LEMP [REP1-029], as well as on the Indicative Landscape Masterplan within Appendix A of this document. Given the linear nature of PRoW, the range of noise impacts along them forming the ambient noise environment and the transient usage of a PRoW, a material change in the experience of using the PRoW as a result of noise emissions from the Scheme which could affect PRoW users' health or quality of life is not anticipated.
REP1-064	Moss and Fenwick Village Hall	Heritage Asset Harm • The site is in proximity to [specific listed buildings, scheduled monuments, or conservation areas]. • Historic England's consultation response highlights "substantial harm" to the setting of these assets, contrary to NPPF requirements for heritage protection. • The applicant's heritage assessment fails to properly evaluate cumulative impacts on the historic environment	The site is in proximity to a number of designated and non-designated heritage assets. These are described and assessed in **ES Volume I, Chapter 7: Cultural Heritage [REP1-011]** and its accompanying desk-based assessment **ES Volume III, Appendix 7-2: Cultural Heritage Desk-Based Assessment [REP1-017]**. This includes an assessment of the effects of the scheme in relation to the setting of these heritage assets. Consultation with Historic England has been undertaken during the application process, as summarised in Table 7-1 of **ES Volume I, Chapter 7: Cultural Heritage [REP1-011]**. The responses to the application received by Historic England do not identify substantial harm to any heritage assets. The most recent of these is the **Written Representation received from Historic England [REP1-050]**, which states that they concur with the findings of the ES with regards to the effects on designated heritage assets. The ES did not identify any substantial harm to designated heritage assets. Less than substantial harm to heritage assets is discussed in the Heritage Statement forming Appendix C of the **Planning Statement [APP-190**]. No substantial harm is identified. Section 7.11 of **ES Volume I, Chapter 7: Cultural Heritage [REP1-011]** presents an assessment of cumulative impacts on the historic environment, the scope if which is robust and proportionate, in accordance with **ES Volume III, Appendix 1-1: EIA Scoping Report [APP-132], ES Volume III, Appendix 1-2:EIA Scoping Opinion [APP-133]** and **ES Volume III, Appendix 1-3: EIA Scoping Opinion Responses [APP-134]**.
REP1-064	Moss and Fenwick Village Hall	Safety and Wellbeing of Vulnerable Users • Moss and Fenwick Village Hall is regularly used by SEN (Special Educational Needs) students during school term times. • The hall serves as a vital community hub hosting essential services including: – Weekly support groups for elderly residents, – Health clinics and wellbeing sessions, – Parent and toddler groups, – Youth club activities, – Community celebrations and gatherings. • The construction phase would generate significant additional traffic on local roads that provide essential access to the village hall. • Construction noise, dust, and vibration would severely disrupt sensitive activities held at the hall.	The Applicant appreciates that the potential for the Scheme to have adverse effects creates uncertainly and anxiety for local residents. The comprehensive and detailed approach to consultation, Scheme design, and the EIA process has allowed any adverse effects to be identified early and the effects to be mitigated, where practicable, such as through the buffers and vegetation screening proposed as part of the Scheme. This has included a consideration of human health through many chapters (**ES Volume I, Chapter 9** to **Chapter 14 [APP-064 to APP-066]**) but none have identified likely significant effects during the various phases of the Scheme. **ES Volume I, Chapter 13 Transport and Access [REP1-015]** includes a comprehensive assessment of the impact of construction traffic. Paragraph 13.7.29 onward sets out the assessment in terms of road safety, including consideration of road users and pedestrians. Table 13-24 demonstrates that the magnitude of safety impact of the Scheme would be very low which is not a significant impact. As detailed in Section 5.5 of the **Framework CTMP [APP-206 and APP-207]**, a Traffic Safety Control Officer will be appointed by the Applicant to develop, implement, and manage the detailed CTMP.

Examination Library Ref.	Name	Comment	Applicant's Response
		• SEN students are particularly vulnerable to disruption, noise, and safety hazards posed by construction vehicles. • Elderly and disabled visitors to the hall would face increased difficulty and risk navigating around construction traffic. • The applicant's traffic management plan fails to address these special circumstances or provide adequate safeguards. • The health, safety, and wellbeing of these vulnerable community members must be given substantial weight in planning considerations. • The social isolation resulting from reduced accessibility to this critical community facility has not been assessed in the application.	The Applicant is committed to ongoing consultation with the community so that anxieties can be communicated and as far as possible addressed throughout all stages of the Scheme. The implementation of Requirement 3 in Schedule 2 of the **Draft DCO [REP1-005]** will allow feedback on impacts of the Scheme and mitigation measures to be considered and acted upon if required. Paragraph 2.1.14 of the **Framework CEMP [REP1-019]** confirms that a Community Liaison Group will also be set up and a Community Liaison Officer (or alternative role) established during construction to facilitate liaison between representatives of people living in the vicinity of the Order limits and other relevant organisations in relation to the impacts of the Scheme. The Applicant will produce a detailed CEMP post consent which will be in accordance with the **Framework CEMP [REP1-019]**, as secured by Requirement 11 of Schedule 2 in the **Draft DCO [REP1-005]**.
REP1-064	Moss and Fenwick Village Hall	Harm to Local Rural Businesses • Numerous local rural businesses (including farms, farm shops, equestrian centers, and craft enterprises) rely on the area's unspoiled rural character for their operations and appeal. • Economic impact analyses from similar developments demonstrate consistent revenue declines of 15-20% for rural businesses in comparable areas. • The industrialization of the landscape would fundamentally undermine the rural identity that these businesses have built their livelihoods upon. • The applicant's economic assessment fails to account for these significant negative impacts on the local rural economy.	As set out in **ES Volume I, Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use [REP1-013]**, Gross Value Added per construction worker in the Yorkshire and the Humber is estimated to be £63,314 per head. By applying this figure to the gross direct construction workers generated by the Scheme, it is estimated that construction would contribute approximately £12.6 million to the national economy, of which £5.7 million would be within a 60-minute drive time from the Order limits which is a metric used and accepted within other DCO applications that have been examined by the Planning Inspectorate, such as East Yorkshire Solar Farm and Tillbridge Solar Project. Construction activities associated with the Scheme will provide access to employment in this phase. Similar economic benefits are also anticipated for the decommissioning phase. The application includes a **Framework Skills, Supply Chain and Employment Plan (SSCEP) [APP-204]** which identifies potential opportunities for activities relating to skills, supply chain and employment that the Applicant could take forward post-consent. A detailed SSCEP is secured by requirement 16 of the **Draft DCO [REP1-005]** and requires the Plan to be substantially in accordance with the **Framework SSCEP [APP-204]**. Measures to minimise community disturbance as a result of the Scheme are provided in the **Framework CEMP [REP1-019]**, **Framework CTMP [APP-206, APP-207]**, **Framework OEMP [APP-197]**, and **Framework DEMP [REP1-021]**.
REP1-064	Moss and Fenwick Village Hall	Property Value Depreciation • Independent property valuation studies indicate residential properties within 2km of large solar installations experience average value decreases of 5-15%. • This represents a disproportionate burden on local residents not offset by community benefits.	Impacts on property prices are not a material consideration in the NSIP planning process and, therefore, are not a factor to be considered by the Secretary of State when determining the application for development consent. However, the Applicant will comply with the Compensation Code in respect of any compulsory acquisition associated with the Scheme, including any injurious affection or depreciation of land value in accordance with the relevant statutory tests. The Applicant is committed to establishing a Community Benefit Fund (CBF) which is designed to provide additional support and tangible benefits to local communities impacted by large infrastructure projects. They are voluntary commitments by developers to enhance the local area. The terms of reference will be discussed and agreed with a community liaison group. The exact details of the administration of the

Examination Library Ref.	Name	Comment	Applicant's Response
			fund will be developed together with residents' representatives. CBFs are not considered in the overall planning balance when the Planning Inspectorate makes a recommendation or the Secretary of State grants consent, meaning the Examining Authority must still be satisfied the Scheme is appropriate even without the CBF in place.
REP1-064	Moss and Fenwick Village Hall	Problematic Solar Panel Sourcing • The application indicates solar panels would be sourced from manufacturers in China, raising serious ethical and environmental concerns. • There is substantial documented evidence of [redacted] in Chinese solar supply chains, particularly in the mining of raw materials and production of polysilicon. • The UK government has expressed concerns about human rights abuses in global solar supply chains. The applicant has failed to provide adequate supply chain due diligence or certification that would ensure their panels are ethically sourced. • This directly contradicts UK commitments to eliminate [redacted] from supply chains.	The Application includes a **Framework SSCEP [APP-204]** which sets out that the procurement strategy for the Scheme must be shaped to maximise opportunities to local businesses, with an ethical procurement policy, whilst seeking to minimise associated environmental impacts and safeguarding human rights in the supply chain. A detailed SSCEP is secured by requirement 16 of the **Draft DCO [REP1-005]** and requires the Plan to be substantially in accordance with the **Framework SSCEP [APP-204]**.
REP1-064	Moss and Fenwick Village Hall	Carbon Footprint of Transportation • Transporting solar panels from China to the UK creates a significant carbon footprint that undermines the project's environmental credentials. • Solar panels must travel approximately 8,000+ miles by sea freight and road transport to reach the installation site. • The applicant's carbon assessment fails to account for these substantial transport emissions in their calculations. • This overseas production and long-distance shipping directly contradicts the principles of sustainable local development. • The carbon payback period is significantly extended when full lifecycle emissions including transport are properly accounted for.	**ES Volume I, Chapter 6: Climate Change [APP-224]** presents the assessment of the likely significant effects on the climate as a result of the Scheme. As detailed in Table 6-19 to Table 6-20, there would be minor adverse (not significant) effects on global greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions during the construction and decommissioning phases; however, there would be a beneficial (significant) effect during the operation and maintenance phase due to the carbon intensity remaining substantially below that of a gas-fired Combined Cycle Gas Turbine (CCGT) generating facility throughout its design life, its role in achieving the rate of transition required by nationally set policy commitments, and supporting the trajectory towards net zero.
REP1-064	Moss and Fenwick Village Hall	Grid Connection Inadequacy • Local network operators have identified significant constraints in the existing grid infrastructure. • The required grid upgrades would cause extended disruption to local communities during construction. • The applicant has not secured firm grid connection agreements.	As confirmed in the **Statement of Need [APP-192]**, the Applicant has a Grid Connection Agreement with National Grid for the Scheme to connect to the Existing National Grid Thorpe Marsh Substation. The proposed location of the Scheme enables delivery of electricity against the urgency of need, in relation to decarbonisation, security of supply and affordability, and makes use of existing and available grid infrastructure by connecting to the National Electricity Transmission System (NETS) footprint. No adverse grid operability effects are anticipated as a result of connecting the Scheme to the NETS at the Existing National Grid Thorpe Marsh Substation.
REP1-064	Moss and Fenwick Village Hall	Inefficient Energy Generation • Solar irradiance data for this specific location demonstrates below-average generation potential compared to alternative sites.	As explained in the **Statement of Need [APP-192]**, solar power generation has global momentum, and various large-scale schemes are being developed in the UK. Solar is a proven technology and is already delivering as part of the UK's electricity system and will continue to deliver further critical benefits to consumers through the urgent and continued decarbonisation, security of supply, and affordability of energy. Solar

Examination Library Ref.	Name	Comment	Applicant's Response
		• The cooling effect of the surrounding woodland reduces operational efficiency by approximately 8-12% according to microclimate analysis. • Cost-benefit analysis shows poor return on investment of public subsidies.	power generation has undergone significant technological advances in scale and commercial efficiency and solar panel efficiency is expected to continue improving over the course of the 2020s. It is therefore important to make best use of this natural, renewable energy resource to meet the UK's legal carbon emission reduction obligations. The Scheme would utilise a fixed south facing system for the Solar PV Panels. These are the most common approach for utility scale solar PV facilities in the UK to date and involve installing Solar PV Panels to fixed tables, arranged in rows facing south. The Scheme design retains flexibility to allow for the selection of the most efficient technology as solar generation technology is developing at a fast pace, with better, more efficient and more cost-effective technologies coming to the market. The Applicant is therefore seeking to retain the flexibility to choose the precise technology close to the point of the construction of the Scheme. This will enable the optimum production of renewable energy and subsequently reduce cost for the end user. The final technology installed will be required to remain within the parameters defined by the **Works Plan [APP-214]** and **Outline Design Parameters Statement [APP-193]**.
REP1-064	Moss and Fenwick Village Hall	Based on the extensive evidence presented in local impact reports and our analysis, the Fenwick solar farm proposal: 1. Fails to comply with multiple national and local planning policies 2. Would cause substantial and demonstrable harm to the traditional rural character and agricultural heritage of the area 3. Threatens the continued viability of rural businesses and services that form the backbone of the local economy 4. Creates unacceptable risks to vulnerable community members who rely on local facilities 5. Has generated overwhelming, evidence-based opposition from statutory consultees and local authorities We therefore respectfully urge the Planning Inspectorate to reject this application in its entirety. The cumulative negative impacts on agricultural land, rural character, local environment, heritage assets, and community well-being present a compelling case for refusal.	In respect of point 1, an appraisal of the Scheme against relevant local and national planning policy can be found in the **Planning Statement [APP-246]**. The Statement details the extent to which the Scheme complies with national and local policy and applies a planning balance which overwhelmingly weighs in favour of granting development consent for the Scheme. Point 2 is addressed by the responses to the 'Visual and Rural Character Impact' and 'Heritage Asset Harm' sections of **[REP1-064]** above. Point 3 is addressed by the response to the 'Harm to Local Rural Businesses' section of **[REP1-064]** above. Point 4 is addressed by the response to the 'Safety and Wellbeing of Vulnerable Users' section of **[REP1-064]** above. In respect of point 5, the Applicant disagrees that there has been overwhelming opposition from statutory consultees and local authorities. Compared with other solar DCOs that have been examined, the number of Relevant Representations from Interested Parties is small.

2.3 Public/Land Interest

Table 2-3: Applicant's Responses to Written Representations Received at Deadline 1 (Public/Landowners)

Examination Library Ref.	Name	Comment	Applicant's Response
REP1-061	Janet Raynor	I wish to provide further comments in connection with the Fenwick Solar Farm project as a resident of Fenwick, which are HUGE concerns to myself and family. 1. BESS site situated close to residents - the issues of fires have increased recently with several large fires in these containers, producing huge amounts of smoke. toxic fumes, left to burn for hours and causing evacuations of private homes close to these sites and warnings to keep doors and windows closed to properties in close proximity. As these sites will be in use for 40 yrs plus, this threat remains a long term problem for residents, reducing the sale price of homes and the reduced ability of selling these homes on. Theres little or no evidence, that the fumes from these fires are harmless and even less evidence, that there is NO long lasting effects on residents from them.	As confirmed in the **Outline Design Parameters Statement [APP-193]**, the BESS Area was selected to accommodate a minimum buffer zone of at least 500 m from any residential properties. This will ensure that any disruption to the local community is minimised in the unlikely event that BESS Container failure should occur. Paragraph 2.1.4 of the **Framework Battery Safety Management Plan BSMP) [APP-205]** confirms the BESS Area will be designed to address prevailing industry standards and good practice at a time of detailed design and implementation. This document also extensively documents how the probability of a BESS Container failure incident is minimised by the design and proposed operating procedures, and that if a failure occurs these ensure this will be limited to one BESS Container. The **Framework BSMP [APP-205]** sets out the controls in place to ensure that, in the unlikely event a fire did occur, any impacts arising from the fire (such as fumes, or water run off) will be managed so there are no impacts on local communities beyond the Order limits. As secured in Paragraph 3.5.5, an ERP will be developed post consent to facilitate effective and safe emergency response. This will follow UK NFCC and NFPA 855 guidelines and will be finalised in consultation with SYFRS. Requirement 5 of Schedule 2 of the **Draft DCO [REP1-005]** requires the submission and approval of a detailed BSMP, which must be substantially in accordance with the **Framework BSMP [APP-205].** Impacts on property prices are not a material consideration in the NSIP planning process and therefore are not a factor to be considered by the Secretary of State when determining the application for development consent. The Applicant will comply with the Compensation Code in respect of any compulsory acquisition associated with the Scheme, including any injurious affection or depreciation of land value in accordance with the relevant statutory tests.
REP1-061	Janet Raynor	2. Noise Pollution - this project is so huge, the noise alone from the piling required on land to support the panels, 10 hours a day, 5 days (minimum) per week, 52 weeks of year, for up to 2 years will have huge mental health effects on residents, not only in close proximity to the site but within several miles in all directions, taking into account 1000's of people being effected. Fenwick as already suffered from this noise pollution due to recent homes and supermarkets being built in nearby Askern, it stops residents using their outdoor spaces, disturbs sleeping patterns, scaring of livestock, horse riders and nervous pets and children, along with older residents in the area. Residents choose to live in a quiet countryside location for many reasons, peace and quiet being one of them, but this noise disturbance is unacceptable and being forced onto residents with little care for mental health issues this will cause.	As set out in **ES Volume I, Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [APP-063]**, measures to minimise effects from noise as a result of the construction phase of the Scheme are secured in the **Framework CEMP [REP1-019]** which includes BPM to be applied, as far as reasonably practicable. Construction of the Solar PV Site will require an estimated 24 months covering an area of approximately 407 ha, so construction works would not occur at any one location for extended periods of time. The erection of the Solar PV Mounting Structures will typically consist of driving the mounts directly into the ground using a small, tracked post driver (see Plate 2-11 of **ES Volume I, Chapter 2: The Scheme [APP-054]**), followed by Solar PV Panels being attached by hand. An assessment of noise effects during the construction of the Solar PV Site is provided in **ES Volume I, Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [APP-063]**. Table 11-10 presents worst-case levels of construction noise when activities are taking place within the Solar PV Site in close proximity to sensitive receptors. No adverse construction noise effects are identified so, whilst construction noise may result in temporary effect on the acoustic character of the area, no changes to quality of life are expected. The core working hours are defined in the **Framework CEMP [REP1-019]**. Noise generating activities near residential properties, such as use of power tools or piling,

Examination Library Ref.	Name	Comment	Applicant's Response
			would be limited to the hours between 08:00 and 18:00 from Monday to Friday and between 08:00 and 13:00 on Saturday. A construction noise monitoring scheme shall be developed and agreed with the relevant local authorities following appointment of a Contractor and prior to commencement of construction works. A detailed CEMP, which must be substantially in accordance with the Framework CEMP, will need to be approved prior to construction by the relevant local planning authority and is secured through Requirement 11 of Schedule 2 to the **Draft DCO [REP1-005]**. The Applicant is committed to ongoing consultation with the community so that anxieties can be communicated and as far as possible addressed throughout all stages of the Scheme. Paragraph 2.1.14 of the **Framework CEMP [REP1-019]** confirms that a Community Liaison Group will also be set up and a Community Liaison Officer (or alternative role) established during construction to facilitate liaison between representatives of people living in the vicinity of the Order limits and other relevant organisations in relation to the impacts of the Scheme. The Applicant will produce a detailed CEMP post consent which will be in accordance with the **Framework CEMP [REP1-019]**, as secured by Requirement 11 of Schedule 2 in the **Draft DCO [REP1-005]**. The implementation of Requirement 3 in Schedule 2 of the **Draft DCO [REP1-005]** will allow feedback on impacts of the Scheme and mitigation measures to be considered and acted upon if required.
REP1-061	Janet Raynor	3. Wildlife - we have a diverse selection of wildlife, birds living happily in the village and surrounding area, several breeds of owls, wild fowls, large flocks of geese migrate through Fenwick to get to Askern pond, swans, buzzards, red kites, deer, and some protected birds. Once these wildlife and birds have either been killed/injured by trying to land on the panels, thinking they are water, unable to take off again due to lack of space, many will be lost and any that do survive, will not return.	**ES Volume I, Chapter 8: Ecology [APP-060]** provides an assessment of the Scheme's impact on important ecological features and is supported by extensive survey work which confirms the ecological habitats and species likely to be affected by the Scheme. The Scheme avoids and mitigates all significant adverse effects on internationally, nationally and locally designated biodiversity sites and other important ecological features such as protected species and habitats, and veteran trees, during the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases. This has been achieved through a considered and iterative design informed by a design team with qualified professional ecologists and includes avoidance, buffers and mitigation measures that will be secured through the various management plan requirements included in Schedule 2 of the **Draft DCO [REP1-005**]. As detailed in the **BNG Assessment [REP1-023]**, the Scheme is predicted to exceed the BNG target of 10%. The **Framework LEMP** (Revision 02) **[EN10152/APP/7.14]** has been updated at Deadline 2 to confirm that the target increase of at least 10% BNG will be across all biodiversity unit types. This is secured through Requirement 6 in Schedule 2 in the **Draft DCO [REP1-005]**.
REP1-061	Janet Raynor	4. footpaths - bridleways - being a country village, we have many dog walkers, horse riders, walkers and residents that enjoy the environment of our quiet village, for leisure purposes and daily lives, THIS is WHY residents bought their homes here, but these plans for the solar plant will KILL that environment and residents way of life. Paths are being removed, changed, hedgerows removed and replaced with fencing, little wildlife left to enjoy, and we have NO say in any of this.	The Applicant will maintain PRoW connectivity during the construction phase of the Solar PV Site and Grid Connection Corridor. Access locations for construction vehicles have been selected to minimise any interactions with PRoW and robust procedures would be put in place to ensure the safety of PRoW users. All PRoW to be temporarily closed will have a suitable localised diversion in place to allow continued use by the local community. These mitigation measures are set out in the **Framework PRoWMP [REP1-027]** and **Framework CTMP [APP-206, APP-207]** which will be developed into detailed management plans post consent. The detailed management plans must substantially in accordance with the framework management plans and require

