
FENWICK SOLAR FARM

**Fenwick Solar Farm
EN010152**

**Statement of Common Ground between Fenwick Solar Project
Limited and City of Doncaster Council**

Document Reference: EN010152/APP/8.5

The Infrastructure Planning (Examination Procedure) Rules 2010

August 2025
Revision Number: 04

2009

BOOM-POWER.CO.UK

BOOM
POWER

Revision History

Revision Number	Date	Details
00	April 2025	Deadline 1
01	May 2025	Deadline 2
02	July 2025	Deadline 3
03	July 2025	Deadline 4
04	August 2025	Deadline 5

Prepared for:
Fenwick Solar Project Limited

Prepared by:
AECOM Limited

© 2025 AECOM Limited. All Rights Reserved.

This document has been prepared by AECOM Limited ("AECOM") for sole use of our client (the "Client") in accordance with generally accepted consultancy principles, the budget for fees and the terms of reference agreed between AECOM and the Client. Any information provided by third parties and referred to herein has not been checked or verified by AECOM, unless otherwise expressly stated in the document. No third party may rely upon this document without the prior and express written agreement of AECOM.

Table of Contents

1.	Introduction and Purpose.....	1
1.1	Purpose of this Statement of Common Ground	1
1.2	Parties to this Statement of Common Ground	2
1.3	Description of the Scheme.....	2
1.4	Format of Document and Terminology	2
2.	Record of Engagement.....	4
2.1	Record of Engagement.....	4
3.	Areas of Discussion Between the Parties	11
4.	References	36
5.	Abbreviations	37

Tables

Table 2-1: Schedule of Meetings and Correspondence.....	4
Table 3-1: Areas of Discussion with City of Doncaster Council	11
Table 5-1: Abbreviations	37

Statement of Common Ground

Signatures

This Statement of Common Ground has been prepared and agreed by Fenwick Solar Project Limited and City of Doncaster Council.

██████████, NSIP Development Manager on behalf of Fenwick Solar Project Limited

Date: 20 August 2025

Signed:

██████████

██████████, Head of Planning, on behalf of City of Doncaster Council.

Date: 20 August 2025

Signed:

██████████

1. Introduction and Purpose

1.1 Purpose of this Statement of Common Ground

- 1.1.1 This Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) has been prepared for the examination of an application (the Application) made to the Secretary of State for Energy Security and Net Zero for a Development Consent Order (DCO) under Section 37 of the Planning Act 2008 (PA 2008) (Ref. 1) for the proposed Fenwick Solar Farm (the Scheme). The Application is submitted by Fenwick Solar Project Limited (the Applicant).
- 1.1.2 This SoCG does not seek to replicate information which is available elsewhere within the Application documents. All documents are available on the Planning Inspectorate's website at <https://national-infrastructure-consenting.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/projects/EN010152/documents>.
- 1.1.3 SoCGs are an established means in the planning process of allowing all parties to identify and focus on specific issues that may need to be addressed during the examination. This SoCG has been produced to confirm to the Examining Authority (ExA) where agreement has been reached between the parties, where matters are under discussion or where agreement has not been reached. It has been progressed during the pre-examination and examination periods to reach a final position between the Applicant and City of Doncaster Council (CDC). This SoCG has been revised and updated as discussions between the Applicant and CDC progress during the Examination.
- 1.1.4 The ExA requested the SoCG include the following matters as set out in its Rule 6 Letter **[PD-005]**:
- a. Scope of Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) topics and issues carried through to the assessment, and the appropriateness of the assessment methodologies used;
 - b. Planning policy;
 - c. The need and principle of the proposed development and the examination of alternatives;
 - d. Air quality and health;
 - e. Noise and vibration;
 - f. Ground conditions and land contamination;
 - g. Land use and agriculture;
 - h. Landscape and visual receptors;
 - i. Biodiversity, ecology and the natural environment;
 - j. Design including effect on trees, woodland and hedgerows;
 - k. Water resources, flood risk and drainage;
 - l. Construction effects on people and communities;
 - m. Employment and other socioeconomic factors;
 - n. Historic environment including archaeology;

- o. Traffic, transport and public rights of way (PRoW);
 - p. Glint and glare;
 - q. An assessment of the proposed development's cumulative and in-combination effects with other nearby major developments;
 - r. Mitigation measures including an assessment of their likely effectiveness, ongoing monitoring procedures and how mitigation will be secured within the DCO; and
 - s. Any other relevant matters.
- 1.1.5 It can be taken that any matters not specifically referred to in Section 3 of this SoCG are not of material interest or relevance to CDC's Relevant Representation (RR) and therefore have not been considered in this document.
- 1.1.6 Full responses to all comments raised within CDC's RR are provided within the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations **[REP1-031]** submitted at Deadline 1 of Examination.

1.2 Parties to this Statement of Common Ground

- 1.2.1 This SoCG has been prepared between (1) the Applicant and (2) CDC (jointly referred to as the Parties).
- 1.2.2 The Applicant is a wholly owned subsidiary of BOOM Developments Limited who specialise in non-subsidised solar and battery storage projects.
- 1.2.3 CDC is the host local authority and is listed as a prescribed consultee in Schedule 1 of the Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009 (Ref. 2). Therefore, CDC has been consulted during the preparation of the Application and following its acceptance.

1.3 Description of the Scheme

- 1.1.1 The Scheme involves the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning of a solar photovoltaic (PV) electricity generation facility with a capacity exceeding 50 megawatts (MW) and associated development. It will connect to the National Grid either at the Existing National Grid Thorpe Marsh Substation or via the Grid Connection Line Drop with both options including necessary associated infrastructure. Since the proposed generating capacity surpasses 50 MW, the Scheme is classified as a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project, requiring consent through a DCO under the PA 2008 (Ref. 1). Further details on the Scheme can be found in **ES Volume I Chapter 2: The Scheme [APP-054]**.

1.4 Format of Document and Terminology

- 1.4.1 Section 2 of this SoCG summarises the engagement the Parties have had with regard to the Scheme.
- 1.4.2 Section 3 summarises the issues that are 'agreed', 'not agreed' or are 'under discussion'.
- 1.4.3 These terms are used as follows:
- a. "Agreed" indicates where the issue has been resolved;

- b. “Under discussion” indicates where these points will be the subject of on-going discussion wherever possible to resolve, or refine, the extent of disagreement between the parties; and
- c. “Not Agreed” indicates a final position where the Parties have agreed to disagree.

1.4.4 Abbreviations used within the SoCG are provided in **Section 4** of this Document.

2. Record of Engagement

2.1 Record of Engagement

2.1.1 Table 2-1 below sets out a summary of the meetings and correspondence between the Parties in relation to the Scheme.

