



City of
Doncaster
Council

Answers to Examining Authority's Questions (ExQ2)

Project: Fenwick Solar Farm

Applicant: Fenwick Solar Project Limited

Unique Reference: B100000053

Ref:	Question to:	Question:	CDC Responses:
General matters			
1.2.1	City of Doncaster Council	Please confirm what planning status and use of the property located at South Fork on Bunfold Shaw Lane has including dates and reference numbers.	Planning permission was granted for the conversion of a barn into a dwellinghouse on this site under CDC reference 23/02547/FUL on 20.03.2024. This now forms the property known as South Fork.
Biodiversity (including HRA and Biodiversity Net Gain)			
1.6.8	City of Doncaster Council, the applicant	Please confirm who currently has responsibility for the Went Valley LWS within the Order limits and who would be responsible for its management during the life of the project and how this would interact with the management plans.	The management of LWSs is the responsibility of whoever is the landowner. CDC has no control of management of such private land. The Applicant would need to secure management of Went Valley LWS with whoever the landowner is in order to ensure that management of the site was carried out as required.
1.6.10	Natural England, City of Doncaster Council	Breeding Bird Report [APP-152] , Breeding Bird Report – Annex A (Confidential) [APP-153] and Non-Breeding Bird Report [APP-154] . The Burnet Heritage Trust (BHT) have questioned the thoroughness of the breeding bird and non-breeding bird surveys conducted for the project, the data used and the omission of curlew records from the applicant's surveys ([RR-011] , [REP1-054] , [REP2-075] and [REP3-035]). Please comment on the bird survey methodology and approach for the project and the comments raised by the BHT on this matter.	CDC have not been informed of additional curlew records and none for the area have been submitted to the Doncaster Local Record Centre (DLRC) within the last 10 years. CDC considers that the survey methods are in accordance with current best practice and at Table 8.1 of the ES Vol 8 Ecology [APP-060] . The Applicant states that in respect of breeding bird surveys "Surveys for breeding birds are based on a standard method for surveying breeding birds as detailed in 'Bird Monitoring Methods' (Ref. 8-55) and 'Bird Census Techniques' (Ref. 8-56); and were adapted where necessary to include species-specific methods (as detailed in 'Bird Monitoring Methods' (Ref. 8-55)) for other species, as required." Without further detail or the scope of recent curlew records from the Burnet Heritage Trust (BHT), CDC is not able to make any informed comment on any omissions in survey effort or scope by the Applicants.
1.6.13	Applicant, City of Doncaster Council	fLEMP [REP3-017] and BHT written representation at deadline 3 [REP3-035] . Please comment on the BHT request for a commitment to include a number of small headlands of pollinator and bird seed crop mixes along hedgerow edges or planned ecological mitigation areas and the request for a commitment that these areas remain ungrazed and reinstated biannually for the duration of the scheme.	CDC would be supportive of this proposed change to the fLEMP.
1.6.19	City of Doncaster Council	Natural England response to deadline 2 [REP2-070] written question 1.6.1 on the candidate Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and Yorkshire Wildlife Trust (YWT) [REP3-038] and BHT [REP3-035] written representations at deadline 3. Please comment on: a) the extent and adequacy of the surveys carried out on land identified as part of the candidate SSSI; b) the adequacy of mitigation proposed and compensation design for the candidate SSSI designation area; and c) the adequacy of potential impacts to habitats and species that form the candidate SSSI site being addressed within the submission and the fLEMP [REP3-017] .	CDC have not been involved in any discussions in respect of the candidate SSSI which are understood to have taken place between the Burnet Heritage Trust (BHT) and Natural England and had not been aware of the candidacy put forward by BHT until Deadline 2. As CDC has not been involved in any discussions or been provided with baseline information about the candidate SSSI, further comment cannot be provided on these matters.

Ref:	Question to:	Question:	CDC Responses:
Transport and access, highways and public rights of way			
1.10.2	City of Doncaster	<p>Chapter 13: Transport and Access [REP1-015] paragraphs 13.7.16 and 13.7.25 and table 13-3.</p> <p>This part of Chapter 13 explains that due to the baseline hourly two-way traffic flows on some of the ATC links, the magnitude of impact has been lowered by one step so that the impact magnitude is therefore medium instead of high and this is considered to be an appropriate method. Please comment on this approach and judgement. Please comment on the findings presented in Table 13-20 for ATC 10, 11, 12, 13 and 14.</p>	<p>CDC has reviewed the rationale behind the magnitude of impact being lowered by one step and is satisfied that this is a reasonable approach. CDC concluded that when the baseline traffic flow data is so low, any proposed increase, is magnitude beyond the context. This is the case for this development proposal as traffic levels are so low meaning that even a small increase in numbers when expressed as a percentage appears to look far more than they would be in reality. CDC would also point out that most of the traffic is out of what is classified as peak hours, therefore in the worst case of 120 cars an hour coming to site, this still only equates to one car every thirty seconds. The use of minibuses for construction staff would further reduce this number.</p>