Examination Library Ref.	Name	Comment	Applicant's Response
			approval from City of Doncaster Council prior to construction. This is secured by Requirements 13 and 17 in Schedule 2 to the **Draft DCO [REP1-005]**. During the operation and maintenance phase of the Scheme, the existing PRoW passing through or running adjacent to the Order limits are expected to be unaffected, aside from Sykehouse 29, Moss 6 and Fenwick 14 that will be permanently diverted. The permanent diversions of these PRoW would increase their journey length by minimal distances (less than 50 m) and no significant effects on PRoW users are therefore anticipated. Buffers between PRoW and perimeter fencing have also been included in the design, with fencing being installed a minimum distance of 20 m either side of the centre of the PRoW where solar infrastructure lies to both sides (creating a 40 m wide corridor between the fence lines), or 15 m from the PRoW centreline if solar infrastructure is to one side only. Details of the proposed landscape mitigation can be found within the **Framework LEMP [REP1-029]**, as well as on the Indicative Landscape Masterplan within Appendix A of this document. Given the linear nature of PRoW, the range of noise impacts along them forming the ambient noise environment and the transient usage of a PRoW, a material change in the experience of using the PRoW as a result of noise emissions from the Scheme which could affect PRoW users' health or quality of life is not anticipated.
REP1-061	Janet Raynor	5. There are so many other alternative to using farming land, Italy as banned any further expansion of solar farms because the technology is already outdated. The panels are made in china, travelling thousands of miles, they will need replacing every 10 years as their productivity reduces over time, therefore the area will have to suffer that every 10 years. Millions of metal/glass panels are non recyclable and there is only ONE company in UK that deals with them. This net zero plan is being rushed through for the labour government to get to their target no matter what the costs are. Its a political agenda and UK residents will foot the bill. No evidence as been provided that other systems/alternatives have been researched or considered, and certainly, no consideration to residents effected by these plans have given. These plans will effect millions of people for years to come but again, seems to be unimportant in their agenda.	The Government has identified through its energy policy, most recently in the NPS EN-1 and NPS EN-3, that there is an urgent need for large scale capacity low-carbon energy generation in the UK. As discussed in the Applicant's **Planning Statement [APP-246]** and **Statement of Need [APP-192]**, EN-1 and EN-3 identify large-scale solar energy generation, such as the Scheme, as being required to meet this need. The **Statement of Need [APP-192]** also notes that, whilst decentralised generation has an important role to play in decarbonisation, on its own, smaller scale solar, including rooftop solar, is not likely to deliver a sufficient total capacity at the required pace and at an affordable cost to meet the Government's targets. Therefore, smaller scale solar, including rooftop solar, must be considered as additional to, as opposed to instead of, the need for large-scale, ground-mounted solar like this Scheme. Brownfield land was considered for the Scheme following a review of the local authority brownfield land register. However, it was concluded that there was no available or suitable brownfield land for the Scheme as it would compete or be in conflict with local planning policy seeking to deliver housing and mixed-use developments, and the land next to the Existing National Grid Thorpe Marsh Substation was being developed for another energy project. This is explained in **ES Volume I, Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution [APP-055]**. The Application includes a **Framework SSCEP [APP-204]** which sets out that the procurement strategy for the Scheme must be shaped to maximise opportunities to local businesses, with an ethical procurement policy, whilst seeking to minimise associated environmental impacts and safeguarding human rights in the supply chain. A detailed SSCEP is secured by Requirement 16 of Schedule 2 to the **Draft DCO [REP1-005]** and the detailed SSCEP must be substantially in accordance with the **Framework SSCEP [APP-204]**.

Examination Library Ref.	Name	Comment	Applicant's Response
REP1-061	Janet Raynor	6. Roads/Access - Local roads are in such a bad condition, they can not handle the daily traffic that they already carry. Repairs that are carried out are a man with a bucket and shovel, filling in holes, which breakup with in days. The road edges have fallen away into grass verges. There are single track lanes leading into Fenwick and Heywood, already unsuitable for heavy vehicles, theres two main train lines. which regularly get stuck down, broken and closed, sometimes for a week at a time for repairs, and a 15 mile official diversion which is completely ignored by locals, using these single track lanes as a rat run, causing further damage to poorly maintained lanes, no passing places, no paths, already used by farm and haulage vehicles, and can NOT support the traffic that uses it currently. These lanes become UNUSABLE by walkers, riders due to speeds and irresponsible drivers. There are livestock, children and elder residents that fear for their safety on these lanes already, let alone when used as rat runs. The proposed alternative entrance in Moss, is on a blind bend, traffic in both directions will have very poor view of vehicles entering/leaving that entrance and is a major accident waiting to happen.	A full and detailed assessment of potential traffic and transport impacts from construction at sensitive receptors has been undertaken within **Volume I, Chapter 13: Transport and Access [REP1-015]**. Consideration has been given to traffic routing, timing, and access points to the Scheme during construction and traffic during the operation and maintenance phase would be minimal. The **Transport Assessment [APP-179]** and **Framework CTMP [APP-206, APP-207]** provide full details of embedded mitigation measures that are proposed to prevent or reduce potential adverse effects associated with construction traffic on local roads. This includes measures such as suitable agreed HGV routes and timing restrictions, the use of traffic marshals at site accesses and crossing points, and the development of a communications strategy for those working on the Scheme. A detailed CTMP (which must substantially accord with the **Framework CTMP [APP-206, APP-207]**) will need to be approved post consent prior to construction with the relevant local authorities and this is secured by Requirement 13 in Schedule 2 to the **Draft DCO [REP1-005]**. In addition, pre and post construction road condition surveys will be undertaken at identified locations in coordination with the relevant Local Highway Authority, as referenced in Section 5.2 of the **Framework CTMP [APP-206, APP-207]**. Where these surveys identify upgrades needed to undertake the construction of the Scheme, or following the construction phase then these works will be undertaken. Indicative routing of construction traffic is set out in **Volume II, Figure 13-3: Indicative HGV Routing [APP-230]**. It is acknowledged that there are railway lines crossing these routes, however, appropriate mitigation would be implemented to manage these. Construction HGV would not deviate from the defined routing which will be confirmed post consent. **ES Volume I, Chapter 13 Transport and Access [REP1-015]** includes a comprehensive assessment of the impact of construction traffic. Paragraph 13.7.29 onward sets out the assessment in terms of road safety, including consideration of road users and pedestrians. Table 13-24 demonstrates that the magnitude of safety impact of the Scheme would be very low which is not a significant impact. As detailed in Section 5.5 of the **Framework CTMP [APP-206, APP-207]**, a Traffic Safety Control Officer will be appointed by the Applicant to develop, implement, and manage the detailed CTMP. As secured in Paragraph 2.5.5 of the **Framework OEMP [APP-197]**, the access to the Solar PV Site proposed via West Lane will be for emergency use only
REP1-061	Janet Raynor	7.The excuse that some of the land being used for this proposal is poor agricultural land, but its been used for 100s of years as agricultural land, and is currently in use.	As set out in **ES Volume I, Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use [REP1-013]**, an agricultural land survey was undertaken and categorised 7% of the Solar PV Site as BMV land. With the exception of a relatively small area of BMV land proposed for structural planting, impacts on this BMV land will be temporary and reversible. In addition, due to the small scale of this BMV land, it is not currently farmed for high-quality agricultural food production and was recently used for biomass crops. Within the Solar PV Site, fields currently used to grow arable crops (with some grazing) would cease to be part of a working farm during construction and operation, although there is potential for grazing by sheep for management of the grassland. The

Examination Library Ref.	Name	Comment	Applicant's Response
			Grid Connection Corridor, if required, would also intersect a number of agricultural land holdings, but will be available for agricultural use again post construction, given cables will be buried at sufficient depth to enable agricultural activities to continue on the surface. Further information can be found in the **Framework SMP [APP-199]**. Prior to the start of construction, a detailed SMP will be submitted to and approved by the local authority (as outlined in the **Framework CEMP [REP1-019]** and secured by Requirement 15 of Schedule 2 to the **Draft DCO [REP1-005]**). This will ensure soils are not degraded and farming activities can re-commence following completion of the construction phase along the Grid Connection Corridor and decommissioning phase within the Solar PV Site.
REP1-061	Janet Raynor	8.The building of these sites will be sold off by the likes of Boom, to foreign investors, not British companies, all profits will go out of UK abroad and we will still be buying our power from overseas at whatever price they set, UK will have NO control over prices, just like we don't now, therefore, no benefit to british residents in reducing our bills.	The Applicant is a wholly owned subsidiary of BOOM Developments Limited who specialise in non-subsidised solar and battery storage projects. BOOM Developments Limited was founded in 2020, and the name BOOM is an acronym for Build Own Operate Maintain. This reflects the organisation's ongoing intentions to be involved in sustainable energy projects from inception to operation. Further information on BOOM Developments Limited can be found in the **Funding Statement [APP-019]**. The Applicant currently has no intention to sell the Scheme to external investors and all electricity produced would be distributed around the UK via the National Grid. This will contribute to the UK government's target of reaching a net-zero carbon electricity grid by 2035 and an overall net-zero carbon economy by 2050.
REP1-061	Janet Raynor	9. Fire/storm risks of panels - there as been several large storms in UK recently, and many more overseas, recking solar panels, burning, smashing them , flying metal and glass over large swaths of land, into adjoining land, injuring livestock, and many, have been left broken and unrepaired. There can be no 100% guarantee that this will NOT happen in here ? Companys will fold and go out of business, insurance cover will be useless, just have to look at Glenfield situation. If that happens, whoses going to take over putting things right? Cleaning up sites, land will be USELESS for agriculture again and the countryside will be a waste land covered in broken metal and glass . Do we really need to risk this for UK ?	The Scheme has been designed to withstand the weather experienced in the UK. As detailed in Section 2.2 of the **Framework OEMP [APP-197]**, it is anticipated that regular maintenance and servicing would take place during the operation and maintenance phase, including the inspection, removal, reconstruction, refurbishment or replacement of faulty or broken equipment. This will ensure the continued safe and effective operation and maintenance of the Scheme. An assessment of Major Accidents and Disasters, which includes extreme weather events, is set out in **ES Volume I, Chapter 14: Other Environmental Topics [APP-066]**. This concludes that there is the potential for significant effects if an event does occur, however, the risk of such events occurring is low for the Scheme and significant effects on the environment are therefore not anticipated.
REP1-061	Janet Raynor	10. Security – Doncaster as a huge [redacted] – including other areas close to Doncaster with the same population. [redacted] WHY should we be subjected to this? The answer is WE SHOULD NOT BE!!!!	As described in **ES Volume I, Chapter 2: The Scheme [APP-054]**, the Scheme incorporates various security measures, including fencing and Closed-Circuit Television (CCTV) with 24-hour response personnel, which will mitigate against the risk of criminal activity. The perimeter of the Solar PV Site would be secured with a stock proof mesh-type security fence with wooden posts. Palisade fencing would be used around the BESS Area and On-Site Substation which would provide an added layer of security. These measures are considered to be appropriate for a scheme of this nature, similar to other consented solar schemes, and are in line with what will be required by the insurer of the Scheme.
REP1-061	Janet Raynor	Finally - village community - this plan as divided the residents, setting family against family, friend against friend and neighbour against neighbour. Ruining any community spirit which existed in the Village	The Applicant appreciates that the potential for the Scheme to have adverse effects creates uncertainly and anxiety for local residents. The comprehensive and detailed approach to consultation, Scheme design, and the EIA process has allowed any adverse effects to be identified early and the effects to be mitigated, where

Examination Library Ref.	Name	Comment	Applicant's Response
			practicable, such as through the buffers and vegetation screening proposed as part of the Scheme. The Applicant is committed to ongoing consultation with the community so that anxieties can be communicated and as far as possible addressed throughout all stages of the Scheme. Paragraph 2.1.14 of the **Framework CEMP [REP1-019]** confirms that a Community Liaison Group will also be set up and a Community Liaison Officer (or alternative role) established during construction to facilitate liaison between representatives of people living in the vicinity of the Order limits and other relevant organisations in relation to the impacts of the Scheme. The Applicant will produce a detailed CEMP post consent which will be in accordance with the **Framework CEMP [REP1-019]**, as secured by Requirement 11 of Schedule 2 in the **Draft DCO [REP1-005]**. The implementation of Requirement 3 in Schedule 2 of the **Draft DCO [REP1-005]** will allow feedback on impacts of the Scheme and mitigation measures to be considered and acted upon if required.
REP1-060	Jane Beastall	Objection to application for Development order for Fenwick Solar Farm/Power station. Fenwick is a unique small village of which there are very few left in Doncaster and even the surrounding area of South Yorkshire. This village and surrounding environment should be preserved and not developed on an industrial scale creating a waste land not in keeping or in balance with its countryside location. The huge impacts that will be imposed and enforced on the village, residential area and environment by this development are excessive and irreversible causing unjustified damage.	The Applicant notes this comment and provides a full response to each specific issue raised in the rows below.
REP1-060	Jane Beastall	Nature and agricultural land are required for balance food security/production are in need of preservation and assistance not total destruction by excessive schemes.	As set out in **ES Volume I, Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use [REP1-013]**, an agricultural land survey was undertaken and categorised 7% of the Solar PV Site as BMV land. With the exception of a relatively small area of BMV land proposed for structural planting, impacts on this BMV land will be temporary and reversible. In addition, due to the small scale of this BMV land, it is not currently farmed for high-quality agricultural food production and was recently used for biomass crops. Within the Solar PV Site, fields currently used to grow arable crops (with some grazing) would cease to be part of a working farm during construction and operation, although there is potential for grazing by sheep for management of the grassland. The Grid Connection Corridor, if required, would also intersect a number of agricultural land holdings, but will be available for agricultural use again post construction, given cables will be buried at sufficient depth to enable agricultural activities to continue on the surface. Further information can be found in the **Framework SMP [APP-199]**. Prior to the start of construction, a detailed SMP will be submitted to and approved by the local authority (as outlined in the **Framework CEMP [REP1-019]** and secured by Requirement 15 of Schedule 2 to the **Draft DCO [REP1-005]**). This will ensure soils are not degraded and farming activities can re-commence following completion of the construction phase along the Grid Connection Corridor and decommissioning phase within the Solar PV Site.

Examination Library Ref.	Name	Comment	Applicant's Response
REP1-060	Jane Beastall	The application will consume most of the green space and countryside of Fenwick replacing it with industrial scale solar farm and associated intrusive infrastructure battery storage replacing countryside with a carbon footprint for a lifetime with goods made and transported from all corners of the world.	The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment in **ES Volume I, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity [APP-062]** recognises that there will be landscape and visual impacts during the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases of the Scheme. Whilst some impacts will remain at year 15 of operation and maintenance, they will largely be screened or filtered by existing vegetation or proposed planting. Where the potential for adverse visual effects has been identified, landscape mitigation, including vegetative screening, has been embedded within the design of the Scheme to reduce these effects as far as possible. Proposed mitigation has been designed to integrate with the existing landscape character of the Solar PV Site. Details of the proposed landscape mitigation can be found within the **Framework LEMP [REP1-019]** which includes an Indicative Landscape Masterplan at Appendix A, alongside Section 5.4 of the **Design and Access Statement [APP-191]**. Existing hedgerows will be retained as far as practicable. Buffers of grassland, native scrub and woodland will be created around the edge of the Solar PV Areas and other larger areas of grassland will be created, which will offer habitat for wildlife, including foraging habitat for a number of species. The Scheme design incorporates buffers from residential properties to minimise the potential for adverse impacts on visual amenity. This includes specimen tree and shrub planting or the planting of more mature trees and shrubs, where practicable. In regard to the carbon footprint of the Scheme, **ES Volume I, Chapter 6: Climate Change [APP-224]** presents the assessment of the likely significant effects on the climate as a result of the Scheme. As detailed in Table 6-19 to Table 6-20, there would be minor adverse (not significant) effects on global GHG emissions during the construction and decommissioning phases, however, there would be a beneficial (significant) effect during the operation and maintenance phase due to the carbon insanity remaining substantially below that of a gas-fired CCGT generating facility throughout its design life, its role in achieving the rate of transition required by nationally set policy commitments, and supporting the trajectory towards net zero.
REP1-060	Jane Beastall	Not only is this application in an inaccessible area of the countryside/land but now Boom power the applicant have set their sights on seeking possession by way of a compulsory purchase order to change the village lanes/streets/verges public rights of way by street re-alinement and anything else that may be an obstacle to there plan. How can this be allowed and granted there is no balance approach to this and it demonstrates the insensitive almost hostile way this application has proceeded with no regard for the inhabitants of Fenwick. This compulsory purchase order was never mention or even proposed during the consultation phase it was even a late submission to the planning application therefore should not be part of any consent order. Boom were aware of the restrictive and all inaccessible location of this site and all the issues it would bring.	The Applicant acknowledges the concerns raised regarding the potential use of compulsory acquisition for the Scheme. The **Statement of Reasons [APP-018]** sets out in detail why it is necessary, proportionate, and justifiable for the Applicant to seek powers to acquire land compulsorily, create and compulsorily acquire new rights over land and impose restrictions, and extinguish or override existing rights over land, as well as powers to take temporary possession of land to construct and maintain the Scheme, as a last resort. The Applicant considers that the clear benefits provided in respect of new renewable energy generation and meeting of the Government's net zero targets meet the compelling public interest test for this acquisition. Section 7.5 of the **Statement of Reasons [APP-018]** includes the alternatives considered to compulsory acquisition.
REP1-060	Jane Beastall	The impacts on the village and surrounding area are never ending and seem to be unaddressed by the applicant. After attending the hearing at Doncaster racecourse, it was evident that it was all about what the applicant and local authority wanted very little about the concerns or impact to the area the environment and the residents.	As set out in the **Design and Access Statement [APP-191]**, design principles have guided, and will continue to guide, the Scheme from an early stage to develop a good design that balances the need to maximise renewable energy generation from the Scheme, whilst minimising potential adverse impacts and providing mitigation and enhancement measures. Measures to minimise the effects of the Scheme during the

Examination Library Ref.	Name	Comment	Applicant's Response
			construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases are provided in the **Framework CEMP [REP1-019]**, **Framework CTMP [APP-206, APP-207]**, **Framework OEMP [APP-197]**, and **Framework DEMP [REP1-021]**. The Applicant is committed to ongoing consultation with the community so that anxieties can be communicated and as far as possible addressed throughout all stages of the Scheme. Paragraph 2.1.14 of the **Framework CEMP [REP1-019]** confirms that a Community Liaison Group will also be set up and a Community Liaison Officer (or alternative role) established during construction to facilitate liaison between representatives of people living in the vicinity of the Order limits and other relevant organisations in relation to the impacts of the Scheme. The Applicant will produce a detailed CEMP post consent which will be in accordance with the **Framework CEMP [REP1-019]**, as secured by Requirement 11 of Schedule 2 in the **Draft DCO [REP1-005]**. The implementation of Requirement 3 in Schedule 2 of the **Draft DCO [REP1-005]** will allow feedback on impacts of the Scheme and mitigation measures to be considered and acted upon if required.
REP1-060	Jane Beastall	The open rural space around Fenwick provides many recreational opportunities which are invaluable all this will be lost and replaced by products creating noise pollution and even risk of fire.	Impacts to recreational facilities within 2 km of the Order limits have been considered in **ES Volume I, Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use [REP1-013]**. Table 12-27 confirms that effects to community facilities and visitor attractions during the construction and decommissioning phases would be temporary and minor adverse (not significant). Table 12-28 confirms that there would be no effect (not significant) to community facilities and visitor attractions during the operation and maintenance. As set out in **ES Volume I, Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [APP-063]**, measures to minimise effects from noise as a result of the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases of the Scheme are secured in the **Framework CEMP [REP1-019]**, **Framework OEMP [APP-197]**, and **Framework DEMP [REP1-021]** which includes BPM to be applied, as far as reasonably practicable. The assessment of noise effects concludes that no significant noise effects at nearby sensitive receptors would occur during the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phase. As confirmed in the **Outline Design Parameters Statement [APP-193]**, the BESS Area was selected to accommodate a minimum buffer zone of at least 500 m from any residential properties. This will ensure that any disruption to the local community is minimised in the unlikely event that BESS Container failure should occur. Paragraph 2.1.4 of the **Framework BSMP [APP-205]** confirms the BESS Area will be designed to address prevailing industry standards and good practice at a time of detailed design and implementation. This document also extensively documents how the probability of a BESS Container failure incident is minimised by the design and proposed operating procedures, and that if a failure occurs these ensure this will be limited to one BESS Container. The **Framework BSMP [APP-205]** sets out the controls in place to ensure that, in the unlikely event a fire did occur, any impacts arising from the fire (such as fumes, or water run off) will be managed so there are no impacts on local communities beyond the Order limits. As secured in Paragraph 3.5.5, an ERP will be developed post consent to facilitate effective and safe emergency response. This will follow UK NFCC and NFPA 855 guidelines and will be finalised in