Table 2-1: Schedule of Meetings and Correspondence

Date	Form of correspondence and attendees	Summary of topics discussed and outcomes
10/05/2023	Letter	The Applicant sent a letter to CDC to inform them of the application and propose a meeting to discuss the proposals.
29/06/2023	Meeting (Teams)	The Applicant provided CDC with a briefing on the Scheme.
24/07/2023	Email/Letter	The Applicant wrote to CDC to request flood data and records.
24/07/2023	Letter	The Applicant wrote to CDC PRow officers to introduce the scheme and to request a meeting.
03/08/2023- 10/08/2023	Email	The Applicant contacted CDC Flood team to request flood data and records. CDC responded to confirm there are no records of historical flooding at the site or the surrounding area, and they did not have any hydraulic models for the area.
29/08/2023	Meeting (Teams)	Meeting with CDC PRow Officers to discuss potential temporary and permanent impacts of the Project on PRowS in CDC. CDC advised the Applicant would need to consult the local community on changes to PRow and consider views from horses and the Trans Pennine Trail.
31/08/2023	Email	The Applicant contacted CDC Highway officers to request specific traffic collision data.
11/09/2023	Onsite Meeting	Meeting held with Conservation Officer at Fenwick Hall Farm.
19/09/2023- 02/10/2023	Email	The Applicant requested meeting with CDC Minerals Officer to discuss Minerals Safeguarding Areas.
		CDC responded and recommended that a geological assessment report / mineral survey be undertaken.

Date	Form of correspondence and attendees	Summary of topics discussed and outcomes
05/10/2023-09/10/2024	Email	The Applicant contacted CDC to agree the methodology and scope of the Agricultural Land Assessment. CDC confirmed.
17/10/2023	Letter/Email	The Applicant provided information on Baseline Sound Monitoring and Receptor Locations to inform the scope of the Environmental Statement (ES).
17/10/2023-20/10/2023	Email	The Applicant requested CDC's views on representative viewpoint locations for the LVIA. CDC responded to request further viewpoints from Fenwick to the Northeast.
19/10/2023	Email	The Applicant contacted CDC PRoW Officers to seek further advice on PRoW impacts.
19/10/2023-27/11/2023	Email	The Applicant requested input on ecology impacts. CDC responded with initial comments on the scoping of the ecological assessment.
24/10/2023	Email	The Applicants confirmed the proposed cumulative assessment methodology and long list / short list.
09/04/2024	Meeting (Teams)	The Applicant provided CDC Planning with an update on the Scheme and next steps, including statutory consultation.
16/05/2024	Meeting (Teams)	The Applicant introduced the project to CDC officers, including an explanation of the DCO process and the statutory consultation period.
04/07/2024	Meeting (Teams)	Meeting with the CDC Highways team to discuss access proposals and PRoW.
29/07/2024-03/08/2024	Email	The Applicant requested confirmation from CDC that no baseline air quality monitoring was required. CDC confirmed this was the case.
13/08/2024	Meeting (Teams)	Meeting with the PRoW officers regarding PRoW Skyhouse 29, Haggs Lane/Fenwick 16, Moss 6 and access proposals.

Date	Form of correspondence and attendees	Summary of topics discussed and outcomes
		It was agreed to include buffers to PRoW and to share further information with CDC for further assessment.
16/08/2024	Email	CDC Highways provided comments on the access proposals, being primarily related to vehicle washing facilities and temporary signage to be installed on the carriageway
04/09/2024	Meeting (Teams)	The Applicant met with CDC Conservation Officer and South Yorkshire Archaeology Service (SYAS) for an update on trial trenching findings and built heritage. It was agreed outstanding trial trenching could be undertaken post-consent and secured within the draft Archaeological Mitigation Strategy (AMS). Archaeological mitigation areas required within the Solar PV Site and the assessment of the Lily Farmhouse demolition were also agreed.
18/09/2024	Meeting (Teams)	The Applicant met with South Yorkshire Archaeology Service (SYAS) to discuss the results of the interim trial trenching report and agree potential mitigation requirements. It was agreed that archaeological surveys within the Grid Connection Corridor would be undertaken post-consent.
25/09/2024	Meeting (Teams)	The Applicant met with CDC and its landscape consultant (Land Use Consultants (LUC)) to provide an update on the Scheme and the Applicant's LVIA findings.
25/10/2024	Meeting (Teams)	Meeting to provide an update on timescales, Local Impact Reports and the PPA.
07/10/2024	Meeting (Teams)	Meeting with CDC Planning, Ecology and tree officers to provide an overview of the Project, Overview of the DCO Process and CDC's Role in DCO Process, Ecology, Arboriculture and BNG.
10/10/2024	Meeting (Teams)	Meeting with CDC tree officers to provide an overview of the Project and the Arboricultural Impact Assessment.
25/10/2024	Meeting (Teams)	Meeting with CDC Planning with overview of next steps and broad timescales post application.

Date	Form of correspondence and attendees	Summary of topics discussed and outcomes
02/12/2024	Meeting (Teams)	Meeting with CDC Planning, Ecology and tree officers with update on the application and timescales.
04/12/2024	Report	LUC review of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment submitted as part of the DCO application.
10/12/2024	Meeting (Teams)	Meeting with CDC Highways and PRow Officers with update on the application.
19/12/2024	Meeting (Teams)	Meeting with CDC Planning and LUC to discuss the findings of LUC report, and the commencement of the relevant representation period.
08/01/2025 and 10/01/2025	Email	CDC provided to the Applicant the consultees it had received to date to inform the preparation of the CDC relevant representation.
30/01/2025	Report	The Applicant provided a response the review of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment received on 04/12/2024.
January – April 2025	Email and Meeting (Teams)	The Applicant engaged with South Yorkshire Archaeology Service (SYAS) throughout this period to review the final trial trenching fieldwork report and to agree the Framework Archaeological Mitigation Strategy (AMS).
10/02/2025	Meeting (Teams)	Meeting with CDC planning officers, LUC and the Applicant in response to LUC's LVIA Review.
14/02/2025	Report	The Applicant provided to CDC a response to CDC's RR.
24/02/2025	Meeting (face to face)	Meeting with CDC planning and legal officers to provide an overview of the draft Development Consent Order.
04/03/2025	SoCG	The Applicant provided to CDC a draft SoCG for comment.
13/03/2025	Report	Additional report provided by LUC providing comment on LVIA.

Date	Form of correspondence and attendees	Summary of topics discussed and outcomes
24/03/2025	Meeting (Teams)	Meeting between CDC and Applicant legal teams regarding draft DCO updates.
03/04/2025	Meeting (Teams)	Meeting with CDC highways officers to discuss their review of the Application documents and the relationship of DCO powers to highways works.
04/04/2025	Email	The Applicant provided a response to CDC to confirm where Invasive non-native species is considered in the Application documents.
07/04/2025	Email	Provision of updated draft DCO following ISH1 and meeting on 24/03 to CDC legal team for input.
10/04/2025	Email	CDC shared with the Applicant the consultee feedback from South Yorkshire Archaeology Service.
14/04/2025	Report	Additional report provided by LUC providing further clarifications on LVIA review.
15/04/2025	Meeting (Teams)	Meeting between LUC and the Applicant to discuss matters raised in previous reports and agree supplementary information required.
16/04/2025	Report	Additional report provided by LUC providing key reflection on the Framework LEMP.
23/04/2025	Email and Report	CDC provided to the Applicant comments on the SoCG and queries relating to drainage, public rights of way and glint and glare.
24/04/2025	Meeting (Teams) and Email	Meeting between CDC and Applicant legal teams regarding draft DCO updates, with follow up email providing updates discussion to draft DCO.
25/04/2025	Email	The Applicant provided a response to CDC regarding drainage and public rights of way queries.
25/04/2025	Report	The Applicant provided a Landscape Supplementary Report to CDC / LUC.