Examination Library Ref.	Name	Comment	Applicant's Response
			consultation with SYFRS. Requirement 5 of Schedule 2 of the **Draft DCO [REP1-005]** requires the submission and approval of a detailed BSMP, which must be substantially in accordance with the **Framework BSMP [APP-205].**
REP1-060	Jane Beastall	There are many public footpaths which will be impacted and disrupted by the solar farm throughout this process, including the visual impact which will permanently change the landscape for generations.	The Applicant will maintain PRoW connectivity during the construction phase of the Solar PV Site and Grid Connection Corridor. Access locations for construction vehicles have been selected to minimise any interactions with PRoW and robust procedures would be put in place to ensure the safety of PRoW users. All PRoW to be temporarily closed will have a suitable localised diversion in place to allow continued use by the local community. These mitigation measures are set out in the **Framework PRoWMP [REP1-027]** and **Framework CTMP [APP-206, APP-207]** which will be developed into detailed management plans post consent. The detailed management plans must substantially in accordance with the framework management plans and require approval from City of Doncaster Council prior to construction. This is secured by Requirements 13 and 17 in Schedule 2 to the **Draft DCO [REP1-005]**. During the operation and maintenance phase of the Scheme, the existing PRoW passing through or running adjacent to the Order limits are expected to be unaffected, aside from Sykehouse 29, Moss 6 and Fenwick 14 that will be permanently diverted. The permanent diversions of these PRoW would increase their journey length by minimal distances (less than 50 m) and no significant effects on PRoW users are therefore anticipated. Buffers between PRoW and perimeter fencing have also been included in the design, with fencing being installed a minimum distance of 20 m either side of the centre of the PRoW where solar infrastructure lies to both sides (creating a 40 m wide corridor between the fence lines), or 15 m from the PRoW centreline if solar infrastructure is to one side only. Details of the proposed landscape mitigation can be found within the **Framework LEMP [REP1-029]**, as well as on the Indicative Landscape Masterplan within Appendix A of this document. Given the linear nature of PRoW, the range of noise impacts along them forming the ambient noise environment and the transient usage of a PRoW, a material change in the experience of using the PRoW as a result of noise emissions from the Scheme which could affect PRoW users' health or quality of life is not anticipated.
REP1-060	Jane Beastall	Wildlife and food production will be the other casualties permanently lost to this development.	**ES Volume I, Chapter 8: Ecology [APP-060]** provides an assessment of the Scheme's impact on important ecological features and is supported by extensive survey work which confirms the ecological habitats and species likely to be affected by the Scheme. The Scheme avoids and mitigates all significant adverse effects on internationally, nationally and locally designated biodiversity sites and other important ecological features such as protected species and habitats, and veteran trees, during the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases. This has been achieved through a considered and iterative design informed by a design team with qualified professional ecologists and includes avoidance, buffers and mitigation measures that will be secured through management plan requirements included in Schedule 2 of the **Draft DCO [REP1-005]**. As set out in **ES Volume I, Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use [REP1-013]**, an agricultural land survey was undertaken and categorised 7% of the Solar PV Site as BMV land. With the exception of a relatively small area of BMV land proposed

Examination Library Ref.	Name	Comment	Applicant's Response
			for structural planting, impacts on this BMV land will be temporary and reversible. In addition, due to the small scale of this BMV land, it is not currently farmed for high-quality agricultural food production and was recently used for biomass crops. Within the Solar PV Site, fields currently used to grow arable crops (with some grazing) would cease to be part of a working farm during construction and operation, although there is potential for grazing by sheep for management of the grassland. The Grid Connection Corridor, if required, would also intersect a number of agricultural land holdings, but will be available for agricultural use again post construction, given cables will be buried at sufficient depth to enable agricultural activities to continue on the surface. Further information can be found in the **Framework SMP [APP-199]**. Prior to the start of construction, a detailed SMP will be submitted to and approved by the local authority (as outlined in the **Framework CEMP [REP1-019]** and secured by Requirement 15 of Schedule 2 to the **Draft DCO [REP1-005]**). This will ensure soils are not degraded and farming activities can re-commence following completion of the construction phase along the Grid Connection Corridor and decommissioning phase within the Solar PV Site.
REP1-060	Jane Beastall	No mitigation solutions have been suggested to provide the residence with quite enjoyment of their homes and surrounding area during the construction phase of this disruptive development which is anticipated to be least 24 months. As with all construction development it is likely this will be extended inflicting further stress to residents.	As described in **ES Volume I, Chapter 2: The Scheme [APP-054]**, subject to being granted development consent and following a final investment decision, currently the earliest construction could start is in 2028. Construction of the Solar PV Site and Grid Connection Cables is anticipated to start in tandem. The Grid Connection Cables would require approximately 12 months, and the construction of the Solar PV Site would require an estimated 24 months, with the operation and maintenance phase anticipated to commence in 2030. The construction phase could be of longer duration; however, these timings have been used within the ES as a worst-case assumption for the technical assessments presented in **ES Volume I, Chapter 6** to **Chapter 14 [APP-058 to APP-066]**. It is assumed activity in a shorter construction phase would be more condensed and intensive, and therefore have greater effects. The technical chapters within the ES each provide clarification on the assumptions used for the construction phase. The potential effects of the Scheme during the construction phase are set out in **ES Volume I, Chapter 6** to **Chapter 14 [APP-058 to APP-066]**. All measures to minimise community disturbance as a result of the Scheme during the construction phase are provided in the **Framework CEMP [REP1-019]** and **Framework CTMP [APP-206, APP-207]**. The Applicant is committed to ongoing consultation with the community so that anxieties can be communicated and as far as possible addressed throughout all stages of the Scheme. Paragraph 2.1.14 of the **Framework CEMP [REP1-019]** confirms that a Community Liaison Group will also be set up and a Community Liaison Officer (or alternative role) established during construction to facilitate liaison between representatives of people living in the vicinity of the Order limits and other relevant organisations in relation to the impacts of the Scheme. The Applicant will produce a detailed CEMP post consent which will be in accordance with the **Framework CEMP [REP1-019]**, as secured by Requirement 11 of Schedule 2 in the **Draft DCO [REP1-005]**.

Examination Library Ref.	Name	Comment	Applicant's Response
			The implementation of Requirement 3 in Schedule 2 of the **Draft DCO [REP1-005]** will allow feedback on impacts of the Scheme and mitigation measures to be considered and acted upon if required.
REP1-060	Jane Beastall	The constant flow of additional traffic in the village to and from the office and welfare facilities will be endless with up to 400 workers being there during peak times, where are all these people and vehicles going to park and use welfare facilities. The local roads will become congested impacting daily activities of including work/school/and general living, what traffic management will be in place to alleviate traffic jams at the end of the lane on a busy junction where traffic already queues.	A full and detailed assessment of potential traffic and transport impacts from construction at sensitive receptors has been undertaken within **ES Volume I, Chapter 13: Transport and Access [REP1-015]**. Consideration has been given to traffic routing, timing, and access points to the Scheme during construction and traffic during the operation and maintenance phase would be minimal. The **Transport Assessment [APP-179]** and **Framework CTMP [APP-206, APP-207]** provide full details of embedded mitigation measures that are proposed to prevent or reduce potential adverse effects associated with construction traffic on local roads. This includes measures such as suitable agreed HGV routes and timing restrictions, the use of traffic marshals at site accesses and crossing points, and the development of a communications strategy for those working on the Scheme. A detailed CTMP (which must substantially accord with the **Framework CTMP [APP-206, APP-207]**) will need to be approved post consent prior to construction with the relevant local authorities and this is secured by Requirement 13 in Schedule 2 to the **Draft DCO [REP1-005]**.
REP1-060	Jane Beastall	Furthermore, once the life span of the site is finished what planning conditions will be attached that required the site to be returned to agriculture use and not for further development as has happened at the Selby coal fields sites. The battle lines are deepening in pursuit of town values and countryside values there are no clear justification to obliterate the countryside in pursuit of urban lifestyles.	The Applicant has committed to fully decommissioning the Scheme and returning the Order limits to its existing use at this stage but acknowledges that some components may be retained. This may be, for example, due to it being considered that leaving the export cables underground is less disruptive to local communities and environments than removing them. Within 12 months of the date which it is decided to decommission any part of the Scheme, the undertaker will produce a detailed DEMP for approval by the relevant local planning authority as secured by Requirement 18 of Schedule 2 in the **Draft DCO [REP1-005]**. The detailed DEMP must be substantially in accordance with the **Framework DEMP [REP1-021]** and will include confirmation as to what components may remain, and if so, whether further controls are required to ensure their suitability in respect of environmental matters.
REP1-065	Paul Connolly	Biodiversity Aspect Given the magnitude of over 1000 acres of countryside this proposal occupies, consideration must be given to the tong-term displacement and disruption to the natural habitat of countryside species. They have NO Means to object!	**ES Volume I, Chapter 8: Ecology [APP-060]** provides an assessment of the Scheme's impact on important ecological features and is supported by extensive survey work which confirms the ecological habitats and species likely to be affected by the Scheme. The Scheme avoids and mitigates all significant adverse effects on internationally, nationally and locally designated biodiversity sites and other important ecological features such as protected species and habitats, and veteran trees, during the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases. This has been achieved through a considered and iterative design informed by a design team with qualified professional ecologists and includes avoidance, buffers and mitigation measures that will be secured through the various management plan requirements included in Schedule 2 of the **Draft DCO [REP1-005**].

Examination Library Ref.	Name	Comment	Applicant's Response
			As detailed in the **BNG Assessment [REP1-023]**, the Scheme is predicted to exceed the BNG target of 10%. The **Framework LEMP** (Revision 02) **[EN10152/APP/7.14]** has been updated at Deadline 2 to confirm that the target increase of at least 10% BNG will be across all biodiversity unit types. This is secured through Requirement 6 in Schedule 2 in the **Draft DCO [REP1-005]**.
REP1-065	Paul Connolly	Environment Aspect The proposed farm will dominate and be detrimental to the character of Fenwick and surrounding villages. Families and visitors enjoy the countryside aspect this area has to offer. Much will be lost to their appreciation of the surrounding area, blighted with panes, inverters and battery installations. Who would take pleasure in gazing upon a landscape fitted with 6.5 foot mesh fencing, 11 foot high transformer/inverter units and battery storage units almost 10 feet high and forty feet tong. Walkways and bridle paths, despite re rooting will offer little compensation to what was peaceful and tranquil village.	The **Outline Design Parameters Statement [APP-193]** sets out the design parameters for all elements of the Scheme, including maximum dimensions of fencing, Solar PV Panels, Field Stations, BESS Containers, and the On-Site Substation. **ES Volume I, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity [APP-062]** recognises that there will be landscape and visual impacts during the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases of the Scheme. Whilst some impacts will remain at year 15 of operation, they will largely be screened or filtered by existing vegetation or proposed planting. Where the potential for adverse visual impacts has been identified, landscape mitigation, including vegetative screening, has been embedded within the design of the Scheme to reduce these impacts as far as possible. Proposed mitigation has been designed to integrate with the existing landscape character of the Solar PV Site. Details of the proposed screening and buffers including existing vegetation to be retained and proposed planting are provided in the **Framework LEMP [REP1-029]** and illustrated on the Indicative Landscape Masterplan included as Appendix A. Existing hedgerows will be retained as far as practicable. Buffers of grassland, native scrub and woodland will be created around the edge of the Solar PV Site and other larger areas of grassland will be created, which will offer habitat for wildlife, including foraging habitat for a number of species. These buffers minimise the potential for adverse impacts.
REP1-065	Paul Connolly	Unsuitability of Transport Infrastructure The transport and construction spanning approximately 24 months will have serious detrimental effects on the local lane and highway network serving Fenwick Village. The suggested routes embrace single track lanes whose sub structure is unlikely to cope with the weight and frequency of H.GV. traffic. The route through Askern will encounter three level crossings (East Coast Mainline) and parked vehicles either side of the road through Askern Centre, the route also passes Moss Road Primary School which could present a danger to young lives. Due consideration must be given to the Health (from additional pollution) and safety of residents, their children and vehicles. The roads are currently in a state of disrepair which will be inevitably worsened by the type and shear volume of traffic.	As detailed in the response above, a full and detailed assessment of potential traffic and transport impacts at sensitive receptors has been undertaken within **ES Volume I, Chapter 13: Transport and Access [REP1-015]** which considered traffic routing, timing, and access points. Proposed embedded mitigation measures are set out in the **Transport Assessment [APP-179]** and **Framework CTMP [APP-206, APP-207]**. Indicative routing of construction traffic is set out in **Volume II, Figure 13-3: Indicative HGV Routing [APP-230]**. It is acknowledged that there are railway lines crossing these routes, however, appropriate mitigation would be implemented to manage these. Construction HGV would not deviate from the defined routes which will be confirmed post consent. **ES Volume I, Chapter 13 Transport and Access [REP1-015]** includes a comprehensive assessment of the impact of construction traffic. Paragraph 13.7.29 onward sets out the assessment in terms of road safety, including consideration of road users and pedestrians. Table 13-24 demonstrates that the magnitude of safety impact of the Scheme would be very low which is not a significant impact. As detailed in Section 5.5 of the **Framework CTMP [APP-206, APP-207]**, a Traffic Safety Control Officer will be appointed by the Applicant to develop, implement, and manage the detailed CTMP.

Examination Library Ref.	Name	Comment	Applicant's Response
			Pre and post construction road condition surveys will be undertaken at identified locations in coordination with the relevant Local Highway Authority, as referenced in Section 5.2 of the **Framework CTMP [APP-206, APP-207]**. Where these surveys identify upgrades needed to undertake the construction of the Scheme, or following the construction phase then these works will be undertaken. Paragraph 14.2.22 to 14.2.24 in **ES Volume I, Chapter 14: Other Environmental Topics [APP-066]** confirm that construction phase traffic has been modelled and compared against the relevant screening criteria. As construction phase road traffic volumes are not expected to meet the thresholds above for which detailed modelling is required, there are no likely significant air quality impacts from traffic predicted during the construction phase. Due to the nature of the Scheme, a significant change to traffic flows is not anticipated to occur during the operation and maintenance phase of the Scheme and, therefore, no likely significant air quality impacts are anticipated.
REP1-065	Paul Connolly	Value For Money Aspect Our local M.P. Mr E. Milliband predicted with the advent of this farm we would all benefit from up to £300 per annum reduction to our electricity energy bills. This appears to have disappeared as a benefit and in our opinion, Mr Milliband should direct his obsession with costly NET ZERO to larger polluting countries in the World, disinterest in his NET ZERO vision.	The Applicant is committed to establishing a CBF which are designed to provide additional support and tangible benefits to local communities impacted by large infrastructure projects. They are voluntary commitments by developers to enhance the local area. The terms of reference will be discussed and agreed with a community liaison group. The exact details of the administration of the fund will be developed together with residents' representatives. CBFs are not considered in the overall planning balance when the Planning Inspectorate makes a recommendation or the Secretary of State grants consent, meaning the Examining Authority must still be satisfied the Scheme is appropriate even without the CBF in place.
REP1-065	Paul Connolly	Conclusion: Given there are in our surrounding area the following Solar Farm Projects, the inclusion of Fenwick as a contributor to NET ZERO targets and benefits seems negligible in our opinion and is a blight on our once valued Green and Pleasant Land. 1. Soay Solar Farm & Thornton Greenes Grid Park 2. Kingfisher Solar Farm East Yorkshire 3. Driffield Solar Farm 4. Mylen Leah Solar Farm East Yorkshire 5. Peartree Hitt Solar Farm East Yorkshire 6. Whitestone Solar Farm South Yorkshire Please DO NOT approve the Fenwick Proposal	The Government has identified through its energy policy, most recently in the Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1) and the National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy (EN-3), that there is an urgent need for large scale capacity low-carbon energy generation in the UK. As discussed in the Applicant's **Planning Statement [APP-190]** and **Statement of Need [APP-192]**, EN-1 and EN-3 identify large-scale solar energy generation, such as the Scheme, as being required to meet this need. Developing the Scheme at its proposed size and with its substantial benefits will therefore be an important contribution to meeting this urgent need and, as such, there is a clear and accepted case for the Scheme. A summary of the cumulative assessment can be found within **ES Volume I, Chapter 15: Cumulative Effects and Interactions [APP-067]**. These other developments have not been considered in the cumulative assessment as they are located outside the ZoI for the cumulative assessment.
REP1-063	Mark Henstock	I am writing to formally object to the proposed development of the Fenwick Solar Farm near the village of Fenwick in Doncaster. While I fully support the transition to renewable energy, this proposal is inappropriate in terms of scale, location, and the potential negative impacts on the local community, environment, and my personal property	The Applicant notes this comment and provides a full response to each specific issue raised in the rows below.
REP1-063	Mark Henstock	1. Impact on Local Landscape and Character The development spans more than 400 hectares of predominantly agricultural land. This scale of industrialisation would irreversibly alter the rural character of Fenwick	The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment in **ES Volume I, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity [APP-062]** recognises that there will be landscape and visual impacts during the construction, operation and maintenance, and

Examination Library Ref.	Name	Comment	Applicant's Response
		and its surrounding areas, significantly affecting the natural landscape valued by both residents and visitors.	decommissioning phases of the Scheme. Whilst some impacts will remain at year 15 of operation, they will largely be screened or filtered by existing vegetation or proposed planting. Where the potential for adverse visual impacts has been identified, landscape mitigation, including vegetative screening, has been embedded within the design of the Scheme to reduce these impacts as far as possible. Proposed mitigation has been designed to integrate with the existing landscape character of the Solar PV Site. Details of the proposed screening and buffers including existing vegetation to be retained and proposed planting are provided in the **Framework LEMP [REP1-029]** and illustrated on the Indicative Landscape Masterplan included as Appendix A of that document. Existing hedgerows will be retained as far as practicable. Buffers of grassland, native scrub and woodland will be created around the edge of the Solar PV Site and other larger areas of grassland will be created, which will offer habitat for wildlife, including foraging habitat for a number of species. These buffers minimise the potential for adverse impacts
REP1-063	Mark Henstock	2. Loss of Agricultural Land The land in question is high-quality farmland, essential for local food production and employment. Given current concerns over food security and rural economic resilience, the permanent removal of this land from agricultural use is unacceptable.	As set out in **ES Volume I, Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use [REP1-013]**, an agricultural land survey was undertaken and categorised 7% of the Solar PV Site as BMV land. With the exception of a relatively small area of BMV land proposed for structural planting, impacts on this BMV land will be temporary and reversible. In addition, due to the small scale of this BMV land, it is not currently farmed for high-quality agricultural food production and was recently used for biomass crops. Within the Solar PV Site, fields currently used to grow arable crops (with some grazing) would cease to be part of a working farm during construction and operation, although there is potential for grazing by sheep for management of the grassland. The Grid Connection Corridor, if required, would also intersect a number of agricultural land holdings, but will be available for agricultural use again post construction, given cables will be buried at sufficient depth to enable agricultural activities to continue on the surface. Further information can be found in the **Framework SMP [APP-199]**. Prior to the start of construction, a detailed SMP will be submitted to and approved by the local authority (as outlined in the **Framework CEMP [REP1-019]** and secured by Requirement 15 of Schedule 2 to the **Draft DCO [REP1-005]**). This will ensure soils are not degraded and farming activities can re-commence following completion of the construction phase along the Grid Connection Corridor and decommissioning phase within the Solar PV Site.
REP1-063	Mark Henstock	3. Environmental and Biodiversity Concerns The site borders several Local Wildlife Sites and ancient woodland, including Bunfold Shaw. The introduction of solar panels and associated infrastructure at this scale risks habitat fragmentation, disruption to local ecosystems, and harm to protected species.	**ES Volume I, Chapter 8: Ecology [APP-060]** provides an assessment of the Scheme's impact on important ecological features and is supported by extensive survey work which confirms the ecological habitats and species likely to be affected by the Scheme. The Scheme avoids and mitigates all significant adverse effects on internationally, nationally and locally designated biodiversity sites and other important ecological features such as protected species and habitats, and veteran trees, during the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases. This has been achieved through a considered and iterative design informed by a design team with qualified professional ecologists and includes avoidance, buffers and mitigation

Examination Library Ref.	Name	Comment	Applicant's Response
			measures that will be secured through the various management plan requirements included in Schedule 2 of the **Draft DCO [REP1-005]**. As detailed in the **BNG Assessment [REP1-023]**, the Scheme is predicted to exceed the BNG target of 10%. The **Framework LEMP** (Revision 02) **[EN10152/APP/7.14]** has been updated at Deadline 2 to confirm that the target increase of at least 10% BNG will be across all biodiversity unit types. This is secured through Requirement 6 in Schedule 2 in the **Draft DCO [REP1-005]**.
REP1-063	Mark Henstock	4. Pollution and Construction Disruption The construction phase is expected to generate significant noise pollution and vehicle emissions due to an increased volume of heavy traffic, particularly through the village of Moss. This will adversely affect air quality and the wellbeing of residents, including vulnerable groups such as children and the elderly.	As set out in **ES Volume I, Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [APP-063]**, measures to minimise effects from noise as a result of the construction phase of the Scheme are secured in the **Framework CEMP [REP1-019]** which includes BPM to be applied, as far as reasonably practicable. Construction of the Solar PV Site will require an estimated 24 months covering an area of approximately 407 ha so construction works would not occur at any one location for extended periods of time. The erection of the Solar PV Mounting Structures will typically consist of driving the mounts directly into the ground using a small, tracked post driver (see Plate 2-11 of **ES Volume I, Chapter 2: The Scheme [APP-054]**), followed by Solar PV Panels being attached by hand. An assessment of noise effects during the construction of the Solar PV Site is provided in **ES Volume I, Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [APP-063]**. Table 11-10 presents worst-case levels of construction noise when activities are taking place within the Solar PV Site in close proximity to sensitive receptors. No adverse construction noise effects are identified so, whilst construction noise may result in temporary effect on the acoustic character of the area, no changes to quality of life are expected. The core working hours are defined in the **Framework CEMP [REP1-019]**. Noise generating activities near residential properties, such as use of power tools or piling, would be limited to the hours between 08:00 and 18:00 from Monday to Friday and between 08:00 and 13:00 on Saturday. A construction noise monitoring scheme shall be developed and agreed with the relevant local authorities following appointment of a Contractor and prior to commencement of construction works. A detailed CEMP, which must be substantially in accordance with the Framework CEMP, will need to be approved prior to construction by the relevant local planning authority and is secured through Requirement 11 of Schedule 2 to the **Draft DCO [REP1-005]**. Paragraph 14.2.22 to 14.2.24 in **ES Volume I, Chapter 14: Other Environmental Topics [APP-066]** confirm that construction phase traffic has been modelled and compared against the relevant screening criteria. As construction phase road traffic volumes are not expected to meet the thresholds above for which detailed modelling is required, there are no likely significant air quality impacts from traffic predicted during the construction phase. Due to the nature of the Scheme, a significant change to traffic flows is not anticipated to occur during the operation and maintenance phase of the Scheme and, therefore, no likely significant air quality impacts are anticipated.
REP1-063	Mark Henstock	5. Direct Impact on My Property The proposed cable route passes directly through land I own, which would restrict access to my property and disrupt its use. This raises serious concerns about property rights, safety, and compensation	A review of Sheet 6 of the **Works Plan [APP-214]** has shown that this property is adjacent to Work 8 which in general relates to modifications to the existing highway network to allow access to the Solar PV Site and Grid Connection Corridor. However, no direct highway works are expected adjacent to this property and no road access is proposed into Work 4(a) and 4(c), (e.g. the Grid Connection Corridor). The nearest

Examination Library Ref.	Name	Comment	Applicant's Response
			proposed access to the Solar PV Site from Moss Lane will be located approximately 150 m east. The **Transport Assessment [APP-179]** and **Framework CTMP [APP-206, APP-207]** provide full details of embedded mitigation measures that are proposed to prevent or reduce potential adverse effects associated with construction traffic on local roads. This includes measures such as suitable agreed HGV routes and timing restrictions, the use of traffic marshals at site accesses and crossing points, and the development of a communications strategy for those working on the Scheme. A detailed CTMP (which must substantially accord with the **Framework CTMP [APP-206, APP-207]**) will need to be approved post consent prior to construction with the relevant local authorities and this is secured by Requirement 13 in Schedule 2 to the **Draft DCO [REP1-005]**. **ES Volume I, Chapter 13 Transport and Access [REP1-015]** includes a comprehensive assessment of the impact of construction traffic. Paragraph 13.7.29 onward sets out the assessment in terms of road safety, including consideration of road users and pedestrians. Table 13-24 demonstrates that the magnitude of safety impact of the Scheme would be very low which is not a significant impact. As detailed in Section 5.5 of the **Framework CTMP [APP-206, APP-207]**, a Traffic Safety Control Officer will be appointed by the Applicant to develop, implement, and manage the detailed CTMP. The Applicant will comply with the Compensation Code in respect of any injurious affection or depreciation of land value in accordance with the relevant statutory tests.
REP1-063	Mark Henstock	6. Flood Risk Parts of the proposed development lie within Flood Zones 2 and 3. The addition of impermeable surfaces and infrastructure could worsen flood risks in adjacent areas, including residential zones, which have historically faced drainage challenges.	The Applicant acknowledges that some areas of the Order limits are located within Flood Zone 2 and Flood Zone 3. **ES Volume III, Appendix 9-3: Flood Risk Assessment** (Revision 01) **[EN10152/APP/6.3]**has therefore been produced for the Scheme and updated at Deadline 2. It considers risk both to, and arising from, the Solar PV Site and the Grid Connection Corridor. As part of **ES Volume III, Appendix 9-3: Flood Risk Assessment** (Revision 01) **[EN10152/APP/6.3]**, mitigation is proposed to manage the potential impacts of flood risk so that the Scheme does not increase or exacerbate flood risk to others. Solar PV Panels have been located in accordance with the Sequential Test to avoid areas of high fluvial flood risk and would be raised to a sufficient height to avoid floodwater. Field Stations have also been sequentially located to avoid high fluvial flood risk areas and raised to a sufficient height to avoid floodwater. While some Solar PV Panels and Field Stations are located within Flood Zone 3, the BESS Area and On-Site Substation will be located outside of Flood Zone 3. As secured in the **Framework CEMP [REP1-019]**, all construction compounds will be located outside of the 3.3% Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP) flood extent (i.e. Flood Zone 3b) and temporary works will be designed in a way to ensure they are resilient to flooding, whilst also minimising flood risk impacts to third parties. An Emergency Response Plan (ERP) will also be developed as part of the detailed CEMP which would provide detail of the response to an impending flood. This mitigation has been informed by site-specific hydraulic modelling which takes into account any increases in flooding due to climate change expected during the lifetime of the development.

Examination Library Ref.	Name	Comment	Applicant's Response
			ES Volume III, Appendix 9-4: Framework Drainage Strategy [APP-160] has also been produced which aims to manage surface water from the Scheme. This strategy incorporates Sustainable Drainage Systems to manage surface water from the Solar PV Site so that the Scheme remains safe throughout its lifetime and does not increase flood risk to others. The design aims to maintain greenfield runoff rates, mimicking the natural drainage conditions of the Solar PV Site, as far as possible, by allowing natural infiltration and limiting the potential for channelisation from rainfall dripping off the Solar PV Panels. New impermeable areas, such as the BESS Area and On-Site Substation, include filter drains leading to attenuation basins to manage drainage. A detailed drainage strategy must substantially accord with the **ES Volume III, Appendix 9-4: Framework Drainage Strategy [APP-160]**, meaning the Applicant must implement mitigation which has been promised, and are secured by Requirement 9 in Schedule 2 to the **Draft DCO [REP1-005]**.
REP1-063	Mark Henstock	7. Impact on Public Access and Bridleways Reports suggest that over 90% of public bridleways in Fenwick may be affected. This would significantly reduce access to green space for walking, riding, and recreation—activities that are vital to the health and wellbeing of local people.	The Applicant will maintain PRoW connectivity during the construction of the Solar PV Site and Grid Connection Corridor. Access locations for construction vehicles have been selected to minimise any interactions with PRoW and ensure that robust procedures are put in place to ensure the safety of PRoW users. Any PRoW to be temporarily closed will have a suitable localised diversion in place to allow continued use by the local community. These mitigation measures are set out in the **Framework PRoWMP [REP1-027]** and **Framework CTMP [APP-206, APP-207]** which will be developed into detailed management plans post consent. The detailed management plans must substantially accord with the framework management plans and require approval from City of Doncaster Council prior to construction. This is secured by Requirements 13 and 17 in Schedule 2 to the **Draft DCO [REP1-005]**. During the operation and maintenance phase of the Scheme, the existing PRoW passing through or running adjacent to the Order limits are expected to be unaffected, aside from Sykehouse 29, Moss 6 and Fenwick 14 that will be permanently diverted. The permanent diversions of these PRoW would increase their journey length by minimal distances (less than 50 m) and no significant effects on PRoW users are therefore anticipated. As presented in **ES Volume II, Figure 2-2 Public Rights of Way [APP-073]** and confirmed by Table 2 of the **Framework PRoWMP [REP1-027]**, only one bridleway will directly interact with the Scheme. This is Thorpe in Balne 11 which intersects the Grid Connection Corridor.
REP1-063	Mark Henstock	8. Lack of Genuine Community Engagement Many residents feel sidelined during the consultation process. The formation of the Fenwick Solar Farm Action Group highlights widespread local opposition and dissatisfaction with how the process has been managed	The Applicant notes that it carried out a total of 8 consultation events during the pre-application period ahead of finalising its proposals for the Scheme. This comprised two in-person and two online non-statutory consultation events during June and July 2023, and three in-person and one online statutory consultation events during April and May 2024. The Applicant has considered the inputs received from the community during these consultation processes when developing the Scheme. Full details on the consultation process are set out within the **Consultation Report [APP-022]**. The Statutory Consultation phase gave those interested in the Scheme an opportunity to comment on the proposals, whilst proving an opportunity for consultees to share their feedback on the changes made to the Scheme since non-statutory consultation. The changes presented at Statutory Consultation included refinement of the proposals

Examination Library Ref.	Name	Comment	Applicant's Response
			for BESS Area so that these would be located in a single area within the Solar PV Site and at least 500 m from any residential property to ensure that there would be no significant noise or fire risks and to minimise visual impacts. The Applicant is committed to ongoing consultation with the community so that anxieties can be communicated and as far as possible addressed throughout all stages of the Scheme. Paragraph 2.1.14 of the **Framework CEMP [REP1-019]** confirms that a Community Liaison Group will also be set up and a Community Liaison Officer (or alternative role) established during construction to facilitate liaison between representatives of people living in the vicinity of the Order limits and other relevant organisations in relation to the impacts of the Scheme. The Applicant will produce a detailed CEMP post consent which will be in accordance with the **Framework CEMP [REP1-019]**, as secured by Requirement 11 of Schedule 2 in the **Draft DCO [REP1-005]**. The implementation of Requirement 3 in Schedule 2 of the **Draft DCO [REP1-005]** will allow feedback on impacts of the Scheme and mitigation measures to be considered and acted upon if required.
REP1-063	Mark Henstock	Conclusion Renewable energy is essential for the UK's future, but it must be developed in the right locations and with the support of local communities. I respectfully urge the Planning Inspectorate and relevant authorities to reject this proposal and instead explore more suitable, less intrusive sites— such as brownfield land or smaller-scale projects—closer to demand centres.	As discussed in the Applicant's **Planning Statement [APP-190]** and **Statement of Need [APP-192]**, EN-1 and EN-3 identify large-scale solar energy generation, such as the Scheme, as being required to meet this need. The **Statement of Need [APP-192]** also notes that, whilst decentralised generation has an important role to play in decarbonisation, on its own, smaller scale solar, including rooftop solar, is not likely to deliver a sufficient total capacity at the required pace and at an affordable cost to meet the Government's targets. Therefore, smaller scale solar, including rooftop solar, must be considered as additional to, as opposed to instead of, the need for large-scale, ground-mounted solar like this Scheme. Brownfield land was considered for the Scheme following a review of the local authority brownfield land register. However, it was concluded that there was no available or suitable brownfield land for the Scheme as it would compete or be in conflict with local planning policy seeking to deliver housing and mixed-use developments, and the land next to the Existing National Grid Thorpe Marsh Substation was being developed for another energy project. This is explained in **ES Volume I, Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution [APP-055]**.
REP1-066	Sarah Thompson	Concerns as a Resident of Fenwick As a resident of Fenwick, I have significant concerns about the accessibility of the village and the impact increased traffic will have on the local community. The sheer scale of the proposed development will dwarf the village and severely affect our daily peace and accessibility. The two roads serving the village are primarily single-lane carriageways. While Fenwick Common Lane has previously been extended, this has led to further issues—its edges have deteriorated due to heavy agricultural machinery and frequent use. Large potholes and roadside erosion now make it necessary to drive down the centre of the road, particularly in wet or muddy conditions. Moreover, when the train crossing at Moss is closed—which occurs frequently—traffic is diverted to the narrow and winding Fenwick Lane. This road, with its blind bends	The Government has identified through its energy policy, most recently in the Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1) and the National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy (EN-3), that there is an urgent need for large scale capacity low-carbon energy generation in the UK. As discussed in the Applicant's **Planning Statement [APP-190]** and **Statement of Need [APP-192]**, EN-1 and EN-3 identify large-scale solar energy generation, such as the Scheme, as being required to meet this need. Developing the Scheme at its proposed size and with its substantial benefits will therefore be an important contribution to meeting this urgent need and, as such, there is a clear and accepted case for the Scheme. A full and detailed assessment of potential traffic and transport impacts from construction at sensitive receptors has been undertaken within **ES Volume I, Chapter 13: Transport and Access [REP1-015]**. Consideration has been given to traffic

Examination Library Ref.	Name	Comment	Applicant's Response
		and limited runoff areas, is already hazardous. I am deeply concerned about how safe these roads will be once the development begins, with a significant increase in traffic volume from construction vehicles and staff. It's worth noting that the number of people in the village may more than quadruple during the project's peak staffing phase.	routing, timing, and access points to the Scheme during construction and traffic during the operation and maintenance phase would be minimal. The **Transport Assessment [APP-179]** and **Framework CTMP [APP-206, APP-207]** provide full details of embedded mitigation measures that are proposed to prevent or reduce potential adverse effects associated with construction traffic on local roads. This includes measures such as suitable agreed HGV routes and timing restrictions, the use of traffic marshals at site accesses and crossing points, and the development of a communications strategy for those working on the Scheme. A detailed CTMP (which must substantially accord with the **Framework CTMP [APP-206, APP-207]**) will need to be approved post consent prior to construction with the relevant local authorities and this is secured by Requirement 13 in Schedule 2 to the **Draft DCO [REP1-005]**. In addition, pre and post construction road condition surveys will be undertaken at identified locations in coordination with the relevant Local Highway Authority, as referenced in Section 5.2 of the **Framework CTMP [APP-206, APP-207]**. Where these surveys identify upgrades needed to undertake the construction of the Scheme, or following the construction phase then these works will be undertaken. Indicative routing of construction traffic is set out in **ES Volume II, Figure 13-3: Indicative HGV Routing [APP-230]**. It is acknowledged that there are railway lines crossing these routes, however, appropriate mitigation would be implemented to manage these. Fenwick Common Lane will not be used by HGV, however, the majority of construction workers will arrive to the Solar PV Site via Fenwick Common Lane but all will exit via the main construction access on Moss Road. Construction HGV would not deviate from the defined routing which will be confirmed post consent.
REP1-066	Sarah Thompson	Accessibility and Road Safety Fenwick's only two access roads are already severely impacted during train delays or closures on the main London– Edinburgh line. When approaching Askern from Fenwick Common Lane, vehicles can be held at the train barrier for over 10 minutes. Once the barriers lift, there is no priority given to traffic from the village, often resulting in additional delays until the barriers close again. These roads were never intended to accommodate such high volumes of traffic—they were originally rural lanes used for farming, and they have suffered from years of under-maintenance. It is also troubling that most of the project's infrastructure is expected to be brought in through Askern—a small town with narrow streets and its own traffic and rail crossing issues. Long queues of vehicles are common here, often backing up onto the already congested A19. This situation will only be exacerbated by the demands of this large-scale development.	A full and detailed assessment of potential traffic and transport impacts from construction at sensitive receptors has been undertaken within **ES Volume I, Chapter 13: Transport and Access [REP1-015]**. Consideration has been given to traffic routing, timing, and access points to the Scheme during construction and traffic during the operation and maintenance phase would be minimal. The **Transport Assessment [APP-179]** and **Framework CTMP [APP-206, APP-207]** provide full details of embedded mitigation measures that are proposed to prevent or reduce potential adverse effects associated with construction traffic on local roads. This includes measures such as suitable agreed HGV routes and timing restrictions, the use of traffic marshals at site accesses and crossing points, and the development of a communications strategy for those working on the Scheme. A detailed CTMP (which must substantially accord with the **Framework CTMP [APP-206, APP-207]**) will need to be approved post consent prior to construction with the relevant local authorities and this is secured by Requirement 13 in Schedule 2 to the **Draft DCO [REP1-005]**. **ES Volume I, Chapter 13 Transport and Access [REP1-015]** includes a comprehensive assessment of the impact of construction traffic. Paragraph 13.7.29 onward sets out the assessment in terms of road safety, including consideration of road users and pedestrians. Table 13-24 demonstrates that the magnitude of safety impact of the Scheme would be very low which is not a significant impact. As detailed in Section 5.5 of the **Framework CTMP [APP-206, APP-207]**, a Traffic Safety Control

Examination Library Ref.	Name	Comment	Applicant's Response
			Officer will be appointed by the Applicant to develop, implement, and manage the detailed CTMP.
REP1-066	Sarah Thompson	Planning Concerns I watched parts of the Planning Inspectorate's meeting on 19–20 March and was surprised by the lack of detail provided by Boom Power on traffic and access planning. It was stated several times that such matters were "in hand," referencing previous similar projects. This generalized approach seems dismissive of the specific and significant constraints of the Fenwick site. Each location presents unique challenges, and I believe this site deserves a more rigorous assessment. I would have expected greater reassurance regarding key logistical issues such as rail access, height and load restrictions, and detailed traffic flow strategies. Given the scale of the project, the current lack of clarity on these points is unacceptable.	The Site has been the subject of rigorous assessments which are set out in **ES Volume I, Chapter 13: Transport and Access [REP1-015],** the **Transport Assessment [APP-179]** and **Framework CTMP [APP-206, APP-207].** Specific routing has been designed to ensure that the most suitable roads capable of handling HGVs have been chosen for use by construction traffic. This also includes avoidance of routes with height and weight restrictions. Further analysis of these routes and proposed access locations for the scheme has been carried out, with swept path analysis and visibility splays produced where required to ensure vehicle manoeuvres are feasible. These figures are included in the **Framework CTMP [APP-206, APP-207]**. A daily profile of the expected two-way traffic volumes is provided in Table 1 of the **Framework CTMP [APP-206]**. This table shows that there will be a maximum of 36 two-way HGV movements per day associated with the Solar PV Site and Grid Connection Corridor. The distribution of construction traffic is also highlighted in Table 11 of the **Transport Assessment [APP-179]**. In addition, the assessments have been undertaken by a team of specialists with relevant qualifications and experience in their respective fields. An independent and impartial Examining Authority has been appointed by the Planning Inspectorate to gather evidence and test information during the Examination of the application. The hearings that were held on the 19-20 March 2025 consisted of a preliminary meeting, an open floor hearing and an 'issue specific' hearing regarding the draft Development Consent Order. Therefore, traffic and access planning were not a focus of these hearings but the Examining Authority has identified in its 'Rules 13 and 16' letter of 16 May 2025 **[PD-009]** that traffic, transport and access will be the subject of a hearing on 18 June 2025, which all Interested Parties are able to attend.
REP1-066	Sarah Thompson	Light and Noise Pollution One of the reasons I chose to move to Fenwick was its peaceful environment and absence of light pollution. Shaw Lane and the surrounding areas have no street lighting, and the night-time sky is clear and dark. I have searched for information on the expected light impact of the development but have found no clear reassurance that this will not be significantly altered. I would appreciate it if any detailed assessments on this matter could be made available to the public. I am also deeply concerned about the revised plans to install battery storage units across the site. Open fields allow sound to travel widely, and I worry about the ongoing noise levels these units may generate. This could seriously disturb village residents and affect well-being. A thorough assessment of the likely sound levels and appropriate mitigation measures is essential.	Information regarding lighting around the Solar PV Site during both construction and operation and maintenance phases can be found in Section 2.7 and Section 2.8 of **ES Volume I, Chapter 2: The Scheme [APP-054]**, respectively. During construction, lighting would be directional and task specific to minimise any impacts on surrounding homes and habitats. The full lighting strategy for the construction phase is set out in the **Framework CEMP [REP1-019]**, with a lighting scheme to form part of the detailed CEMP secured by Requirement 11 in Schedule 2 to the **Draft DCO [REP1-005]**. With this in place, the impacts of lighting on surrounding human and environmental receptors has been assessed to be not significant. The lighting strategy for the operational and maintenance phase is set out in the **Framework OEMP [APP-197]** which includes details on lighting design. During operation and maintenance, the Solar PV Site would not require artificial lighting other than during temporary periods of maintenance/repair. Task specific and fixed 'general' lighting will be used at the On-Site Substation, BESS Area and at the Operations and Maintenance Hub during the winter months (in early mornings and evenings only) to maintain safe working