Date	Form of correspondence and attendees	Summary of topics discussed and outcomes
28/04/2025	Meeting (Teams) and emails	Engagement between the Applicant and CDC to discuss and agree the content of the SoCG for Deadline 1.
29/04/2025	Meeting (Teams) and emails	Engagement between the Applicant and CDC to discuss and agree the content of the SoCG for Deadline 1.
30/04/2025	Email	CDC shared the CDC Local Impact Report with the Applicant for information.
07/05/2025	Email	CDC confirmed agreement of matters relating to glint and glare in the SoCG.
15/05/2025	Email	The Applicant provided an updated SoCG to CDC for review.
22/05/2025	Meeting (Teams)	Meeting between the Applicant and CDC to discuss and agree the content of the SoCG for Deadline 2.
27/05/2025 28/05/2025	Emails	Engagement between the Applicant and CDC to discuss and agree the content of the SoCG for Deadline 2.
29/05/2025	Email	The Applicant shared the updated LEMP (submitted at Deadline 2) with CDC.
10/06/2025	Email	CDC confirmed to the Applicant that it agreed to the updated LEMP submitted at Deadline 2.
17/06/2025	Meeting	CDC requested amendments to sheet 4 of the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans and to the legend on all sheets.
24/06/2025	Email	The Applicant provided to CDC an updated draft DCO.
25/06/2025	Emails	The Applicant sent to CDC updated versions of the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans. CDC agreed to the updated plans.
01/07/2025	Emails	CDC sent to the Applicant their comments on the updated draft DCO.

Date	Form of correspondence and attendees	Summary of topics discussed and outcomes
02/07/2025	Meeting (Teams)	The Applicant and CDC met to agree the content of the SoCG submitted at Deadline 3.
17/07/2025	Meeting (Teams)	The Applicant and CDC met to agree the costs agreement.
30/07/2025	Meeting (Teams)	The Applicant and CDC met to agree a) the mechanism for agreeing costs to discharge biodiversity net gain requirements and b) an update to the Framework LEMP (to accommodate headlands of pollinator and bird seed crop mixes) was not necessary.
05/08/2025	Meeting (Teams)	The Applicant and CDC met to discuss outstanding comments on the draft Highways Agreement.
06/08/2025	Email	CDC provided an updated version of the costs agreement to the Applicant, save for one hold to confirm.
06/08/2025 – 13/08/2025	Email	The Applicant provided an updated version of the draft Highways Agreement, reflecting the discussion of the meeting. Various versions of the Highways Agreement were exchanged between the parties, resolving comments.
13/08/2025	Email	CDC confirmed to the Applicant that the costs agreement between the parties was principally agreed and ready to proceed to engrossment.
15/08/2025	Emails	CDC sent to the Applicant their final amendments to the highways agreement. The Applicant agreed to these, and the parties reached principled agreement on the Highways Agreement, so it was ready to proceed to engrossment.

3. Areas of Discussion Between the Parties

3.1.1 Table 3-1 below details the areas of discussion and matters that are agreed, under discussion and not agreed between the Parties.

Table 3-1: Areas of Discussion with City of Doncaster Council

Ref.	Subject	Relevant Application Document	CDC Position	Applicants Position	Status	Likelihood of Resolution
1. Scheme Description						
1.1	Scheme Description	ES Volume I, Chapter 2: The Scheme [APP-054]	The Site and Scheme description as set out in ES Volume I, Chapter 2: The Scheme [APP-054] is accurate and is agreed.	The Site and Scheme description set out in ES Volume I, Chapter 2: The Scheme [APP-054] is accurate and agreed.	Agreed	Agreed
2. Need and Principle of Development						
2.1	Need and Principle of Development	Statement of Need [APP-192] Planning Statement [APP-246]	It is accepted that in accordance with NPS EN-1 the scheme will provide infrastructure considered to be Critical Need Priority, and that such need is fully established by national planning policy, and as such the presumption in favour of consent is engaged, unless any more specific and relevant policies set out in the relevant NPSs clearly indicate that consent should be refused.	The Statement of Need [APP-192] and sections 5 and 6.2 of the Planning Statement [APP-246] sets out the needs and benefits of the Scheme. In accordance with NPS EN-1 the Scheme will provide infrastructure that is of Critical National Priority where need is fully established by national planning policy and for which the presumption in favour of granting development consent is engaged.	Agreed	Agreed
3. Legislation and Planning Policy						
3.1	Legislation and Planning Policy	ES Volume I [APP-224, REP1-011, REP4-010, APP-061, APP-062, REP4-012, REP1-013, REP1-015, APP-066 and APP-067]. Planning Statement [APP-246]	The ES Volume I identifies all relevant applicable legislation and national policy in respect of the cited Chapters.	The ES Volume I [APP-052 to APP-068] has identified all relevant applicable legislation and national policy pertaining to the following assessments undertaken as part of the EIA of the Scheme: ES Volume I, Chapter 6: Climate Change [APP-224]; ES Volume I, Chapter 7: Cultural Heritage [REP1-011]; ES Volume I, Chapter 8: Ecology [REP4-010]; ES Volume I, Chapter 9: Water Environment [APP-061]; ES Volume I, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity [APP-062]; ES Volume I, Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [REP4-012]; ES Volume I, Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use [REP1-013]; ES Volume I, Chapter 13: Transport and Access [REP1-015]; ES Volume I, Chapter 14: Other Environmental Topics [APP-066] ES Volume I, Chapter 15: Cumulative Effects and Interactions [APP-067]. The Planning Statement [APP-246] also identifies all relevant application legislation and national policy.	Agreed	Agreed

Ref.	Subject	Relevant Application Document	CDC Position	Applicants Position	Status	Likelihood of Resolution
4. Alternatives and Design Evolution						
4.1	Site Selection and design	ES Volume I, Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution [APP-055] Design and Access Statement [APP-191] Outline Design Parameters Statement [APP-093]	The methodology used in the site selection process, the design principles set out Table 2 of the Design and Access Statement [APP-191] , the outline design parameters set out in the Outline Design Parameters Statement [APP-093] and the assessment and mitigation to trees and hedgerows set out in Arboricultural Impact Assessment [APP-236 and APP-240] are confirmed as appropriate.	The methodology used in the site selection process as detailed in ES Volume I, Chapter 3: Alternatives and Design Evolution [APP-055] is appropriate for the Scheme. The Design Principles set out Table 2 in the Design and Access Statement [APP-191] are considered to have been met in the design of the Scheme. The outline design parameters set out in the Outline Design Parameters Statement [APP-093] are considered appropriate and are secured by Requirement 4 in the Draft DCO [APP-220]. The Arboricultural Impact Assessment [APP-236 and APP-240] (Appendix 10-7: ES Volume III) includes consideration of impact to trees and hedgerows and how those impacts are to be mitigated which is considered appropriate.	Agreed	Agreed
5.Environmental Assessment						
5.1	Application of professional Judgement	ES Volume I [APP-224, REP1-011, REP4-010, APP-061, APP-062, REP4-012, REP1-013, REP1-015, APP-066 and APP-067]	No comments to make in this respect.	The identification of likely significant effects on sensitive features and receptors has been informed by professional judgement and the views of the relevant technical specialists, where necessary. The application of professional judgement by specialists within the environmental topic assessments is outlined in the technical chapters of the ES Volume I [APP-224, REP1-011, REP4-010, APP-061, APP-062, REP4-012, REP1-013, REP1-015, APP-066 and APP-067] are appropriate and robust.	Agreed	Agreed
6. Assessment Methodology						
6.1	Methodology	ES Volume I [APP-224, REP1-011, REP4-010, APP-061, APP-062, APP-063, REP1-013, REP1-015, APP-066 and APP-067]	The assessment methodology used within ES Volume I [APP-224, REP1-011, REP4-010, APP-061, APP-062, APP-063, REP1-013, REP1-015, APP-066 and APP-067] is considered acceptable.	The assessment methodology adopted within the environmental topic assessments mentioned in the technical chapters of the ES Volume I [APP-224, REP1-011, REP4-010, APP-061, APP-062, REP4-012, REP1-013, REP1-015, APP-066 and APP-067] have been derived from the information obtained through consultation with stakeholders and by reviewing relevant guidance and studies and is considered acceptable.	Agreed	Agreed
7. Baseline Assessment						
7.1	Baseline	ES Volume I [APP-224, REP1-011, REP4-010, APP-061, APP-062,	No comments to make in this respect.	The baseline conditions have been collated using desk-based and field-based techniques, and through consultation with stakeholders including the local	Agreed	Agreed

Ref.	Subject	Relevant Application Document	CDC Position	Applicants Position	Status	Likelihood of Resolution
		REP4-012, REP1-013, REP1-015, APP-066 and APP-067]		authorities. The scope, coverage and timing of surveys undertaken to establish the baseline conditions and sensitive features and receptors are in line with best practice and appropriate to inform the assessment of direct and indirect effects reported in the technical chapters of the ES Volume I [APP-224, REP1-011, REP4-010, APP-061, APP-062, REP4-012, REP1-013, REP1-015, APP-066 and APP-067]		
8. Impacts and Effects						
8.1	Impacts and Effects	ES Volume I [APP-061, APP-066 and APP-224]	The assessment findings in respect of these environmental topics are considered acceptable. In respect of ES Volume I, Chapter 9: Water Environment [APP-061], CDC will defer to the Environment Agency insofar as this covers its specific remit.	The assessment findings for the environmental topics mentioned in the following technical chapters of the ES are considered acceptable: • ES Volume I, Chapter 6: Climate Change [APP-224] • ES Volume I, Chapter 7: Cultural Heritage [REP1-011] • ES Volume I, Chapter 8: Ecology [REP4-010] • ES Volume I, Chapter 9: Water Environment [APP-061] • ES Volume I, Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [REP4-012] • ES Volume I, Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use [REP1-013] • ES Volume I, Chapter 13: Transport and Access [REP1-015] • ES Volume I, Chapter 14: Other Environmental Topics [APP-066]	Agreed	Agreed
9. Environmental Mitigation						
9.1	Mitigation	ES Volume I [APP-061, APP-066 and APP-224] Draft DCO [REP1-005]	Mitigation in these respects are considered to be acceptable. In respect of ES Volume I, Chapter 9: Water Environment [APP-061], CDC will defer to the Environment Agency insofar as this covers its specific remit.	The mitigation measures mentioned in the following environmental topic chapters are considered acceptable to mitigate potential impacts and manage potential effects during the construction, operation and decommissioning phases: • ES Volume I, Chapter 6: Climate Changes [APP-224] • ES Volume I, Chapter 7: Cultural Heritage [REP1-011] • ES Volume I, Chapter 8: Ecology [REP4-010] • ES Volume I, Chapter 9: Water Environment [APP-061]	Agreed	Agreed

Ref.	Subject	Relevant Application Document	CDC Position	Applicants Position	Status	Likelihood of Resolution
				• ES Volume I, Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [REP4-012] • ES Volume I, Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use [REP1-013] • ES Volume I, Chapter 13: Transport and Access [REP-015] • ES Volume I, Chapter 14: Other Environmental Topics [APP-066] The provision of mitigation is secured by specific requirements within the Draft DCO [REP1-005]. These include the requirement for management plans that must be prepared and approved before commencement of development.		
10. Cultural Heritage						
10.1	Noise Impacts	ES Volume I, Chapter 7: Cultural Heritage [REP-011] ES Volume I, Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [REP4-012]	As stated with CDC’s RR [RR-001] , CDC continues to review the submission with a view to ensuring a suitable noise environment for those presently uninhabited buildings would prevail in the event that residential occupation did commence in the future. CDC does accept that Schedule 2, Requirement 14 of the Draft DCO [REP1-005] will provide the council with an appropriate level of control over operational noise at a level consistent with those set out in the ES.	ES Volume I, Chapter 7: Cultural Heritage [REP1-011] presents the findings of an assessment of the likely significant effects on cultural heritage as a result of the Scheme. This includes consideration of the noise impacts set out in ES Volume I, Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [REP4-012] . The Applicant has previously indicated to CDC that the level of noise from solar farm infrastructure predicted at Riddings Farm and Fenwick Hall is 35 dB LAeq,T, which is equivalent to a whisper or the level of noise that you may experience in a library. This is a conservative prediction where plant is operating at full capacity and only likely to occur during hot days. Schedule 2, Requirement 14 of the Draft DCO [REP1-005] will ensure that operational noise levels remain consistent with those set out within Table 11-7 of ES Volume I, Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [REP4-012] .	Agreed	Agreed
10.2	Archaeological Assets	ES Volume I, Chapter 7: Cultural Heritage [REP1-011] Draft AMS [APP-209] Framework AMS [REP1-044]	As stated with CDC’s RR [RR-001] , SYAS (on behalf of CDC) are satisfied that the archaeological work provides a satisfactory level of information to understand the impact of the scheme. The caveat to this position is that minor revisions are likely to be required to the archaeological programme for the site once the full trial trenching report is received. Similarly, a lack of detail regarding the grid connection method means that assessment of the potential grid connection corridor relies only on desk-based information at this point. However, given the overall size of the scheme, these are minor matters that do not compromise the	A Cultural Heritage Desk-Based Assessment [APP-142] , supported by the results of a Geophysical Survey [APP-144] and trial trench evaluation, were undertaken within the Solar PV Site. The interim results of the trial trench evaluation were summarised in the Desk Based Assessment. The full assessment report for the trial trench evaluation was shared with the SYAS on 10 February 2025 and was submitted into Examination at Deadline 1 [REP1-045] following agreement of the report by SYAS. The framework mitigation methodology has been agreed following review and acceptance of the final fieldwork report for the trial trenching. This is set out in the Framework AMS [REP1-044] submitted at Deadline 1 and the final detailed mitigation strategies will be set out in the	Agreed	Agreed