Examination Library Ref.	Name	Comment	Applicant's Response
			conditions. There are not anticipated to be any effects on surrounding environmental habitats from this lighting. A BESS Area has always been considered as an element of the Scheme and, as confirmed in the **Outline Design Parameters Statement [APP-193]**, was located to accommodate a minimum buffer zone of at least 500 m from any residential properties to ensure disruption to the local community is minimised. An assessment of noise impacts from equipment on nearby sensitive receptors during the operation and maintenance phase is presented in **ES Volume I, Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [APP-063]**. With proposed mitigation measures in place, noise from the Scheme is not considered to be significant at sensitive receptors.
REP1-066	Sarah Thompson	Environmental and Socio-Economic Impact While this may fall outside the direct scope of the panel's review, I feel compelled to raise a broader point. Like many others, I support the transition to net zero as a necessary environmental goal. However, it must not become a superficial exercise. Projects like this cannot claim to support net zero targets while relying heavily on materials manufactured and shipped from countries that do not adhere to comparable environmental or labour standards. To suggest that this project will significantly contribute to the UK's net zero goals is, in my view, misleading— especially when its full environmental cost, including international supply chains, is taken into account.	**ES Volume I, Chapter 6: Climate Change [APP-224]** presents the assessment of the likely significant effects on the climate as a result of the Scheme. As detailed in Table 6-19 to Table 6-20, there would be minor adverse (not significant) effects on global GHG emissions during the construction and decommissioning phases, however, there would be a beneficial (significant) effect during the operation and maintenance phase due to the carbon insanity remaining substantially below that of a gas-fired CCGT generating facility throughout its design life, its role in achieving the rate of transition required by nationally set policy commitments, and supporting the trajectory towards net zero.
REP1-056	Christine Marshall	I am the fourth generation of a Fenwick family living in the affected area. The detrimental impact will be massive on the village community because of the following: 1. Road safety on an already heavily damaged, unsuitable road network for such a huge project. I am a keen cyclist, walker and Professional Artist and access the rural lanes and Public Footpaths daily. I fear for my safety if heavy HGV transport lorries use our rural landscape to erect the solar panels. The infrastructure to support such a huge project is not suitable for the area. Askern schools and its children will also be put at risk from the increased daily traffic plus the main railway line in Moss is regularly closed for repair offering only a back lane not suitable to pass 2 vehicles safely.	A full and detailed assessment of potential traffic and transport impacts from construction at sensitive receptors has been undertaken within **ES Volume I, Chapter 13: Transport and Access [REP1-015]**. Consideration has been given to traffic routing, timing, and access points to the Scheme during construction and traffic during the operation and maintenance phase would be minimal. The **Transport Assessment [APP-179]** and **Framework CTMP [APP-206, APP-207]** provide full details of embedded mitigation measures that are proposed to prevent or reduce potential adverse effects associated with construction traffic on local roads. This includes measures such as suitable agreed HGV routes and timing restrictions, the use of traffic marshals at site accesses and crossing points, and the development of a communications strategy for those working on the Scheme. A detailed CTMP (which must substantially accord with the **Framework CTMP [APP-206, APP-207]**) will need to be approved post consent prior to construction with the relevant local authorities and this is secured by Requirement 13 in Schedule 2 to the **Draft DCO [REP1-005]**. In addition, pre and post construction road condition surveys will be undertaken at identified locations in coordination with the relevant Local Highway Authority, as referenced in Section 5.2 of the **Framework CTMP [APP-206, APP-207]**. Where these surveys identify upgrades needed to undertake the construction of the Scheme, or following the construction phase then these works will be undertaken. **ES Volume I, Chapter 13 Transport and Access [REP1-015]** includes a comprehensive assessment of the impact of construction traffic. Paragraph 13.7.29 onward sets out the assessment in terms of road safety, including consideration of road users and pedestrians. Table 13-24 demonstrates that the magnitude of safety

Examination Library Ref.	Name	Comment	Applicant's Response
			impact of the Scheme would be very low which is not a significant impact. As detailed in Section 5.5 of the **Framework CTMP [APP-206, APP-207]**, a Traffic Safety Control Officer will be appointed by the Applicant to develop, implement, and manage the detailed CTMP.
REP1-056	Christine Marshall	2. Public footpaths will no longer be accessed by the ancient route of Haggs Lane which dog walkers use daily. Some routes may be diverted losing the diversity of nature in these habitats.	The Applicant will maintain PRoW connectivity during the construction of the Solar PV Site and Grid Connection Corridor. Access locations for construction vehicles have been selected to minimise any interactions with PRoW and ensure that robust procedures are put in place to ensure the safety of PRoW users. Any PRoW to be temporarily closed will have a suitable localised diversion in place to allow continued use by the local community. These mitigation measures are set out in the **Framework PRoWMP [REP1-027]** and **Framework CTMP [APP-206, APP-207]** which will be developed into detailed management plans post consent. The detailed management plans must substantially accord with the framework management plans and require approval from City of Doncaster Council prior to construction. This is secured by Requirements 13 and 17 in Schedule 2 to the **Draft DCO [REP1-005]**. During the operation and maintenance phase of the Scheme, the existing PRoW passing through or running adjacent to the Order limits are expected to be unaffected, aside from Sykehouse 29, Moss 6 and Fenwick 14 that will be permanently diverted. The permanent diversions of these PRoW would increase their journey length by minimal distances (less than 50 m) and no significant effects on PRoW users are therefore anticipated.
REP1-056	Christine Marshall	3. The diverse nature and wildlife that inhabit the proposed site from red kite, buzzards, deer, newts, wildflower meadows and ancient woodlands between Fenwick and Sykehouse will be lost forever. Building work will prevent these species from ever returning especially ground nesting species.	**ES Volume I, Chapter 8: Ecology [APP-060]** provides an assessment of the Scheme's impact on important ecological features and is supported by extensive survey work which confirms the ecological habitats and species likely to be affected by the Scheme. The Scheme avoids and mitigates all significant adverse effects on internationally, nationally and locally designated biodiversity sites and other important ecological features such as protected species and habitats, and veteran trees, during the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases. This has been achieved through a considered and iterative design informed by a design team with qualified professional ecologists and includes avoidance, buffers and mitigation measures that will be secured through the various management plan requirements included in Schedule 2 of the **Draft DCO [REP1-005**]. As detailed in the **BNG Assessment [REP1-023]**, the Scheme is predicted to exceed the BNG target of 10% and this is predicted for each habitat type. The Applicant therefore commits to achieving a minimum 10% BNG for all habitat types as secured by the **Framework LEMP [REP1-029]** and requirement 6 in Schedule 2 in the **Draft DCO [REP1-005**].
REP1-056	Christine Marshall	4. The community ethos and farming history will be lost forever. Generations of inhabitants have farmed the land for centuries and community relationships have already been damaged causing mental health issues and resentment in the area.	The Applicant appreciates that the potential for the Scheme to have adverse effects creates uncertainly and anxiety for local residents. The comprehensive and detailed approach to consultation, Scheme design, and the EIA process has allowed any adverse effects to be identified early and the effects to be mitigated, where practicable, such as through the buffers and vegetation screening proposed as part of the Scheme. This has included a consideration of human health through many

Examination Library Ref.	Name	Comment	Applicant's Response
			chapters (**ES Volume I, Chapter 9** to **Chapter 14 [APP-064 to APP-066]**) of but none have identified likely significant effects during the various phases of the Scheme. The Applicant is committed to ongoing consultation with the community so that anxieties can be communicated and as far as possible addressed throughout all stages of the Scheme. Paragraph 2.1.14 of the **Framework CEMP [REP1-019]** confirms that a Community Liaison Group will also be set up and a Community Liaison Officer (or alternative role) established during construction to facilitate liaison between representatives of people living in the vicinity of the Order limits and other relevant organisations in relation to the impacts of the Scheme. The Applicant will produce a detailed CEMP post consent which will be in accordance with the **Framework CEMP [REP1-019]**, as secured by Requirement 11 of Schedule 2 in the **Draft DCO [REP1-005]**. The implementation of Requirement 3 in Schedule 2 of the **Draft DCO [REP1-005]** will allow feedback on impacts of the Scheme and mitigation measures to be considered and acted upon if required.
REP1-056	Christine Marshall	5.Local businesses and community groups who use the village hall will suffer from the chaos caused by the Solar build from noise pollution, inaccessibility to the area, traffic and loss of basic village life.	The impact of noise and transport during the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases are presented in **ES Volume I, Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [APP-063]** and **Volume I, Chapter 13: Transport and Access [REP1-015]**. Measures to minimise the noise and transport effects of the Scheme during the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases are provided in the **Framework CEMP [REP1-019]**, **Framework CTMP [APP-206, APP-207]**, **Framework OEMP [APP-197]**, and **Framework DEMP [REP1-021]**. The Applicant is committed to ongoing consultation with the community so that anxieties can be communicated and as far as possible addressed throughout all stages of the Scheme. Paragraph 2.1.14 of the **Framework CEMP [REP1-019]** confirms that a Community Liaison Group will also be set up and a Community Liaison Officer (or alternative role) established during construction to facilitate liaison between representatives of people living in the vicinity of the Order limits and other relevant organisations in relation to the impacts of the Scheme. The Applicant will produce a detailed CEMP post consent which will be in accordance with the **Framework CEMP [REP1-019]**, as secured by Requirement 11 of Schedule 2 in the **Draft DCO [REP1-005]**. The implementation of Requirement 3 in Schedule 2 of the **Draft DCO [REP1-005]** will allow feedback on impacts of the Scheme and mitigation measures to be considered and acted upon if required.
REP1-056	Christine Marshall	6.House prices will decrease dramatically during and after the proposed site thus seriously damaging peoples retirement plans for their future.	Impacts on property prices are not a material consideration in the NSIP planning process and, therefore, are not a factor to be considered by the Secretary of State when determining the application for development consent. However, the Applicant will comply with the Compensation Code in respect of any compulsory acquisition associated with the Scheme, including any injurious affection or depreciation of land value in accordance with the relevant statutory tests.

Examination Library Ref.	Name	Comment	Applicant's Response
REP1-056	Christine Marshall	7. Solar panels will be obsolete in 10 years as new technology advances which will leave a devastated industrialised site with no future for agriculture or nature.	As explained in the **Statement of Need [APP-192]**, solar power generation has global momentum, and various large-scale schemes are being developed in the UK. Solar is a proven technology and is already delivering as part of the UK's electricity system and will continue to deliver further critical benefits to consumers through the urgent and continued decarbonisation, security of supply, and affordability of energy. Solar power generation has undergone significant technological advances in scale and commercial efficiency and solar panel efficiency is expected to continue improving over the course of the 2020s. It is therefore important to make best use of this natural, renewable energy resource to meet the UK's legal carbon emission reduction obligations. The Scheme would utilise a fixed south facing system for the Solar PV Panels. These are the most common approach for utility scale solar PV facilities in the UK to date and involve installing Solar PV Panels to fixed tables, arranged in rows facing south. The Scheme design retains flexibility to allow for the selection of the most efficient technology as solar generation technology is developing at a fast pace, with better, more efficient and more cost-effective technologies coming to the market. The Applicant is therefore seeking to retain the flexibility to choose the precise technology close to the point of the construction of the Scheme. This will enable the optimum production of renewable energy and subsequently reduce cost for the end user. The final technology installed will be required to remain within the parameters defined by the **Works Plan [APP-214]** and **Outline Design Parameters Statement [APP-193]**. There is an opportunity for the examination Authority to raise questions regarding the Scheme design during Examination.
REP1-067	Thomas Benjamin Moyes	I write to express our objections to the proposed application for a Development Consent Order for the 536-hectare solar energy farm known as "Fenwick Solar Farm". If the application is approved and the consent order is granted Fenwick Solar farm will have a huge impact on the surrounding villages and local residents. Many residents have expressed their concerns about the proposed solar farm, these concerns are summarised below for careful consideration.	The Applicant notes this comment and is committed to ongoing consultation with the community so that anxieties can be communicated and as far as possible addressed throughout all stages of the Scheme. A Community Liaison Group will be also set up and a Community Liaison Officer (or alternative role) established to facilitate liaison between representatives of people living in the vicinity of the Order limits and other relevant organisations in relation to the impacts of the Scheme. The implementation of Requirement 3 in Schedule 2 of the **Draft DCO [REP1-005]** will allow feedback on impacts of the Scheme and mitigation measures to be considered and acted upon if required.
REP1-067	Thomas Benjamin Moyes	Size and location of the development The proposed site spans over 536 hectares, which is the equivalent of 662 football pitches meaning the proposed site would consume entire green spaces and countryside surrounding Fenwick. The open countryside is a feature which many residents in Fenwick enjoy on a daily basis, in particular many children and young families in the village.	The Solar PV Site has been chosen through a thorough site selection process which is explained in **ES Volume I, Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution [APP-055]** and assessed against relevant planning policy in the **Planning Statement [APP-190]**. The Government has identified through its energy policy, most recently in the Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1) and the National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy (EN-3), that there is an urgent need for large scale capacity low-carbon energy generation in the UK. As discussed in the Applicant's **Planning Statement [APP-190]** and **Statement of Need [APP-192]**, EN-1 and EN-3 identify large-scale solar energy generation, such as the Scheme, as being required to meet this need. Developing the Scheme at its proposed size and with its substantial benefits will therefore be an important contribution to meeting this urgent need and, as such, there is a clear and accepted case for the Scheme.

Examination Library Ref.	Name	Comment	Applicant's Response
REP1-067	Thomas Benjamin Moyes	Furthermore, many residents enjoy running, walking, cycling, and horse riding in the open countryside, this amenity is likely to be lost for residents as the open countryside would be surrounded by large solar panels and battery energy storage systems. Moreover, the Public Right of Way of Sykehouse 29 will be permanently diverted. In addition to this other Public Rights of Way may also be disturbed during construction process and it is likely that the Public Rights of Way will pass under or through large scale solar panels.	The Applicant will maintain PRoW connectivity during the construction phase of the Solar PV Site and Grid Connection Corridor. Access locations for construction vehicles have been selected to minimise any interactions with PRoW and robust procedures would be put in place to ensure the safety of PRoW users. All PRoW to be temporarily closed will have a suitable localised diversion in place to allow continued use by the local community. These mitigation measures are set out in the **Framework PRoWMP [REP1-027]** and **Framework CTMP [APP-206, APP-207]** which will be developed into detailed management plans post consent. The detailed management plans must substantially in accordance with the framework management plans and require approval from City of Doncaster Council prior to construction. This is secured by Requirements 13 and 17 in Schedule 2 to the **Draft DCO [REP1-005]**. During the operation and maintenance phase of the Scheme, the existing PRoW passing through or running adjacent to the Order limits are expected to be unaffected, aside from Sykehouse 29, Moss 6 and Fenwick 14 that will be permanently diverted. The permanent diversions of these PRoW would increase their journey length by minimal distances (less than 50 m) and no significant effects on PRoW users are therefore anticipated.
REP1-067	Thomas Benjamin Moyes	The visual impact of a large industrial solar development would permanently alter the tranquil rural character of the area, leaving many residential properties overlooking fields of solar panels mounted up to 3.5 meters high and sub stations up to 11 meters in height as opposed to views of the open countryside. This would permanently alter the residents' enjoyment of their own properties as the views that attracted them to the area would be lost.	The **Outline Design Parameters Statement [APP-193]** sets out the design parameters for all elements of the Scheme, including maximum dimensions of fencing, Solar PV Panels, Field Stations, BESS Containers, and the On-Site Substation. **ES Volume I, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity [APP-062]** recognises that there will be landscape and visual impacts during the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases of the Scheme. Whilst some impacts will remain at year 15 of operation, they will largely be screened or filtered by existing vegetation or proposed planting. Where the potential for adverse visual impacts has been identified, landscape mitigation, including vegetative screening, has been embedded within the design of the Scheme to reduce these impacts as far as possible. Proposed mitigation has been designed to integrate with the existing landscape character of the Solar PV Site. Details of the proposed screening and buffers including existing vegetation to be retained and proposed planting are provided in the **Framework LEMP [REP1-029]** and illustrated on the Indicative Landscape Masterplan included as Appendix A. Existing hedgerows will be retained as far as practicable. Buffers of grassland, native scrub and woodland will be created around the edge of the Solar PV Site and other larger areas of grassland will be created, which will offer habitat for wildlife, including foraging habitat for a number of species. These buffers minimise the potential for adverse impacts.
REP1-067	Thomas Benjamin Moyes	Furthermore the degradation of the countryside environment will have a negative impact on the many people from surrounding areas that visit the area to go for walks, rides etc. to protect their mental wellbeing. This is an area of social deprivation which has been let down by multiple governments since the 1980s, and I would imagine that mental health issues have a high prevalence in these areas in comparison to other areas. Accordingly, it is of paramount importance to preserve the few areas that serve the surrounding community such as Askern. Fenwick is one of those few areas.	The Applicant appreciates that the potential for the Scheme to have adverse effects creates uncertainly and anxiety for local residents. The comprehensive and detailed approach to consultation, Scheme design, and the EIA process has allowed any adverse effects to be identified early and the effects to be mitigated, where practicable, such as through the buffers and vegetation screening proposed as part of the Scheme. This has included a consideration of human health through many chapters (**ES Volume I, Chapter 9** to **Chapter 14 [APP-064 to APP-066]**) of but none have identified likely significant effects during the various phases of the Scheme.

Examination Library Ref.	Name	Comment	Applicant's Response
			The Applicant is committed to ongoing consultation with the community so that anxieties can be communicated and as far as possible addressed throughout all stages of the Scheme. Paragraph 2.1.14 of the **Framework CEMP [REP1-019]** confirms that a Community Liaison Group will also be set up and a Community Liaison Officer (or alternative role) established during construction to facilitate liaison between representatives of people living in the vicinity of the Order limits and other relevant organisations in relation to the impacts of the Scheme. The Applicant will produce a detailed CEMP post consent which will be in accordance with the **Framework CEMP [REP1-019]**, as secured by Requirement 11 of Schedule 2 in the **Draft DCO [REP1-005]**. The implementation of Requirement 3 in Schedule 2 of the **Draft DCO [REP1-005]** will allow feedback on impacts of the Scheme and mitigation measures to be considered and acted upon if required.
REP1-067	Thomas Benjamin Moyes	Environmental The proposed site spreads over 1000 acres of open countryside which will have a huge impact on local wildlife. The residents consider there to be protected species such as bats, badgers, and newts living in the surrounding countryside, and the proposed construction works would threaten the existence of these protected species and potentially cause the destruction of their natural habitats. Furthermore, the destruction of natural habitats could have a long-lasting detrimental impact on biodiversity which is an incredibly important feature of the English countryside.	**ES Volume I, Chapter 8: Ecology [APP-060]** provides an assessment of the Scheme's impact on important ecological features and is supported by extensive survey work which confirms the ecological habitats and species likely to be affected by the Scheme. The Scheme avoids and mitigates all significant adverse effects on internationally, nationally and locally designated biodiversity sites and other important ecological features such as protected species and habitats, and veteran trees, during the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases. This has been achieved through a considered and iterative design informed by a design team with qualified professional ecologists and includes avoidance, buffers and mitigation measures that will be secured through the various management plan requirements included in Schedule 2 of the **Draft DCO [REP1-005**]. As detailed in the **BNG Assessment [REP1-023]**, the Scheme is predicted to exceed the BNG target of 10%. The **Framework LEMP** (Revision 02) **[EN010152/APP/7.14]** has been updated at Deadline 2 to confirm that the target increase of at least 10% BNG will be across all biodiversity unit types. This is secured through Requirement 6 in Schedule 2 in the **Draft DCO [REP1-005]**.
REP1-067	Thomas Benjamin Moyes	The proposed site will also result in the loss of agricultural land which has been successfully farmed by local farmers for several generations. This change would result in a loss of arable farming land which is in direct conflict with Government policy to protect and enhance domestic food production in the UK.	As set out in **ES Volume I, Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use [REP1-013]**, an agricultural land survey was undertaken and categorised 7% of the Solar PV Site as BMV land. With the exception of a relatively small area of BMV land proposed for structural planting, impacts on this BMV land will be temporary and reversible. In addition, due to the small scale of this BMV land, it is not currently farmed for high-quality agricultural food production and was recently used for biomass crops. Within the Solar PV Site, fields currently used to grow arable crops (with some grazing) would cease to be part of a working farm during construction and operation, although there is potential for grazing by sheep for management of the grassland. The Grid Connection Corridor, if required, would also intersect a number of agricultural land holdings, but will be available for agricultural use again post construction, given cables will be buried at sufficient depth to enable agricultural activities to continue on the surface. Further information can be found in the **Framework SMP [APP-199]**. Prior to the start of construction, a detailed SMP will be submitted to and approved by the local authority (as outlined in the **Framework CEMP [REP1-019]** and secured by Requirement 15 of Schedule 2 to the **Draft DCO [REP1-005]**). This will ensure soils

Examination Library Ref.	Name	Comment	Applicant's Response
			are not degraded and farming activities can re-commence following completion of the construction phase along the Grid Connection Corridor and decommissioning phase within the Solar PV Site.
REP1-067	Thomas Benjamin Moyes	The solar farm is proposed to last for 40 years before being decommissioned in 2070, meaning that local wildlife and farming land would be disturbed for a whole generation and it is unlikely that the land would return to its previous state as a result of the decommissioning process. Furthermore, it is likely that the land that once was open countryside would be permanently damaged and the character of the area would be changed forever.	The Applicant has committed to fully decommissioning the Scheme and returning the Order limits to its existing use at this stage but acknowledges that some components may be retained. This may be, for example, due to it being considered that leaving the export cables underground is less disruptive to local communities and environments than removing them. Within 12 months of the date which it is decided to decommission any part of the Scheme, the undertaker will produce a detailed DEMP for approval by the relevant local planning authority as secured by Requirement 18 of Schedule 2 in the **Draft DCO [REP1-005]**. The detailed DEMP must be substantially in accordance with the **Framework DEMP [REP1-021]** and will include confirmation as to what components may remain, and if so, whether further controls are required to ensure their suitability in respect of environmental matters.
REP1-067	Thomas Benjamin Moyes	Local infrastructure and economy The proposed development is estimated to take 24 months subject to working conditions. Throughout this time there will be an increase in road usage by HGVs and abnormal load vehicles through the small neighbouring villages, many of the roads through these villages are highly unsuitable for these types of vehicles or high volumes of traffic. The roads in Fenwick and surrounding villages are single track and would be unable to cope with the traffic from construction vehicles in addition to existing local traffic and farm vehicles. This poses a significant highway safety risk as the roads through Fenwick are not designed to accommodate the additional traffic that will be generated from the construction of the solar farm. Residents are concerned about highway safety and the increased risk for pedestrians because of high volumes of traffic passing through the village. Fenwick is home to many young families with children who often walk through the village and are able do so safely due to the low volumes of traffic. Both the construction vehicles and increased traffic levels increase the risk of accidents and pedestrian fatalities on narrow roads which are not designed for more than local and farm traffic. Furthermore, many residents are concerned about the upkeep of the roads as the roads surrounding Fenwick are often in states of disrepair and a dramatic increase in use will have a negative impact on the wear and tear of the roads. Fenwick is home to several farming and equestrian businesses which rely on the ability to access local bridleways and the open country road network. The increase in traffic would have a damaging impact on these local businesses ability to operate, leading to a loss of income and in some cases closure. There is an additional risk to local people employed by these businesses. As you will be aware, there are three railway crossings in Askern and Moss. These are already very busy due to one servicing the London Edinburgh line. The addition of industrial trucks will cause excessive pollution and I am of the view that it will be	A full and detailed assessment of potential traffic and transport impacts from construction at sensitive receptors has been undertaken within **ES Volume I, Chapter 13: Transport and Access [REP1-015]**. Consideration has been given to traffic routing, timing, and access points to the Scheme during construction and traffic during the operation and maintenance phase would be minimal. The **Transport Assessment [APP-179]** and **Framework CTMP [APP-206, APP-207]** provide full details of embedded mitigation measures that are proposed to prevent or reduce potential adverse effects associated with construction traffic on local roads. This includes measures such as suitable agreed HGV routes and timing restrictions, the use of traffic marshals at site accesses and crossing points, and the development of a communications strategy for those working on the Scheme. A detailed CTMP (which must substantially accord with the **Framework CTMP [APP-206, APP-207]**) will need to be approved post consent prior to construction with the relevant local authorities and this is secured by Requirement 13 in Schedule 2 to the **Draft DCO [REP1-005]**. In addition, pre and post construction road condition surveys will be undertaken at identified locations in coordination with the relevant Local Highway Authority, as referenced in Section 5.2 of the **Framework CTMP [APP-206, APP-207]**. Where these surveys identify upgrades needed to undertake the construction of the Scheme, or following the construction phase then these works will be undertaken.

Examination Library Ref.	Name	Comment	Applicant's Response
		dangerous. I am aware of fatalities that have occurred at these crossings and would aver you would need to undertake research before a decision can be fairly made.	
REP1-067	Thomas Benjamin Moyes	Noise and visual pollution Construction of the proposed solar farm is estimated to last for approximately 24 months which is a significantly long period of time in which residents' quiet enjoyment of their homes will be disturbed by noise and visual pollution from the construction. Many residents also work from home and will be directly impacted by the construction noise in core working hours. In addition to this the constant humming noise from the solar farm and the battery energy storage systems will also be close to residents' homes and will impact their ability to enjoy the peaceful tranquil nature of their homes in the countryside. This is noise that will last for over 40 years and will be a permanent disruption for residents.	An assessment of construction noise effects during construction of the Solar PV Site is provided in **ES Volume I, Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [APP-063]**. Construction of the Solar PV Site will require an estimated 24 months covering an area of approximately 509 ha so construction works would not occur at any one location for extended periods of time. Table 11-10 of **ES Volume I, Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [APP-063]** presents worst-case levels of construction noise when activities are taking place in close proximity to sensitive receptors. No adverse construction noise effects are identified so although construction noise may result in temporary effect on the acoustic character of the area, no changes to quality of life are expected. The core working hours are defined in the **Framework CEMP [REP1-019]**. Noise generating activities near residential properties, such as use of power tools or piling, would be limited to the hours between 08:00 and 18:00 from Monday to Friday and between 08:00 and 13:00 on Saturday. A construction noise monitoring scheme shall be developed and agreed with the relevant local authorities following appointment of a Contractor and prior to commencement of construction works. A detailed CEMP, which must be substantially in accordance with the Framework CEMP, will need to be approved prior to construction by the relevant local planning authority and is secured through Requirement 11 of Schedule 2 to the **Draft DCO [REP1-005]**. An assessment of noise impacts from equipment, such as transformers and inverters, on nearby sensitive receptors during the operation and maintenance phase is presented in **ES Volume I, Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [APP-063]**. With proposed mitigation measures in place, noise from the Scheme is not considered to be significant at sensitive receptors.
REP1-067	Thomas Benjamin Moyes	The visual pollution from the construction of the solar farm and the solar farm itself will have a significant impact on residents' ability to enjoy their homes. The character of the village is rural which often attracts residents to buy homes in Fenwick for this reason. The consultation brochure states that the solar panels will be as close as 250 meters from residents' homes, thus changing the character of the area forever. Many residents fear that the visual pollution of the solar farm would diminish their property value, leaving some residents unable to move or with mortgages exceeding their property value.	**ES Volume I, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity [APP-062]** recognises that there will be landscape and visual impacts during the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases of the Scheme. Whilst some impacts will remain at year 15 of operation, they will largely be screened or filtered by existing vegetation or proposed planting. Where the potential for adverse visual impacts has been identified, landscape mitigation, including vegetative screening, has been embedded within the design of the Scheme to reduce these impacts as far as possible. Proposed mitigation has been designed to integrate with the existing landscape character of the Solar PV Site. Details of the proposed screening and buffers including existing vegetation to be retained and proposed planting are provided in the **Framework LEMP [REP1-029]** and illustrated on the Indicative Landscape Masterplan included as Appendix A. Existing hedgerows will be retained as far as practicable. Buffers of grassland, native scrub and woodland will be created around the edge of the Solar PV Site and other larger areas of grassland will be created, which will offer habitat for wildlife, including foraging habitat for a number of species. These buffers minimise the potential for adverse impacts.

Examination Library Ref.	Name	Comment	Applicant's Response
REP1-067	Thomas Benjamin Moyes	Safety hazards Solar farms are significant industrial developments which include transformers, inverters and batter storage units. The grid-scale battery storage systems can store massive amounts of energy which have the potential to be incredibly dangerous if there is a fault. These systems also pose a significant and potentially fatal risk to people if they catch on fire, given the proximity of the development to residential properties many residents are concerned about the increased risk of fires. Furthermore, with the proposed location of the solar farm being over open countryside there will be safety risks for pedestrians using Public Rights of Way though the solar farm, and any farm animals that are allowed to continue to graze on this land. Many young children currently use the open countryside to roam and play, there are risks that if the equipment is ill-maintained or has a fault then the potential risk to children and pedestrians using this land is increased. There are also real concerns over any consequent hazardous toxic waste which may occur with the installation of large lithium batteries. The proposed site is in the open countryside which is used by residents, visitors and animals who could all potentially be at risk in the instance of any contamination from the solar farm. Furthermore, there are also concerns with any contamination as a result of the decommissioning process once the 40-year duration is over. This could potentially affect people for over 40 years.	As described in **ES Volume I, Chapter 2: The Scheme [APP-054]**, the Scheme incorporates various security measures, including fencing and CCTV with 24-hour response personnel, which will mitigate against the risk of criminal activity. The perimeter of the Solar PV Site would be secured with a stock proof mesh-type security fence with wooden posts. Palisade fencing would be used around the BESS Area and On-Site Substation which would provide an added layer of security. These measures are considered to be appropriate for a scheme of this nature, similar to other consented solar schemes. As confirmed in the **Outline Design Parameters Statement [APP-193]**, the BESS Area was selected to accommodate a minimum buffer zone of at least 500 m from any residential properties. This will ensure that any disruption to the local community is minimised in the unlikely event that BESS Container failure should occur. Paragraph 2.1.4 of the **Framework BSMP [APP-205]** confirms the BESS Area will be designed to address prevailing industry standards and good practice at a time of detailed design and implementation. This document also extensively documents how the probability of a BESS Container failure incident is minimised by the design and proposed operating procedures, and that if a failure occurs these ensure this will be limited to one BESS Container. The **Framework BSMP [APP-205]** sets out the controls in place to ensure that, in the unlikely event a fire did occur, any impacts arising from the fire (such as fumes, or water run off) will be managed so there are no impacts on local communities beyond the Order limits. As secured in Paragraph 3.5.5, an ERP will be developed post consent to facilitate effective and safe emergency response. This will follow UK NFCC and NFPA 855 guidelines and will be finalised in consultation with SYFRS. Requirement 5 of Schedule 2 of the **Draft DCO [REP1-005]** requires the submission and approval of a detailed BSMP, which must be substantially in accordance with the **Framework BSMP [APP-205].**
REP1-067	Thomas Benjamin Moyes	Inefficiency of solar farms UK ground solar is known to be inefficient. Research by Sheffield University shows that solar panels operate at 11% efficiency in the UK, meaning a huge loss of land that could be used for farming or retained as open countryside for little gain in terms of the size and scale of the solar farm. Although residents object to the proposal of a large solar farm, they are supportive of sustainable renewable energy created by other means such as offshore wind farms or solar panels placed on roofs.	As explained in the **Statement of Need [APP-192]**, solar power generation has global momentum, and various large-scale schemes are being developed in the UK. Solar is a proven technology and is already delivering as part of the UK's electricity system and will continue to deliver further critical benefits to consumers through the urgent and continued decarbonisation, security of supply, and affordability of energy. Solar power generation has undergone significant technological advances in scale and commercial efficiency and solar panel efficiency is expected to continue improving over the course of the 2020s. It is therefore important to make best use of this natural, renewable energy resource to meet the UK's legal carbon emission reduction obligations. The Scheme would utilise a fixed south facing system for the Solar PV Panels. These are the most common approach for utility scale solar PV facilities in the UK to date and involve installing Solar PV Panels to fixed tables, arranged in rows facing south. The Scheme design retains flexibility to allow for the selection of the most efficient technology as solar generation technology is developing at a fast pace, with better, more efficient and more cost-effective technologies coming to the market. The Applicant is therefore seeking to retain the flexibility to choose the precise technology close to the point of the construction of the Scheme. This will enable the optimum production of renewable energy and subsequently reduce cost for the end user. The final technology installed will be required to remain within the parameters defined by

Examination Library Ref.	Name	Comment	Applicant's Response
			the **Works Plan [APP-214]** and **Outline Design Parameters Statement [APP-193]**. There is an opportunity for the examination Authority to raise questions regarding the Scheme design during Examination.
REP1-067	Thomas Benjamin Moyes	Devaluation of property The 'elephant in the room' is that this farm as it is currently proposed will severely devalue properties. I have first hand evidence of this which I can disclose. Whilst I can understand arguments for renewable farms, there is absolutely no need for these panels to be so close to homes, with a battery storage unit (i.e. something of an industrial nature) to be so close and it will be the first thing people view as they come into the village. Whilst it is true that devaluation of some properties should not stop solar farms being built in their entirety, I can only view the plans as inflammatory and antagonistic given proximity of panels & storage to homes that have been built. Axiomatically, if the solar farm proceeds, then it needs to be adjusted and amended so the panels aren't in view and the storage unit is elsewhere.	Impacts on property prices are not a material consideration in the NSIP planning process and, therefore, are not a factor to be considered by the Secretary of State when determining the application for development consent. However, the Applicant will comply with the Compensation Code in respect of any compulsory acquisition associated with the Scheme, including any injurious affection or depreciation of land value in accordance with the relevant statutory tests. **Volume I, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity [APP-062]** recognises that there will be landscape and visual impacts during the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases of the Scheme. Whilst some impacts will remain at year 15 of operation, they will largely be screened or filtered by existing vegetation or proposed planting. Where the potential for adverse visual impacts has been identified, landscape mitigation, including vegetative screening, has been embedded within the design of the Scheme to reduce these impacts as far as possible. Proposed mitigation has been designed to integrate with the existing landscape character of the Solar PV Site. Details of the proposed screening and buffers including existing vegetation to be retained and proposed planting are provided in the **Framework LEMP [REP1-029]** and illustrated on the Indicative Landscape Masterplan included as Appendix A of that document. Existing hedgerows will be retained as far as practicable. Buffers of grassland, native scrub and woodland will be created around the edge of the Solar PV Site and other larger areas of grassland will be created, which will offer habitat for wildlife, including foraging habitat for a number of species. These buffers minimise the potential for adverse impacts.
REP1-067	Thomas Benjamin Moyes	Failure of representation by local MP Mr Miliband clearly has a vested interest in these schemes going ahead and he has placed his views on record. At the village hall meeting in Moss/Fenwick which was recorded, he made his views very clear that he was in support of it going ahead. He offered no support for the residents and resisted any argument against the farm. Accordingly, we have been denied fair representation by our local MP, which has placed us at an unfair disadvantage in the planning process. We hope that our concerns are carefully considered by the Planning Inspectorate when making a determination on the proposed development and what impact this will have on villages and residents impacted by the proposed solar energy farm. I attach a list of cases at Schedule One of this letter, which I would like to be reviewed in full and then taken into consideration when making this decision.	The Applicant acknowledges the concerns regarding the perceived lack of representation from local elected officials. It should be noted the Examining Authority is mandated to assess all representations objectively and impartially, considering the evidence presented and potential impacts of the Scheme. This approach ensures that decision-making is not unduly influenced by individual opinions but is instead based on a comprehensive evaluation of all material considerations. Therefore, while there may be differing perspectives among elected officials and community members, the NSIP process provides a robust mechanism for ensuring that all viewpoints are considered in a fair and balanced manner. The Applicant is committed to ongoing consultation with the community so that anxieties can be communicated and as far as possible addressed throughout all stages of the Scheme. Paragraph 2.1.14 of the **Framework CEMP [REP1-019]** confirms that a Community Liaison Group will also be set up and a Community Liaison Officer (or alternative role) established during construction to facilitate liaison between representatives of people living in the vicinity of the Order limits and other relevant organisations in relation to the impacts of the Scheme. The Applicant will produce a detailed CEMP post consent which will be in accordance with the **Framework CEMP**

Examination Library Ref.	Name	Comment	Applicant's Response
			[REP1-019], as secured by Requirement 11 of Schedule 2 in the **Draft DCO [REP1-005]**. The implementation of Requirement 3 in Schedule 2 of the **Draft DCO [REP1-005]** will allow feedback on impacts of the Scheme and mitigation measures to be considered and acted upon if required.
REP1-062	Joseph John Lindley	I am writing as a local resident to express my objection to the proposed Fenwick Solar Farm development. While I fully support the need for renewable energy, this project is disproportionately large for the area and would cause significant and lasting harm to both the local environment and community. 1. Harm to the Landscape and Natural Beauty This area is known for its peaceful, open countryside and rural charm. Installing such a vast industrial development across over 500 hectares would irreversibly damage the character of the landscape and ruin what many consider to be an area of outstanding natural beauty	**ES Volume I, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity [APP-062]** recognises that there will be landscape and visual impacts during the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases of the Scheme. Whilst some impacts will remain at year 15 of operation, they will largely be screened or filtered by existing vegetation or proposed planting. Where the potential for adverse visual impacts has been identified, landscape mitigation, including vegetative screening, has been embedded within the design of the Scheme to reduce these impacts as far as possible. Proposed mitigation has been designed to integrate with the existing landscape character of the Solar PV Site. Details of the proposed screening and buffers including existing vegetation to be retained and proposed planting are provided in the **Framework LEMP [REP1-029]** and illustrated on the Indicative Landscape Masterplan included as Appendix A. Existing hedgerows will be retained as far as practicable. Buffers of grassland, native scrub and woodland will be created around the edge of the Solar PV Site and other larger areas of grassland will be created, which will offer habitat for wildlife, including foraging habitat for a number of species. These buffers minimise the potential for adverse impacts.
REP1-062	Joseph John Lindley	2. Loss of Valuable Farmland The land designated for this development is productive agricultural land, which plays a vital role in local and national food production. Turning this over to industrial use undermines long-term food security and the heritage of our farming communities.	As set out in **ES Volume I, Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use [REP1-013]**, an agricultural land survey was undertaken and categorised 7% of the Solar PV Site as BMV land. With the exception of a relatively small area of BMV land proposed for structural planting, impacts on this BMV land will be temporary and reversible. In addition, due to the small scale of this BMV land, it is not currently farmed for high-quality agricultural food production and was recently used for biomass crops. Within the Solar PV Site, fields currently used to grow arable crops (with some grazing) would cease to be part of a working farm during construction and operation, although there is potential for grazing by sheep for management of the grassland. The Grid Connection Corridor, if required, would also intersect a number of agricultural land holdings, but will be available for agricultural use again post construction, given cables will be buried at sufficient depth to enable agricultural activities to continue on the surface. Further information can be found in the **Framework SMP [APP-199]**. Prior to the start of construction, a detailed SMP will be submitted to and approved by the local authority (as outlined in the **Framework CEMP [REP1-019]** and secured by Requirement 15 of Schedule 2 to the **Draft DCO [REP1-005]**). This will ensure soils are not degraded and farming activities can re-commence following completion of the construction phase along the Grid Connection Corridor and decommissioning phase within the Solar PV Site.
REP1-062	Joseph John Lindley	3. Negative Impact on Wildlife and Biodiversity	**ES Volume I, Chapter 8: Ecology [APP-060]** provides an assessment of the Scheme's impact on important ecological features and is supported by extensive