Ref.	Subject	Relevant Application Document	CDC Position	Applicants Position	Status	Likelihood of Resolution
			understanding of archaeological significance and sufficient provisions are included to address these points later in the process. Latest position from SYAS - The final fieldwork report for the trial trenching was received and detailed discussions took place regarding the draft AMS . As design decisions are still to be made, the draft AMS has become a Framework AMS . SYAS have agreed this in principle subject to minor final edits.	Final AMS secured through Requirement 10 of the Draft DCO [REP1-005] .		
10.3	Draft AMS Framework AMS	Draft AMS [APP-209] Framework AMS [REP1-044]	As stated with CDC's RR [RR-001] , the draft AMS [APP-209] outlines a series of measures to mitigate the impact of the scheme on the archaeological remains. These measures will provide appropriate mitigation for the impact of the scheme, but it is noted that some revision to the areas selected for mitigation will be required on receipt of full trial trenching report. It should also be made clear that no ground disturbance beyond the 100mm levelling allowance is to take place in the archaeological mitigation areas where preservation in situ is to be achieved. A distinction should also be made between the types of archaeological mitigation. Following discussion with SYAS, revisions to mitigation areas have been agreed based on information provided in the final trial trenching report. These mitigation areas are now set out in the Framework AMS [REP1-044] .	The draft AMS [APP-209] sets out the scope and guiding principles for the planning and implementation of further evaluation surveys and proposed archaeological mitigation works to be undertaken in relation to the DCO application for the Scheme. The framework mitigation methodology has been agreed with SYAS following review and acceptance of the final fieldwork report for the trial trenching. This is set out in the Framework AMS [REP1-044] submitted at Deadline 1 and the final mitigation strategies will be set out in the Final AMS secured through Requirement 10 of the Draft DCO [REP1-005] .	Agreed	Agreed
10.4	Mitigation during operation and decommissioning	Framework Operational Environmental Management Plan (OEMP) [REP4-017] Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP) [REP4-019]	As stated with CDC's RR [RR-001] , the Framework OEMP and Framework DEMP identify no or limited physical impacts on archaeological features as these will have already occurred during the construction phase. Whilst this is substantially correct, there is a minor threat to the archaeological mitigation areas preserved in situ through a lack of information. The methodology to be included within the detailed OEMP for heritage buffer areas should be extended to include the archaeological mitigation areas preserved in situ, where applicable, include a plan showing those areas and stipulate like for like replacement. Similarly, the detailed DEMP should include a plan showing the archaeological mitigation areas	Table 3-2 of the Framework OEMP [REP4-017] outlines mitigation and enhancement measures that are proposed to reduce impacts to heritage assets during the operation phase of the Scheme. A detailed OEMP, to be substantially in accordance with the Framework OEMP, is secured through Schedule 2, Requirement 12 of the Draft DCO [REP1-005] . Table 2 of the Framework DEMP [REP4-019] outlines mitigation and enhancement measures that are proposed to reduce impacts to heritage assets during the decommissioning phase of the Scheme. A detailed DEMP, to be substantially in accordance with the Framework DEMP, is secured through Schedule 2, Requirement 18 of the Draft DCO [REP1-005] .	Agreed	Agreed

Ref.	Subject	Relevant Application Document	CDC Position	Applicants Position	Status	Likelihood of Resolution
			preserved in situ and make provision for decommissioning methods to be assessed by the Archaeological Clerk of Works and SYAS (or its successor). Understand that updated Framework OEMP [REP4-017] and updated Framework DEMP [REP4-019] are due to be submitted into Examination at Deadline 1. SYAS have confirmed they will review the position after this date.	As set out within the Framework AMS , submitted at Deadline 1 [REP1-044] , following the completion of the further evaluation surveys and agreement of final mitigation strategies for each mitigation area post consent, a Final AMS will be prepared and agreed with SYAS. The detailed OEMP and DEMP will take into account the final mitigation strategies set out within the Final AMS and will include plans showing areas where preservation in-situ of archaeological remains is required.		
10.5	Draft AMS Framework AMS	Draft AMS [APP-209] Framework AMS [REP1-044] Framework Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) [REP1-029]	As stated with CDC's RR [RR-001] , the Framework LEMP [APP-203] makes provision for wetland scrapes within the River Went riparian corridor. Following discussion with SYAS, the River Went riparian corridor is now included within the Framework AMS [REP1-044] as mitigation Area 14 with a watching brief proposed. This is satisfactory.	The draft AMS [APP-209] sets out the scope and guiding principles for the planning and implementation of further evaluation surveys and proposed archaeological mitigation works to be undertaken in relation to the DCO application for the Scheme. The framework mitigation methodology has been agreed with SYAS following review and acceptance of the final fieldwork report for the trial trenching. This is set out in the Framework AMS [REP1-044] submitted at Deadline 1 and the final mitigation strategies will be set out in the Final AMS secured through Requirement 10 of the Draft DCO [REP1-005] .	Agreed	Agreed
10.6	Trial Trenching	Draft AMS [APP-209] Framework AMS [REP1-044]	As stated with CDC's RR [RR-001] , regarding (d), trial trenching could not proceed in four fields due to ecological constraints (NW3, NW8, NW10, SE5). SYAS advise that trenching would still be required in three fields (NW3, NW8, NW10) but that this could be carried out post-consent as part of any mitigation strategy. Sufficient information was available from results around field SE5 to confirm a negligible potential and it was agreed the trenching here could be removed from the assessment. Regarding (e), no fieldwork has taken place within the grid connection corridor due to uncertainties about the method of connection. SYAS advise that, should the corridor be required, a geophysical survey should be undertaken in the first instance followed by a programme of trial trenching and that the results should be used to inform any further work. SYAS agreed that this could be undertaken post consent as part of the mitigation strategy. Following discussion with SYAS, explicit provision is made for these works within the Framework AMS [REP1-044] .	The draft AMS [APP-209] sets out the scope and guiding principles for the planning and implementation of further evaluation surveys and proposed archaeological mitigation works to be undertaken in relation to the DCO application for the Scheme. The framework mitigation methodology has been agreed with SYAS following review and acceptance of the final fieldwork report for the trial trenching. This is set out in the Framework AMS [REP1-044] submitted at Deadline 1 and the final mitigation strategies will be set out in the Final AMS secured through Requirement 10 of the Draft DCO [REP1-005] .	Agreed	Agreed

Ref.	Subject	Relevant Application Document	CDC Position	Applicants Position	Status	Likelihood of Resolution
10.7	Built Heritage Assets	ES Volume I, Chapter 7: Cultural Heritage [REP1-011] Planning Statement (Appendix C) [APP-246]	No further comments to make in this respect.	ES Volume I, Chapter 7 Cultural Heritage [REP1-011] and its supporting appendices provide an assessment of the likely significant effects of the Scheme on heritage assets. The chapter identifies there to be a significant residual adverse effect on Fenwick Hall moated site scheduled monument for the lifetime of the Scheme and for Thorpe in Balne moated site, chapel and fishpond scheduled monument, during construction. The designated assets have been assessed in the Heritage Statement (see Appendix C of the Planning Statement [APP-247]) to result in ‘less than substantial harm’ owing mainly to the temporary and reversible change to the setting of the assets.	Agreed	Agreed
11. Ecology and Biodiversity						
11.1	Great Crested Newts	ES Volume III, Appendix 8-2 Reptile Report [APP-146] ES Volume I, Chapter 8: Ecology [REP4-010]	As stated with CDC’s RR [RR-001] , it is understood that a separate Amphibian Survey has not been undertaken, however it is appreciated that the applicant is intending to adopt a District Level Licencing approach, although presently there is no direct reference to this. Given the applicant’s ongoing engagement with Natural England to finalise the Impact Assessment Compensation Payment Certificate, the council is satisfied with the approach adopted in this respect.	ES Volume III, Appendix 8-2 Reptile Report [APP-146] provides information on reptile and amphibian presence within the Order limits. No specific surveys were undertaken for amphibians, although if observed as part of other ecological surveys, e.g., refugia surveys, they were noted and recorded. As set out in section 8.4.21 of ES Volume I, Chapter 8: Ecology [REP4-010] , the Scheme will apply for a Great Crested Newt District Level Licence on receipt of consent. The Applicant continues to engage with Natural England to finalise the Impact Assessment Compensation Payment Certificate. Irrespective of this, measures set out in Table 8-10 of ES Volume I, Chapter: 8 Ecology [REP4-010] include those to avoid and minimise impacts to common amphibian species.	Agreed	Agreed
11.2	Biodiversity Net Gain- Percentage	Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment [REP4-023] Draft DCO [REP1-005] Framework LEMP [REP1-029]	As stated with CDC’s RR [RR-001] , CDC understands that the Applicant commits to achieving a minimum 10% BNG for each unit and will demonstrate this via an updated BNG assessment prior to construction	The Scheme is committed to deliver Biodiversity Net Gain in accordance with Schedule 2, Requirement 7 of the draft DCO [APP-220], which states, ‘<i>—(1) No part of the authorised development may commence until a biodiversity net gain strategy has been submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority for that part, in consultation with the relevant statutory nature conservation body. (2) The biodiversity net gain strategy must be substantially in accordance with the framework landscape and ecological management plan and must be implemented as approved. (3) The biodiversity net gain strategy must be maintained throughout the operation of the relevant part of the authorised development to which the plan relates.</i> The updated Biodiversity Net Gain provided post consent, will be supported by pre-construction surveys, as set out in the Framework LEMP [REP1-029].	Agreed	Agreed

Ref.	Subject	Relevant Application Document	CDC Position	Applicants Position	Status	Likelihood of Resolution
11.3	Biodiversity Net Gain - Methodology	Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment [REP4-023] Draft DCO [REP1-005] Framework LEMP [REP1-029]	As stated with CDC's RR [RR-001], it is considered that a generalised approach to post-development habitats has been utilised. The following comments were made: • The UKHabs Classification System version 2.01 identifies that the habitat below solar panels should be identified as u1b6 with the strips of open habitat between the panels being recorded separately. • CDC would ask that consideration be given to any potential changes to the widespread cropland. • It should be acknowledged that some areas of arable land baseline habitat may be left uncultivated and the nature of them may change from cropland to some other transitional habitat. If this is the case, the BNG baseline should reflect this. CDC acknowledges this position and given that there is acceptance that the development will deliver a 'healthy' net gain in biodiversity irrespective of the ascribed habitats under the solar panels, this position is accepted.	The Scheme is committed to deliver Biodiversity Net Gain in accordance with Schedule 2, Requirement 7 of the draft DCO [REP1-005], which states: <i>‘—(1) No part of the authorised development may commence until a biodiversity net gain strategy has been submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority for that part, in consultation with the relevant statutory nature conservation body. (2) The biodiversity net gain strategy must be substantially in accordance with the framework landscape and ecological management plan and must be implemented as approved. (3) The biodiversity net gain strategy must be maintained throughout the operation of the relevant part of the authorised development to which the plan relates.’</i> The updated Biodiversity Net Gain required by the above will be supported by pre-construction surveys, as set out in the Framework LEMP [REP1-029]. This will capture any changes to pre and post-development habitats and designs. As is discussed in Section 2.9.1 and assumption (b) of the Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment [REP4-023], the Applicant's approach challenges the UKHab guidance with reference to guidance published by Building Research Establishment which recognises that on average 95% of a site used for solar farm development is <i>“still accessible for plant growth and potentially for wildlife enhancements and complementary agricultural activities such as conservation grazing”</i>. Therefore, an approach of 95% of the Solar PV Panel footprint within the Site has been categorised as the 'Grassland – Modified grassland', with the remaining 5% categorised as 'Urban – Developed land; sealed surface' to consider the Solar PV Panel and supporting infrastructure. This approach is understood to be supported by the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds and will be reflected in the management of the grassland habitats and adjusted accordingly to maintain grassland cover. This approach has been accepted in numerous other solar projects that have undergone examination and/or been granted DCOs (including Cottam Solar (https://national-infrastructure-consenting.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/projects/EN010133) and Gate Burton Energy Park (https://national-infrastructure-consenting.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/projects/EN010131)).	Agreed	Agreed

Ref.	Subject	Relevant Application Document	CDC Position	Applicants Position	Status	Likelihood of Resolution
11.4	Ecology	ES Volume I, Chapter 8: Ecology [REP4-010]	CDC confirms that the avoidance and mitigation measures for 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 set out in detail at ES Volume I, Chapter 8: Ecology [REP4-010] are acceptable.	ES Volume I, Chapter 8: Ecology [REP4-010] confirms that 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] .	Agreed	Agreed
11.5	Framework LEMP	Framework LEMP [REP3-016]	Shortly before Deadline 1, CDC requested more detail which, in summary, relate to: a) the seed mix; b) enhancement and management measures; c) the baseline BNG assessment at the point of construction; d) post construction surveys; and e) the process for making iterative changes to the LEMP. The Applicant submitted an updated Framework LEMP [REP2-042] (Revision 02) at Deadline 2, to incorporate the changes requested by CDC. CDC confirm that the changes are acceptable. CDC met the Applicant following Deadline 4 and agreed that an update to the Framework LEMP (to accommodate headlands of pollinator and bird seed crop mixes) was not necessary, but would have no concerns if such a mix was to be provided.	The Applicant has submitted an updated Framework LEMP [REP2-042] (Revision 02) at Deadline 2, to incorporate the changes requested by the Council. These include amendments to grassland seed mixes and further details on the target conditions of hedgerows. The Applicant has also provided further clarification on reporting processes and the ability for making iterative changes. The Applicant and the Council have agreed the LEMP for Deadline 3 [REP3-016] and will ensure that the outputs are taken forward into the preparation of the detailed Landscape and Ecological Management Plan and Biodiversity Net Gain Strategy which are secured by Requirements 6 and 7 respectively of the draft DCO [REP3-006] .	Agreed	Agreed
12. Landscape and Visual Amenity						
12.1	Methodology, Scope and Process	ES Volume I, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity [APP-062]	The 'Review of Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment' (LUC, November 2024) ('the LUC November 2024 report') stated that the methodology, scope and process for undertaking the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, set out in ES Volume I, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity [APP-062] , is agreed, other	The assessment methodology set out in Section 10.4 of ES Volume I, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity [APP-062] is considered appropriate. Further detail regarding individual elements of magnitude and the approach to ZTV were provided to CDC/ LUC shortly before Deadline 1 in the form of an updated methodology and were submitted into Examination at Deadline 2 (ES	Agreed	Agreed