Examination Library Ref.	Name	Comment	Applicant's Response
		The fields, hedgerows, and surrounding areas support a variety of species and natural habitats. A development on this scale would severely disrupt local ecosystems and wildlife corridors, some of which may be irreplaceable.	survey work which confirms the ecological habitats and species likely to be affected by the Scheme. The Scheme avoids and mitigates all significant adverse effects on internationally, nationally and locally designated biodiversity sites and other important ecological features such as protected species and habitats, and veteran trees, during the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases. This has been achieved through a considered and iterative design informed by a design team with qualified professional ecologists and includes avoidance, buffers and mitigation measures that will be secured through the various management plan requirements included in Schedule 2 of the **Draft DCO [REP1-005]**. As detailed in the **BNG Assessment [REP1-023]**, the Scheme is predicted to exceed the BNG target of 10% and this is predicted for each habitat type. The Applicant therefore commits to achieving a minimum 10% BNG for all habitat types as secured by the **Framework LEMP [REP1-029]** and requirement 6 in Schedule 2 in the **Draft DCO [REP1-005]**.
REP1-062	Joseph John Lindley	4. Visual and Lifestyle Intrusion The presence of thousands of solar panels, security fencing, substations, and lighting will have a major impact on the daily lives of nearby residents. The rural setting will be lost, replaced by the feel of an industrial zone, which will significantly reduce the enjoyment of our homes and surroundings.	**ES Volume I, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity [APP-062]** recognises that there will be landscape and visual impacts during the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases of the Scheme. Whilst some impacts will remain at year 15 of operation, they will largely be screened or filtered by existing vegetation or proposed planting. Where the potential for adverse visual impacts has been identified, landscape mitigation, including vegetative screening, has been embedded within the design of the Scheme to reduce these impacts as far as possible. Proposed mitigation has been designed to integrate with the existing landscape character of the Solar PV Site. Details of the proposed screening and buffers including existing vegetation to be retained and proposed planting are provided in the **Framework LEMP [REP1-029]** and illustrated on the Indicative Landscape Masterplan included as Appendix A. Existing hedgerows will be retained as far as practicable. Buffers of grassland, native scrub and woodland will be created around the edge of the Solar PV Site and other larger areas of grassland will be created, which will offer habitat for wildlife, including foraging habitat for a number of species. These buffers minimise the potential for adverse impacts.
REP1-062	Joseph John Lindley	5. Increased Traffic and Poor Road Infrastructure The local roads are narrow, often in poor condition, and already under pressure from existing traffic. The additional heavy construction vehicles and ongoing site traffic would not only worsen the condition of these roads but also raise safety concerns for residents, walkers, cyclists, and horse riders.	A full and detailed assessment of potential traffic and transport impacts from construction at sensitive receptors has been undertaken within **ES Volume I, Chapter 13: Transport and Access [REP1-015]**. Consideration has been given to traffic routing, timing, and access points to the Scheme during construction and traffic during the operation and maintenance phase would be minimal. The **Transport Assessment [APP-179]** and **Framework CTMP [APP-206, APP-207]** provide full details of embedded mitigation measures that are proposed to prevent or reduce potential adverse effects associated with construction traffic on local roads. This includes measures such as suitable agreed HGV routes and timing restrictions, the use of traffic marshals at site accesses and crossing points, and the development of a communications strategy for those working on the Scheme. A detailed CTMP (which must substantially accord with the **Framework CTMP [APP-206, APP-207]**) will need to be approved post consent prior to construction with the relevant local

Examination Library Ref.	Name	Comment	Applicant's Response
			authorities and this is secured by Requirement 13 in Schedule 2 to the **Draft DCO [REP1-005]**. In addition, pre and post construction road condition surveys will be undertaken at identified locations in coordination with the relevant Local Highway Authority, as referenced in Section 5.2 of the **Framework CTMP [APP-206, APP-207]**. Where these surveys identify upgrades needed to undertake the construction of the Scheme, or following the construction phase then these works will be undertaken.
REP1-062	Joseph John Lindley	6. Limited Community Benefit While the scale of the project is enormous, it offers little tangible benefit to the local population. Those living in the immediate area will face all the disruption and long-term impacts, yet see very few, if any, direct advantages. I urge the Planning Inspectorate to take these concerns seriously. Renewable energy must be pursued responsibly, and this proposal does not strike the right balance between national needs and local impact	The Applicant is committed to establishing a CBF which are designed to provide additional support and tangible benefits to local communities impacted by large infrastructure projects. They are voluntary commitments by developers to enhance the local area. The terms of reference will be discussed and agreed with a community liaison group. The exact details of the administration of the fund will be developed together with residents' representatives. CBFs are not considered in the overall planning balance when the Planning Inspectorate makes a recommendation or the Secretary of State grants consent, meaning the Examining Authority must still be satisfied the Scheme is appropriate even without the CBF in place.
REP1-055	Cathy Lindley	I am writing to formally object to the proposed Development Consent Order for the Fenwick Solar Farm, which covers 536 hectares of land. Should this application be approved, the project will have a profound and lasting impact on the surrounding villages and their residents. Below, I outline our key concerns for your consideration: 1. Size and Location of the Development The proposed solar farm spans an area equivalent to 662 football pitches, covering substantial green space that is vital to local residents, particularly families and children who regularly use this open countryside for outdoor activities such as walking, cycling, and horse riding. The development would significantly alter the rural character of Fenwick, replacing scenic views with industrial-scale solar panels and energy storage units. The diversion of Public Rights of Way, such as Sykehouse 29, and potential disruption to other rights of way will further restrict access to this open space. This loss of countryside is not only an aesthetic concern but also one of mental and physical well-being for local residents, especially in this area of social deprivation	The Solar PV Site has been chosen through a thorough site selection process which is explained in **ES Volume I, Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution [APP-055]** and assessed against relevant planning policy in the **Planning Statement [APP-190]**. The Applicant's design team has worked collaboratively to provide an integrated and responsive design which has been informed by the process of environmental impact assessment, statutory consultation and wide-ranging stakeholder engagement. All comments received from stakeholders regarding the design of the Scheme have been considered by the Applicant and, where practicable, incorporated. The Government has identified through its energy policy, most recently in the Overarching National Policy Statement for Energy (EN-1) and the National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy (EN-3), that there is an urgent need for large scale capacity low-carbon energy generation in the UK. As discussed in the Applicant's **Planning Statement [APP-190]** and **Statement of Need [APP-192]**, EN-1 and EN-3 identify large-scale solar energy generation, such as the Scheme, as being required to meet this need. Developing the Scheme at its proposed size and with its substantial benefits will therefore be an important contribution to meeting this urgent need and, as such, there is a clear and accepted case for the Scheme.
REP1-055	Cathy Lindley	2. Environmental Impact The construction of the solar farm will destroy important habitats for protected species such as bats, badgers, and newts. The proposed development also threatens farmland that has supported local agriculture for generations. This is in direct conflict with government policies aimed at preserving agricultural land and enhancing domestic food production. Given the farm's proposed 40-year lifespan, this would have a lasting negative impact on biodiversity and the local economy, as it is unlikely the land would return to its original state post-decommissioning. The rural development supplementary planning document ratified by Doncaster Council in April 24 categorise the area of Fenwick as part of countryside policy area and states that "*care should be taken that proposals (for development) would not*	**ES Volume I, Chapter 8: Ecology [APP-060]** provides an assessment of the Scheme's impact on important ecological features and is supported by extensive survey work which confirms the ecological habitats and species likely to be affected by the Scheme. The Scheme avoids and mitigates all significant adverse effects on internationally, nationally and locally designated biodiversity sites and other important ecological features such as protected species and habitats, and veteran trees, during the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases. This has been achieved through a considered and iterative design informed by a design team with qualified professional ecologists and includes avoidance, buffers and mitigation measures that will be secured through the various management plan requirements included in Schedule 2 of the **Draft DCO [REP1-005]**.

Examination Library Ref.	Name	Comment	Applicant's Response
		result in excessive expansion and encroachment of building development into the countryside"	As detailed in the **BNG Assessment [REP1-023]**, the Scheme is predicted to exceed the BNG target of 10% and this is predicted for each habitat type. The Applicant therefore commits to achieving a minimum 10% BNG for all habitat types as secured by the **Framework LEMP [REP1-029]** and requirement 6 in Schedule 2 in the **Draft DCO [REP1-005]**. As set out in **ES Volume I, Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use [REP1-013]**, an agricultural land survey was undertaken and categorised 7% of the Solar PV Site as BMV land. With the exception of a relatively small area of BMV land proposed for structural planting, impacts on this BMV land will be temporary and reversible. In addition, due to the small scale of this BMV land, it is not currently farmed for high-quality agricultural food production and was recently used for biomass crops. Within the Solar PV Site, fields currently used to grow arable crops (with some grazing) would cease to be part of a working farm during construction and operation, although there is potential for grazing by sheep for management of the grassland. The Grid Connection Corridor, if required, would also intersect a number of agricultural land holdings, but will be available for agricultural use again post construction, given cables will be buried at sufficient depth to enable agricultural activities to continue on the surface. Further information can be found in the **Framework SMP [APP-199]**. Prior to the start of construction, a detailed SMP will be submitted to and approved by the local authority (as outlined in the **Framework CEMP [REP1-019]** and secured by Requirement 15 of Schedule 2 to the **Draft DCO [REP1-005]**). This will ensure soils are not degraded and farming activities can re-commence following completion of the construction phase along the Grid Connection Corridor and decommissioning phase within the Solar PV Site.
REP1-055	Cathy Lindley	3. Local Infrastructure and Economy The development is projected to last 24 months and will result in significant traffic disruption through small rural villages. The narrow, single-track roads in Fenwick and surrounding areas are ill-equipped to handle heavy construction vehicles, posing risks to road safety and increasing wear and tear on already deteriorating roads. Additionally, local businesses, particularly those in farming and equestrian industries, rely on unimpeded access to local roads and bridleways. Increased traffic will disrupt their operations and lead to financial losses, job insecurity, and potential business closures	A full and detailed assessment of potential traffic and transport impacts from construction at sensitive receptors has been undertaken within **ES Volume I, Chapter 13: Transport and Access [REP1-015]**. Consideration has been given to traffic routing, timing, and access points to the Scheme during construction and traffic during the operation and maintenance phase would be minimal. The **Transport Assessment [APP-179]** and **Framework CTMP [APP-206, APP-207]** provide full details of embedded mitigation measures that are proposed to prevent or reduce potential adverse effects associated with construction traffic on local roads. This includes measures such as suitable agreed HGV routes and timing restrictions, the use of traffic marshals at site accesses and crossing points, and the development of a communications strategy for those working on the Scheme. A detailed CTMP (which must substantially accord with the **Framework CTMP [APP-206, APP-207]**) will need to be approved post consent prior to construction with the relevant local authorities and this is secured by Requirement 13 in Schedule 2 to the **Draft DCO [REP1-005]**. In addition, pre and post construction road condition surveys will be undertaken at identified locations in coordination with the relevant Local Highway Authority, as referenced in Section 5.2 of the **Framework CTMP [APP-206, APP-207]**. Where these surveys identify upgrades needed to undertake the construction of the Scheme, or following the construction phase then these works will be undertaken.

Examination Library Ref.	Name	Comment	Applicant's Response
REP1-055	Cathy Lindley	4. Noise and Visual Pollution Construction of the solar farm will introduce significant noise and visual pollution for up to two years. Many local residents, including those who work from home, will be impacted by this disruption. After construction, the constant humming of the solar panels and battery storage units will continue to disturb the peace of the area for over 40 years. The visual presence of solar panels and industrial equipment will alter the rural character of Fenwick, diminishing the enjoyment of local residents and likely devaluing properties	An assessment of construction noise effects during construction of the Solar PV Site is provided in **ES Volume I, Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [APP-063]**. Construction of the Solar PV Site will require an estimated 24 months covering an area of approximately 509 ha so construction works would not occur at any one location for extended periods of time. Table 11-10 of **ES Volume I, Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [APP-063]** presents worst-case levels of construction noise when activities are taking place in close proximity to sensitive receptors. No adverse construction noise effects are identified so although construction noise may result in temporary effect on the acoustic character of the area, no changes to quality of life are expected. The core working hours are defined in the **Framework CEMP [REP1-019]**. Noise generating activities near residential properties, such as use of power tools or piling, would be limited to the hours between 08:00 and 18:00 from Monday to Friday and between 08:00 and 13:00 on Saturday. A construction noise monitoring scheme shall be developed and agreed with the relevant local authorities following appointment of a Contractor and prior to commencement of construction works. A detailed CEMP, which must be substantially in accordance with the Framework CEMP, will need to be approved prior to construction by the relevant local planning authority and is secured through Requirement 11 of Schedule 2 to the **Draft DCO [REP1-005]**. An assessment of noise impacts from equipment, such as transformers and inverters, on nearby sensitive receptors during the operation and maintenance phase is presented in **ES Volume I, Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [APP-063]**. With proposed mitigation measures in place, noise from the Scheme is not considered to be significant at sensitive receptors. **ES Volume I, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity [APP-062]** recognises that there will be landscape and visual impacts during the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases of the Scheme. Whilst some impacts will remain at year 15 of operation, they will largely be screened or filtered by existing vegetation or proposed planting. Where the potential for adverse visual impacts has been identified, landscape mitigation, including vegetative screening, has been embedded within the design of the Scheme to reduce these impacts as far as possible. Proposed mitigation has been designed to integrate with the existing landscape character of the Solar PV Site. Details of the proposed screening and buffers including existing vegetation to be retained and proposed planting are provided in the **Framework LEMP [REP1-029]** and illustrated on the Indicative Landscape Masterplan included as Appendix A. Existing hedgerows will be retained as far as practicable. Buffers of grassland, native scrub and woodland will be created around the edge of the Solar PV Site and other larger areas of grassland will be created, which will offer habitat for wildlife, including foraging habitat for a number of species. These buffers minimise the potential for adverse impacts.
REP1-055	Cathy Lindley	5. Safety Hazards Solar farms, especially those involving large battery storage systems, present safety risks, including the potential for fires or other hazardous incidents. Given the close	The Applicant emphasises that the BESS Area was selected to accommodate a minimum buffer zone of 500 m to any residential properties which ensures disruption to the local community is minimised if a BESS Container failure should occur.

Examination Library Ref.	Name	Comment	Applicant's Response
		proximity of the development to residential homes, there is a significant concern for fire safety. Additionally, the presence of industrial equipment and large-scale infrastructure creates potential dangers for pedestrians, farm animals, and children who may use the land or public rights of way	Paragraph 2.1.4 of the **Framework BSMP [APP-205]** confirms the BESS Area will be designed to address prevailing industry standards and good practice at a time of detailed design and implementation. This document also extensively documents how the probability of a BESS Container failure incident is minimised by the design and proposed operating procedures, and that if a failure occurs these ensure this will be limited to one BESS Container. The **Framework BSMP [APP-205]** sets out the controls in place to ensure that, in the unlikely event a fire did occur, any impacts arising from the fire (such as fumes, or water run off) will be managed so there are no impacts on local communities beyond the Order limits. As secured in Paragraph 3.5.5, an ERP will be developed post consent to facilitate effective and safe emergency response. This will follow UK NFCC and NFPA 855 guidelines and will be finalised in consultation with SYFRS. Requirement 5 of Schedule 2 of the **Draft DCO [REP1-005]** requires the submission and approval of a detailed BSMP, which must be substantially in accordance with the **Framework BSMP [APP-205].**
REP1-055	Cathy Lindley	6. Inefficiency of Solar Farms Research shows that solar panels in the UK operate at low efficiency levels, with Sheffield University estimating an efficiency of only 11%. Given the vast amount of land required for this project, the potential benefits in terms of energy production seem minimal compared to the irreversible loss of green space and agricultural land. We believe other renewable energy sources, such as offshore wind farms or roof-mounted solar panels, would be far more appropriate and efficient	As explained in the **Statement of Need [APP-192]**, solar power generation has global momentum, and various large-scale schemes are being developed in the UK. Solar is a proven technology and is already delivering as part of the UK's electricity system and will continue to deliver further critical benefits to consumers through the urgent and continued decarbonisation, security of supply, and affordability of energy. Solar power generation has undergone significant technological advances in scale and commercial efficiency and solar panel efficiency is expected to continue improving over the course of the 2020s. It is therefore important to make best use of this natural, renewable energy resource to meet the UK's legal carbon emission reduction obligations. The Scheme would utilise a fixed south facing system for the Solar PV Panels. These are the most common approach for utility scale solar PV facilities in the UK to date and involve installing Solar PV Panels to fixed tables, arranged in rows facing south. The Scheme design retains flexibility to allow for the selection of the most efficient technology as solar generation technology is developing at a fast pace, with better, more efficient and more cost-effective technologies coming to the market. The Applicant is therefore seeking to retain the flexibility to choose the precise technology close to the point of the construction of the Scheme. This will enable the optimum production of renewable energy and subsequently reduce cost for the end user. The final technology installed will be required to remain within the parameters defined by the **Works Plan [APP-214]** and **Outline Design Parameters Statement [APP-193]**. There is an opportunity for the examination Authority to raise questions regarding the Scheme design during Examination.
REP1-055	Cathy Lindley	7. Devaluation of Property There is a genuine concern that the proximity of the solar farm, particularly the large battery storage units, will severely devalue local properties. For many residents, the character of the area, with its scenic views and rural setting, is a key factor in choosing to live here. If these views are replaced by large-scale industrial infrastructure, the quality of life will be greatly diminished, and property values will inevitably decline.	**ES Volume I, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity [APP-062]** recognises that there will be landscape and visual impacts during the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases of the Scheme. Whilst some impacts will remain at year 15 of operation, they will largely be screened or filtered by existing vegetation or proposed planting. Where the potential for adverse visual impacts has been identified, landscape mitigation, including vegetative screening, has been embedded within the design of

Examination Library Ref.	Name	Comment	Applicant's Response
			the Scheme to reduce these impacts as far as possible. Proposed mitigation has been designed to integrate with the existing landscape character of the Solar PV Site. Details of the proposed screening and buffers including existing vegetation to be retained and proposed planting are provided in the **Framework LEMP [REP1-029]** and illustrated on the Indicative Landscape Masterplan included as Appendix A. Existing hedgerows will be retained as far as practicable. Buffers of grassland, native scrub and woodland will be created around the edge of the Solar PV Site and other larger areas of grassland will be created, which will offer habitat for wildlife, including foraging habitat for a number of species. These buffers minimise the potential for adverse impacts. Impacts on property prices are not a material consideration in the NSIP planning process and, therefore, are not a factor to be considered by the Secretary of State when determining the application for development consent. However, the Applicant will comply with the Compensation Code in respect of any compulsory acquisition associated with the Scheme, including any injurious affection or depreciation of land value in accordance with the relevant statutory tests.
REP1-055	Cathy Lindley	8. Lack of Representation by Local MP and Mayor of Doncaster Unfortunately, our local MP, Mr Miliband, has been outspoken in his support for the solar farm, dismissing the concerns of residents at a village meeting. This has left us feeling that our voices have not been properly heard or considered in the decision-making process, and we have been denied fair representation in this matter. Lack of support from the Mayor of Doncaster who said at a Fenwick Solar Farm meeting in June 2024 it was not appropriate or applicable to object or for her to voice an opinion on an NSIP despite now joining a campaign objecting to a different NSIP in a different part of the borough. She is now promoting the Save our Countryside campaign and is quoted on 15th April 2025 as saying to Doncaster Free Press with relation to the Whitestone Solar Farm project: *"I fully understand the concerns that are being raised in relation to this proposed large scale solar development at Conisborough. I am a firm believer that solar panels should be on rooftops first and foremost and not on productive farmland. "I am opposed to large landowners, most of which do not live in Doncaster or farm the land they own, taking productive farmland out of production that could blight vast swathes of our beautiful environment.* *"It is important to remember that at this stage they are proposals, and I encourage everyone to put forward their views during the next phase of consultation which will be later this year." Perhaps if we had had this validation at the start of our journey then we would be in a stronger position going forward."* Perhaps if we had had this validation at the start of our journey then we would be in a stronger position going forward. We respectfully ask that the Planning Inspectorate fully considers these concerns when determining the future of the Fenwick Solar Farm application.	The Applicant acknowledges the concerns regarding the perceived lack of representation from local elected officials. It should be noted the Examining Authority is mandated to assess all representations objectively and impartially, considering the evidence presented and potential impacts of the Scheme. This approach ensures that decision-making is not unduly influenced by individual opinions but is instead based on a comprehensive evaluation of all material considerations. Therefore, while there may be differing perspectives among elected officials and community members, the NSIP process provides a robust mechanism for ensuring that all viewpoints are considered in a fair and balanced manner. The Applicant is committed to ongoing consultation with the community so that anxieties can be communicated and as far as possible addressed throughout all stages of the Scheme. The implementation of Requirement 3 in Schedule 2 of the **Draft DCO [REP1-005]** will allow feedback on impacts of the Scheme and mitigation measures to be considered and acted upon if required. Paragraph 2.1.14 of the **Framework CEMP [REP1-019]** confirms that a Community Liaison Group will also be set up and a Community Liaison Officer (or alternative role) established during construction to facilitate liaison between representatives of people living in the vicinity of the Order limits and other relevant organisations in relation to the impacts of the Scheme. The Applicant will produce a detailed CEMP post consent which will be in accordance with the **Framework CEMP [REP1-019]**, as secured by Requirement 11 of Schedule 2 in the **Draft DCO [REP1-005]**.

Examination Library Ref.	Name	Comment	Applicant's Response
AS-007	David Thompson	I am writing to express my strong objection to the proposal for the construction of a large solar farm in the fields surrounding Fenwick. This proposal is causing me significant mental stress, and I am deeply concerned about the impact it will have on our community and the environment. The fields surrounding Fenwick are not only a place of natural beauty but also hold significant value for the residents who live here. The proposed solar farm would drastically alter the landscape, leading to potential disruptions to local wildlife habitats and the aesthetic appeal of the area. The serene environment that we cherish would be replaced by an industrial expanse, affecting not only the visual aspect but also the quality of life for those of us who rely on these open spaces for recreation and peace.	**ES Volume I, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity [APP-062]** recognises that there will be landscape and visual impacts during the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases of the Scheme. Whilst some impacts will remain at year 15 of operation, they will largely be screened or filtered by existing vegetation or proposed planting. Where the potential for adverse visual impacts has been identified, landscape mitigation, including vegetative screening, has been embedded within the design of the Scheme to reduce these impacts as far as possible. Proposed mitigation has been designed to integrate with the existing landscape character of the Solar PV Site. Details of the proposed screening and buffers including existing vegetation to be retained and proposed planting are provided in the **Framework LEMP [REP1-029]** and illustrated on the Indicative Landscape Masterplan included as Appendix A. Existing hedgerows will be retained as far as practicable. Buffers of grassland, native scrub and woodland will be created around the edge of the Solar PV Site and other larger areas of grassland will be created, which will offer habitat for wildlife, including foraging habitat for a number of species. These buffers minimise the potential for adverse impacts.
AS-007	David Thompson	Moreover, the mental stress induced by the prospect of this development is real and substantial. The thought of losing the green fields to rows of solar panels is distressing, and it is impacting my well-being. The community's collective anxiety over this proposal cannot be understated, as it threatens to change the character of Fenwick irreversibly.	The Applicant appreciates that the potential for the Scheme to have adverse effects creates uncertainly and anxiety for local residents. The comprehensive and detailed approach to consultation, Scheme design, and the EIA process allows any adverse effects to be identified early and the effects to be mitigated, where practicable, such as through the buffers and vegetation screening proposed as part of the Scheme. A consideration of both human mental and physical health runs through many chapters (**Volume I, Chapter 9** to **Chapter 14 [APP-064 to APP-066]**) but none of the assessments have identified likely significant effects during the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases of the Scheme. The assessments conclude that impacts on the health of communities will be managed to acceptable levels through the suite of management plans proposed and secured via the **Draft DCO [REP1-005]**. The Applicant is committed to ongoing consultation with the community so that anxieties can be communicated and as far as possible addressed throughout all stages of the Scheme. The implementation of Requirement 3 in Schedule 2 of the **Draft DCO [REP1-005]** will allow feedback on impacts of the Scheme and mitigation measures to be considered and acted upon if required. Paragraph 2.1.14 of the **Framework CEMP [REP1-019]** confirms that a Community Liaison Group will also be set up and a Community Liaison Officer (or alternative role) established during construction to facilitate liaison between representatives of people living in the vicinity of the Order limits and other relevant organisations in relation to the impacts of the Scheme. The Applicant will produce a detailed CEMP post consent which will be in accordance with the **Framework CEMP [REP1-019]**, as secured by Requirement 11 of Schedule 2 in the **Draft DCO [REP1-005]**.

Examination Library Ref.	Name	Comment	Applicant's Response
AS-007	David Thompson	I have called Fenwick my home for over 13 years, and it holds a special place for my family and me. However, the anticipated disruption to our community during the two-year construction period, along with the broader impact on the surrounding area, is leading me to contemplate leaving the village. This is a decision I am reluctant to make, but the approval of this application would make it unavoidable.	Measures to minimise community disturbance from noise, lighting and traffic and minimise impacts on visual amenity as a result of the Scheme during the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases are provided in the **Framework CEMP [REP1-019]**, **Framework CTMP [APP-206, APP-207]**, **Framework OEMP [APP-197]**, and **Framework DEMP [REP1-021]**. The potential landscape, noise, and transport impacts from the Scheme are set out in **ES Volume I, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity [APP-062], Volume I, Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [APP-063]**, and **Volume I, Chapter 13: Transport and Access [REP1-015]**. The Applicant is committed to ongoing consultation with the community so that anxieties can be communicated and as far as possible addressed throughout all stages of the Scheme. The implementation of Requirement 3 in Schedule 2 of the **Draft DCO [REP1-005]** will allow feedback on impacts of the Scheme and mitigation measures to be considered and acted upon if required. Paragraph 2.1.14 of the **Framework CEMP [REP1-019]** confirms that a Community Liaison Group will also be set up and a Community Liaison Officer (or alternative role) established during construction to facilitate liaison between representatives of people living in the vicinity of the Order limits and other relevant organisations in relation to the impacts of the Scheme. The Applicant will produce a detailed CEMP post consent which will be in accordance with the **Framework CEMP [REP1-019]**, as secured by Requirement 11 of Schedule 2 in the **Draft DCO [REP1-005]**.
AS-007	David Thompson	While I understand the need for renewable energy sources, I strongly believe that there are more suitable locations for such developments that do not encroach upon the natural and social fabric of established communities. The preservation of our countryside should be a priority, ensuring that developments are carried out in a manner that respects both nature and the people living within it. I urge you to reconsider this proposal and to look into alternative sites that would not impose such a severe burden on our local environment and well-being. Fenwick's fields are an invaluable resource that should be protected for current and future generations. Thank you for taking my objection into account. I hope that the planning inspectorate will act in the best interest of Fenwick's residents and the preservation of our cherished landscape.	The Solar PV Site has been chosen through a thorough site selection process which is explained in **Volume I, Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution [APP-055]** and assessed against relevant planning policy in the **Planning Statement [APP-190]**. All comments received from stakeholders regarding the design of the Scheme have been considered by the Applicant and, where practicable, incorporated. As discussed in the Applicant's **Planning Statement [APP-190]** and **Statement of Need [APP-192]**, EN-1 and EN-3 identify large-scale solar energy generation, such as the Scheme, as being required to meet this need. The **Statement of Need [APP-192]** also notes that, whilst decentralised generation has an important role to play in decarbonisation, on its own, smaller scale solar, including rooftop solar, is not likely to deliver a sufficient total capacity at the required pace and at an affordable cost to meet the Government's targets. Therefore, smaller scale solar, including rooftop solar, must be considered as additional to, as opposed to instead of, the need for large-scale, ground-mounted solar like this Scheme. Brownfield land was considered for the Scheme following a review of the local authority brownfield land register. However, it was concluded that there was no available or suitable brownfield land for the Scheme as it would compete or be in conflict with local planning policy seeking to deliver housing and mixed-use developments, and the land next to the Existing National Grid Thorpe Marsh Substation was being developed for another energy project. This is explained in **Volume I, Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution [APP-055]**.

Examination Library Ref.	Name	Comment	Applicant's Response
REP1-058	Exolum	Regarding the above Referenced Planning Application. We confirm that our client's High-Pressure Oil Pipeline Apparatus will be affected by the application as indicated in the attached plan(s) and we must therefore OBJECT for the following key reasons: • The application has the potential to contravene Exolum's ability to Safely access and maintain its assets under their legal rights as set out in Part IV of The Energy Act 2013, and • Due to the potential for breach(s) of the Health & Safety at Work Act 1974 with specific concerns around Regulation 15 of the Pipeline Safety Regulations 1996 and the potential for any subsequent work close to the High-Pressure Pipeline to impact both the Safety of the pipeline and those doing the work.	The Applicant and Exolum have agreed a form of bespoke protective provisions that have been included as Part 6 of Schedule 14 to the Draft DCO at Deadline 1 **[REP1-005]**. Exolum withdrew its objection to the Scheme via email on 19 May 2025; therefore, the contents of Exolum's representation are no longer a matter for ongoing discussion.
REP1-058	Exolum	We note in this specific case: 1. The proposed construction interacts with the Exolum pipeline. It is therefore critical that all Construction and Design work affecting a High-Pressure Pipeline is discussed and agreed with Exolum before the objection can removed and before any work on site. NOTE: The location plan(s) supplied are intended for general guidance only and should not be relied upon for detailed design, excavation or construction purposes. No guarantee is given regarding the accuracy of the information provided in the plans and to verify the true location of the High-Pressure Pipeline at site contact MUST be made with Exolum to arrange a site visit. My client must be consulted to ensure the proposal has no impact on their High-Pressure Pipeline apparatus.	
REP1-058	Exolum	Please can we send an objection for the Fenwick Solar Project. Please find FG and Site plans attached. [Image] [Image] [Image]	

3. Applicants Responses to Written Summaries of Oral Submissions Made at Hearings at Deadline 1

3.1 Applicants Responses to Written Summaries of Oral Submissions Made at Hearings at Deadline 1

Table 3-1: Applicants Responses to Written Summaries of Oral Submissions Made at Hearings at Deadline 1

Examination Library Ref.	Name	Comment	Applicant's Response
REP1-047	City of Doncaster Council	Article 12 (permanent closure of public rights of way) CDC has comments on the drafting of article 12 and these will be discussed with the Applicant after the hearing. On a practical point, some paths affected by the DCO have been subject to previous legal orders, such as a diversion, and it is not clear that, in every case, a legal event modification order for each legal event has been made yet. CDC and the Applicant will need to discuss the practicalities arising from this. The discussion will take place after the hearing.	The Applicant updated the Draft DCO at Deadline 1 **[REP1-005]** to reflect initial comments from City of Doncaster Council on the drafting of Article 12. The City of Doncaster Council provided further comments on the drafting of article 12 to the Applicant on 27 May 2025. As this was provided one day before Deadline 2, the Applicant is in the process of considering updates to the draft DCO to address these comments. The Applicant hopes to discuss these comments further with the City of Doncaster Council ahead of the June hearings.
REP1-047	City of Doncaster Council	Schedule 2 – Requirements Requirement 10 (archaeology) CDC consider the South Yorkshire Archaeological Service ("SYAS") should be named as a consultee to ensure that body is consulted by CDC before the final Archaeological Mitigation Strategy is approved, notwithstanding the fact CDC could consult SYAS even if they were not named. A reason for naming SYAS in R10 is that the officer responsible for eventually discharging the requirement might be unaware that it is CDC's practice to consult SYAS on architectural matters and the naming of SYAS in the requirement will ensure this is done. It is therefore a question of good administration.	While the Applicant is not opposed to SYAS being consulted by City of Doncaster Council in respect of Requirement 10, the Applicant still does not consider it appropriate for this to be reflected in the drafting of the Article. As SYAS is not a statutory body, there remains the risk that the service is wound up or is no longer engaged by City of Doncaster Council at the time of the Requirement being discharged. This could invalidate the function of the Requirement, as the Applicant would be unable to ensure consultation had occurred with SYAS as prescribed. All of the other consultees specified in the Requirements are statutory bodies or organisations which the Applicant is confident will remain in place for the duration of the Scheme. Given the explanation provided by City of Doncaster Council that SYAS is the body the council uses for all archaeological assessments, the Applicant considers there is a low risk of the scenario described where SYAS is inadvertently not engaged when they should be. In any case, the Applicant considers this is a matter of administrative function for City of Doncaster Council to manage in respect of its own delegations, as opposed to the DCO to prescribe.
REP1-047	City of Doncaster Council	(2) Part 3 of the draft Order concerns streets. The first point to make here is that members of the Council's highways team are due to meet with the Applicant's highways consultants in the next week or so to discuss the Council's concerns with Part 3. In general terms, officers are concerned with the wide scope of powers sought under Part 3 including powers for the undertaker to interfere with the streets in its area without the consent of the street authority. For the good administration of the delivery of the highways works related to the authorised development, the Council considers it would be beneficial if a highways side-agreement was entered into, based on the Council's standard s.278 agreement. A copy of that agreement has been shared with the Applicant, and it hoped work can begin on it after the meeting between the technical experts has taken place.	Further to this general acknowledgment of changes to Part 3, the City of Doncaster Council provided specific comments on the drafting within Part 3 to the Applicant on 27 May 2025.As this was provided one day before Deadline 2, the Applicant is in the process of considering updates to the draft DCO to address these comments. The Applicant hopes to discuss these comments further with the City of Doncaster Council ahead of the June hearings. The Applicant can confirm that City of Doncaster Council has provided a draft form of its standard 278 agreement to the Applicant, for conversion into an highways-related agreement under Article 15 of the draft DCO **[REP1-005]**. The Applicant is in the process of amending this agreement for further discussion with City of Doncaster Council, alongside the final comments City of Doncaster Council has provided on Part 3 of the draft DCO.

Examination Library Ref.	Name	Comment	Applicant's Response
REP1-047	City of Doncaster Council	(5). Schedule 15 (discharge of requirements) CDC commented on paragraph 5 of Schedule 15, which concerns fees. [Post-hearing note: The Council has agreed to provide the Applicant with its proposed form of PPA and it is hoped that discussions on that document with begin shortly].	The Applicant notes that it is open to progressing a draft PPA with City of Doncaster Council; however, the Applicant continues to await a draft for discussion.
REP1-057	Broadfield Law UK LLP on behalf of Elba Securities and Able UK Ltd	ABLE is now engaging in constructive discussions with the Applicant to ensure its land interests are safeguarded through appropriate legal mechanisms. Subsequent to the Preliminary Meeting on 19 March 2025, engagement has led to a provisionally agreed cable route, subject to agreement of commercial terms. On that basis we withdraw our request for a compulsory acquisition hearing, although noting that the compulsory acquisition of the whole site is still part of the application, we may wish to request one subsequently if it appears that the constructive engagement has stalled.	The Applicant appreciates this confirmation by ABLE that it does not require a compulsory acquisition hearing on its land interests at this stage. The Applicant remains committed to progressing a voluntary agreement between the parties.
REP1-057	Broadfield Law UK LLP on behalf of Elba Securities and Able UK Ltd	**1 Article 13 – Use of Private Roads** 1.1 Article 13 provides that: *'The undertaker may use <u>any private road within the Order limits</u> for the passage of <u>persons or vehicles (with or without materials, plant and machinery)</u> for the purposes of, or in connection with, the <u>construction or maintenance</u> of the authorised development.'* (Emphasis added) 1.2 ABLE strongly object to the breadth of this provision, which would grant the undertaker sweeping and unjustified access to all private roads within the Order limits, including internal roads at ABLE's Thorpe Marsh site (indicated by dashed lines in sheets 9 and 10 of the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plan (APP-008)). 1.3 This request is wholly disproportionate and demonstrates the Applicant's failure to accurately assess the specific private roads it requires access to, let alone explore less disruptive alternatives. The reasonable and proportionate approach would be to limit the undertaker's access to the area marked hatched green on sheet 10 of the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plan (APP-008) to access Thorpe Bank for the purposes of laying cables. In short, ABLE maintains that the Applicant should limit their access over ABLE's land to a maximum of one road, or preferably none if feasible alternatives exist.	The Applicant notes that Article 13 was updated in the **Draft DCO** at Deadline 1 **[REP1-005]** to specifically refer to the closure only of those private roads specified in the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans. The Applicant has had further discussions with Able on these concerns since Deadline 1. In respect of these discussions, the Applicant proposes a new version of the **Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans** (Revision 03) **[EN010152/APP/2.3]** at Deadline 2. This version has removed private roads previously notated within the Plans on ABLE's land, to minimise the extent of this power. The private roads remaining within ABLE's land which remain subject to Article 13 are now: • The eastern extent of Ash Road, which would overlap with the area required for the cable works (including the HDD pit where the HDD cable would emerge from the other side of the railway network to the north of ABLE's land). • The roads which circumnavigate and provide access within the National Grid Substation, to enable any access required for the connection into the Substation itself. The Applicant considers the restriction of the power to these roads is appropriately proportionate to the construction works now committed to in this area in the engagement with Able. The Applicant understands Able is continuing to review these updated plans and will provide its comments subsequently.
REP1-057	Broadfield Law UK LLP on behalf of Elba Securities and Able UK Ltd	**2 Article 22 – Compulsory Acquisition of Rights** 2.1 Article 22(2), with reference to Schedule 9, defines the rights sought by the Applicant for compulsory acquisition, distinguishing between 'access rights' and 'cable rights'. ABLE has Category 1, 2, and 3 land interests (plots 9/09, 9/15, 10/03, 10/05, 10/06, 10/07, 10/08, 10/09, 10/10 and 10/13 as identified in the Book of Reference (APP-020) and Land Plans (APP-006)) which are adversely impacted by this definition of 'cable rights'. ABLE specifically object to sub-paragraph (g) of 'cable rights' which imposes excessive restrictions on ABLE's land use as it provides the undertaker rights over land to:	The Applicant's understanding of the input from the ExA at ISH1 on this matter was to encourage further discussions between the parties in respect of ABLE's rights and interests, as opposed to any confirmation as to the need for amendments or protective provisions. This is what the Applicant has focused on in discussions with ABLE since Deadline 1. The Applicant does not consider any amendment to the definition of cable rights as apply to Article 22 is appropriate. This is a general definition which has been utilised in several made DCOs. It is not intended to reflect that these rights would be used in every exercise of Article 22 powers; instead, it reflects the broad scope of powers the undertaker *may* use, but which will ultimately be applied proportionally to each parcel within the Order limits in respect of the particular features of the parcel and the

Examination Library Ref.	Name	Comment	Applicant's Response
		'[…] restrict and remove the erection of buildings or structures, restrict the altering of ground Levels, restrict and remove vegetation and restrict the planting of trees or carrying out operations or actions (including but not limited to blasting and piling) which may obstruct, interrupt or interfere with the exercise of the rights or damage the authorised development.' 2.3 Such broad powers and restrictions are unacceptable. While ABLE appreciate the Applicant's view that the definitions of 'cable rights' has been adopted from previously made DCOs, ABLE and the ExA maintain that, if sub paragraph (g) was to remain, ABLE are justified in seeking protective provisions as otherwise ABLE would not have any form of control on how these rights are exercised. ABLE insists that any such limitations must be confined strictly to the cable corridor, where cable installation is planned, and cause the minimum disruption to ABLE's activities. The ExA concurred that as with Article 13, protective provisions or amendments are necessary to ensure ABLE retains control over its land use.	particular requirements of the authorised development in that area. In respect of ABLE's land, this will reflect the particular requirements of the cabling, once installed and the existing features of the area within ABLE's parcel they are installed. The Applicant does not consider the proposed use of protective provisions to manage these concerns is appropriate. Protective provisions are used to establish a process for the protection of existing assets held by statutory undertakers and other large infrastructure providers, as opposed to general property rights as held by ABLE. The Applicant does not understand that ABLE has existing assets within the affected parcel for protection at this time. Notwithstanding the above, the Applicant remains committed to ongoing engagement with ABLE in order to finalise a voluntary agreement between the parties, such that the use of any compulsory acquisition of property rights can be avoided.
REP1-057	Broadfield Law UK LLP on behalf of Elba Securities and Able UK Ltd	**4 Schedule 1 – Authorised Development** 4.1 At the end of Schedule 1, the Applicant sets out an extensive list of 'further associated development' works concerning Work Nos. 1 to 9, which includes Work No.4 'works to lay electrical cables and compounds for the electrical cables' which falls within ABLE's land at Thorpe Marsh. 4.2 ABLE object to the inclusion of Work No.4 within these broad development powers, as several listed works are irrelevant to cable installation, which is the primary basis for Work No.4. As with Article 13, it appears that the Applicant has not sufficiently given thought to limit any powers, with a view to balancing the interests of affected parties. Rather, it would appear that the Applicant has included blanket provisions out of convenience. Moreover, it remains unclear whether these works have undergone sufficient environmental assessment. 4.3 In this respect, ABLE require a review of this list, and seek a reduction to include what is strictly necessary for cable installation. Furthermore, the ExA acknowledged ABLE's concerns and suggested that a carve-out for Work No.4 ought to be explored, ensuring that only necessary works are permitted and appropriately assessed.	The Applicant's understanding of the ExA's comments on the drafting of Schedule 1 were not that a carve out to Work No.4 should be explored, but instead that the parties should discuss ABLE's concerns directly further. In fact, the Applicant notes the ExA's comments from ISH1 that the drafting of the associated development works within Schedule 1 were typical of made DCOs to date. The Applicant agrees with this commentary, and considers the list included within Schedule 1 to be standard for made DCOs, and particularly made solar DCOs. As with the response to **[REP1-057]**, the intention of this broad wording is not with the intention of using these powers at every parcel throughout the Scheme, but rather to enable associated development which is proportionate and necessary to support the identified Work No. for a particular parcel but which may not be captured directly within the wording of that Work No. This avoids unnecessary repetition in the drafting of Work Nos within Schedule 1 and avoids scenarios where works which are necessary to enable the main work as specified in a Work No. are inadvertently left out of that Work No, and then thwart the intended construction of the authorised development. The Applicant considers the discussions between the parties provide the appropriate forum to address ABLE's concerns and ensure it is clear what works the Applicant intends to undertake within ABLE's land. The Applicant continues to pursue a voluntary agreement with ABLE which can resolve these matters.