Ref.	Subject	Relevant Application Document	CDC Position	Applicants Position	Status	Likelihood of Resolution
			than a request for additional information regarding the criteria used to assess magnitude. This has since been provided to CDC / LUC and updated in the LVIA methodology (ES Volume III, Appendix 10-2 Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment Methodology) which is understood to be submitted by the Applicant at Deadline 2. The methodology, scope and process is therefore now agreed.	Volume III, Appendix 10-2 Landscape and Visual (Revision 01) Impact Assessment Methodology [REP2-019] . Engagement has continued with CDC/ LUC during May to arrive at an agreed position for Deadline 2.		
12.2	Landscape and Visual Baseline	ES Volume I, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity [REP2-007]	The landscape and visual baseline is set out in ES Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity, ES Volume I [APP-062]. The visual baseline and the seasonality of viewpoint photography captured is agreed. Updates to the presentation of the Zone of Theoretical Visibility were provided to CDC / LUC following Deadline 1 and are understood to be submitted by the Applicant at Deadline 2. It is considered that the value, susceptibility and sensitivity of each landscape and visual receptor is agreed. Para. 1.47 – 1.48 of the LUC November 2024 report explains that the sensitivity of visual receptors is supported by clear narrative and the judgements seem reasonable. A supplementary report describing how the proposed development has responded to the landscape strategy of each landscape character area within the published Landscape Character Assessment was provided to CDC/ LUC prior to Deadline 1 and is understood, together with related updates to ES Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity, ES Volume I [REP2-007], to be submitted by the Applicant at Deadline 2. The landscape and visual baseline is agreed.	Further detail regarding how the proposed development has responded to the landscape strategy for the relevant landscape character areas within the published Landscape Character Assessments LCAs was provided to CDC/ LUC shortly before Deadline 1. This has been updated in the ES Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity, ES Volume (Revision 01) [REP2-007] which was submitted at Deadline 2. Engagement has continued with CDC/ LUC during May to arrive at an agreed position for Deadline 2. The landscape and visual baseline is now agreed.	Agreed	Agreed
12.3	Landscape Effects- Assessment	ES Volume I, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity [REP2-007]	Para. 1.44 of the LUC November 2024 report states that the lack of an assessment of landscape effects relating “to the Site and its immediate context as a landscape receptor in its	The Site and its immediate surroundings were not considered to be a landscape receptor but rather an arbitrary boundary in landscape character terms. Local	Agreed	Agreed

Ref.	Subject	Relevant Application Document	CDC Position	Applicants Position	Status	Likelihood of Resolution
			own right” is an omission. An assessment of the Site as a landscape receptor was provided to CDC / LUC prior to Deadline 1. It is understood that this will be updated in ES Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity, ES Volume I [REP2-007] and will be submitted by the Applicant at Deadline 2. All other elements of landscape effects are considered to be agreed (the landscape effects associated with LCA F2 are considered under 12.4 below).	Landscape Character Areas were identified to provide a more granular assessment of landscape effects appropriate to the scale of the Proposed Development, rather than relying on published landscape character areas alone. However, in line with the feedback received, an assessment of the Site was provided to CDC / LUC shortly before Deadline 1 and is reflected in the updated ES Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity, ES Volume I (Revision 01) [REP2-007] submitted at Deadline 2. This point is therefore agreed.		
12.4	Landscape Effects- LCA F2	ES Volume I, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity [REP2-007]	Para. 1.45 of the LUC November 2024 report requests that the level of effect identified for LCA F2: Owston to Sykehouse Settled Clay Farmlands is reviewed. This review was received prior to Deadline 1 confirming that the Applicant considers the overall assessment of LCA F2 to be correct. No further engagement on this matter is requested.	A response was provided to CDC/ LUC shortly before Deadline 1 providing supplementary information on the impacts on LCA F2, including specific measurements requested on vegetation removal and proportion of the Site covered by Solar PV Infrastructure. This information confirmed that the assessment of landscape effects on LCA F2 is correct and is reflected in the updated ES Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity, ES Volume I (Revision 01) [REP2-007]. Therefore, this matter is agreed.	Agreed	Agreed
12.5	Visual Impacts	ES Volume I, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity [REP2-007]	Para. 1.50 – 1.52 of the LUC November 2024 report questions several judgements in relation to visual impacts. A supplementary report was received prior to Deadline 1 confirming that the applicant considers the overall assessment of visual receptors to be correct. No further engagement on this matter is requested.	A response was provided to CDC/ LUC shortly before Deadline 1 and subsequently discussed prior to Deadline 2. No further clarification regarding visual impacts has been requested and therefore the position regarding visual impacts is agreed.	Agreed	Agreed
12.6	Cumulative Effects on landscape	ES Volume I, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity [REP2-007]	Para. 1.57 of the LUC November 2024 report requests additional narrative is provided setting out why certain cumulative developments have been assessed in the LVIA and additional detail on the assessment of cumulative effects. A supplementary report was received prior to Deadline 1 providing additional narrative and clarifications around the identification of cumulative schemes and their assessment. We therefore consider this matter to be agreed.	Clarification was provided to CDC/ LUC shortly before Deadline 1 and therefore the position regarding cumulative effects is agreed.	Agreed	Agreed
12.7	Mitigation and Design	ES Volume I, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity [APP-062]	The LUC November 2024 report recommend several design alterations which are reflected in CDC’s RR [RR-001], including:	The Proposed Development has undergone several design iterations, each time embedding landscape and wider environmental mitigation as part of the aim of achieving good design. CDC were consulted on the design of the scheme and	Agreed.	Agreed

Ref.	Subject	Relevant Application Document	CDC Position	Applicants Position	Status	Likelihood of Resolution
			a) Omission of the rectilinear parcel of land accommodating solar PV panels adjoining West Lane. b) Integrating an increased offset from the solar PV panels and residential properties located on Lawn Lane, Fenwick. c) Omission of the outlier parcels of land accommodating solar PV panels to the north-west of Jett Hall. d) Reduction of the solar PV panel coverage to the north-east of the Site where the landscape is characterised by smaller-scale pasture and water meadows. CDC accepts that NPS EN-1 states that the scale of energy projects means that they will often be visible across a very wide area and that a judgement must be made as to whether any adverse impact on the landscape would be so damaging that it is not offset by the benefits (including need) of the project. CDC also accepts that given the degree of landscape and visual mitigation provided, as set out in paragraphs 10.7.4 – 10.7.8 of ES Volume I Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity [APP-062], and the level of effects identified for landscape and visual receptors in the LVIA, the Applicant does not intend to reduce the extent of Work No. 1. Whilst incorporating points (a) – (d) above would contribute in some reduction in impacts, this would be at a very localised level, and CDC agrees that retaining these elements of the proposal would not render it so damaging to offset the benefits of the project. No further engagement on this matter is requested.	feedback was regularly sought throughout the evolution of the project. Landscape and visual impacts need to be balanced against other considerations such as the ‘critical national priority’ to deliver solar infrastructure. This balancing exercise is set out in the Planning Statement [APP-246]. Mitigation and design was discussed with LUC in mid-April. Commentary on each of the recommended locations cited by CDC/ LUC is provided below: a) The rectilinear parcel adjoining West Lane is well contained by existing vegetation along the disused railway line and woodland to the north of Bungalow Farm, which helps to minimise any adverse landscape and visual effects arising from these fields. As such, no additional mitigation is required at this location. With reference to Tables 4, 8 and 20 within ES Volume III, Appendix 10-6: Visual Assessment Tables [APP-166], these fields do not give rise to any significant visual effects for nearby residents or users of West Lane. It has the potential to give rise to negligible adverse visual effects during construction for some residents in Sykehouse and makes a small contribution towards the overall minor adverse visual effect for users of West Lane during construction and Year 1. With reference to Table 10 within ES Volume III, Appendix 10-5: Landscape Assessment Tables [APP-165], the introduction of these fields makes some contribution towards the overall minor adverse judgement for LLCA 04 during construction and Year 1, reducing to negligible adverse at Year 15. b) An offset of approximately 100m has already been integrated into the Scheme at this location, alongside a new belt of vegetation to help filter and eventually screen views. This offset was deemed appropriate considering the existing vegetation along the northern curtilage of these properties, as well as the orientation of windows and the fact they are 1 storey, restricting the potential for longer views above intervening vegetation from first floor windows. As noted within paragraph 5.3.2 of the Framework Landscape and Ecological Management Plan [REP1-029], this would be a focal area for the use of ready hedges and more mature planting stock to allow for		

Ref.	Subject	Relevant Application Document	CDC Position	Applicants Position	Status	Likelihood of Resolution
				mitigation to establish faster. With reference to Table 1 within ES Volume III, Appendix 10-6: Visual Assessment Tables [APP-166], significant adverse visual effects would exist during construction and Year 1, reducing to not significant once mitigation establishes. c) With reference to Table 2 within ES Volume III, Appendix 10-6: Visual Assessment Tables [APP-166], moderate adverse (significant) effects are identified for Jet Hall Farm, Lilac Cottage, Sunrise Cottage and the Old School as a result of the development within Fields SW11 and SW12. These reduce at Year 15 once proposed mitigation establishes, with the exception of Jet Hall Farm which would continue to experience a moderate adverse (significant) effect at Year 15 during Winter only. Although a significant adverse effect has been found at Year 15 during Winter for the property at Jet Hall Farm, it is noted that these views are at an oblique angle and limited to upper storey windows on a single façade of the property. As set out on page 49 of the Framework LEMP [REP1-029], mitigation has been embedded within the Scheme through the gapping up of existing hedgerows and hedgerow trees along field boundaries in this location. With reference to paragraph 5.3.2 of the Framework LEMP [APP-203], this would be a focal area for the use of ready hedges and more mature planting stock to allow for mitigation to establish faster. d) With reference to the Works Plans [APP-214] and the Indicative Site Layout Plan [APP-074], development has already been set back from the River Went corridor to create a more open riparian corridor and associated habitats. This is an improvement to the existing extent of the River Went corridor, which has arable farming practices abutting the edge of the watercourse in places. The extent of development and the proposed riparian edge hedgerow and trees follows the existing hedgerow and tree boundaries in the north-east of the Site, where they exist. This allows for the existing field pattern to be reinforced, as opposed to creating new boundaries. Given the degree of landscape and visual mitigation provided, as set out in paragraphs 10.7.4 – 10.7.8 of ES Volume I Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity [APP-062], and the level of effects identified for landscape and visual receptors in the LVIA,		

Ref.	Subject	Relevant Application Document	CDC Position	Applicants Position	Status	Likelihood of Resolution
				the Applicant does not intend to reduce the extent of Work No. 1.		
12.8	Framework LEMP	Framework LEMP [REP1-029]	LUC have now reviewed the LEMP and have provided comments back to the Applicant for consideration. An updated version of the FLEMP [REP1-029] was submitted at Deadline 1 with these comments addressed and this point is therefore considered to be agreed.	CDC / LUC's comments on the FLEMP have been incorporated and an updated document submitted at Deadline 1. This point is therefore agreed.	Agreed	Agreed
12.9	Visualisations	ES Volume I, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity, [APP-062]	Para. 1.78 of the LUC November 2024 report confirms that the selection of visualisations appear to be appropriate. An updated representative viewpoint plan was provided to CDC/ LUC prior to Deadline 1 and is understood to be submitted by the Applicant at Deadline 2. Updated type 1 viewpoint photography was also provided to CDC/ LUC after Deadline 1 and is understood to be submitted by the Applicant at Deadline 2. This point is therefore considered to be agreed.	It is proposed that the photomontage locations as presented in the LVIA are agreed. An updated representative viewpoint plan was provided to CDC/ LUC shortly before Deadline 1 and is submitted at Deadline 2. Updated type 1 viewpoint photography was provided to CDC/ LUC after Deadline 1 and is submitted at Deadline 2. This point is therefore agreed.	Agreed	High
13. Public Rights of Way						
13.1	PRoW	ES Volume I, Chapter 13: Transport and Access [REP1-015]	As stated with CDC's RR [RR-001], in respect of ES Volume I Chapter 13: Transport and Access [APP-065], the following comments are noted: 13.5.17 states PRoW Fenwick 16 exists on the northern side of Haggs Lane and separation between vehicles and the PRoW will be managed through the measures described in the Framework PRoW Management Plan. To clarify, public footpath No.16 does not exist just on the northern side of Haggs Lane, it exists across the entire width of Haggs Lane. 13.5.24 Should also be reference to the Trans Pennine Trail, which NCN 62 is part of. 13.5.26 ...In addition, it has been observed that several footpath bridges were showing vegetation growing completely across them indicating there had been no recent usage at all. I don't agree that bridges with vegetation growing across them indicates no recent use. Depending on the type of vegetation, users can get past by moving vegetation with little or no disturbance. We've also had issues carrying out our maintenance schedule so	ES Volume I, Chapter 13: Transport and Access, [REP1-015] identifies and proposes measures to address the potential impacts and likely significant effects of the Scheme on Transport and Access during the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases, including PRoW. ES Volume I, Chapter 13: Transport and Access [REP1-015] has been updated to reflect these three suggested changes by CDC and submitted into Examination at Deadline 1 as follows: 13.5.17: 'PRoW Fenwick 16 exists on the <i>entire width</i> northern side of Haggs Lane...' 13.5.24: '...<i>The nearest section of the National Cycle Network is part of Route 62 (which also forms part of the Trans Pennine Trail) and lies approximately 4 km to the east and south of the Solar PV Site...</i> 13.5.26: 'In addition, it has been observed that several footpath bridges were showing vegetation	Agreed	Agreed

Ref.	Subject	Relevant Application Document	CDC Position	Applicants Position	Status	Likelihood of Resolution
			many of the paths/bridges went uncut for long periods. Again, this is not an indication of the lack of use. The changes set out in the Applicant's response are fully agreed following agreement between the Applicant and CDC to those sections of the draft DCO [REP3-006] (Revision 04) which is understood to be submitted at Deadline 3.	<i>growing completely across them indicating there had been no recent usage at all</i>.		
13.2	Public Rights of Way Management Plan	Framework Public Rights of Way Management Plan [REP4-025]	As stated with CDC's RR [RR-001], in respect of Framework Public Rights of Way Management Plan [REP4-025], the following comments are noted: • Query regarding maintenance of PRow • Query regarding the minimum widths of PRow • Query regarding erroneous references to the PRow definitive map and PRow users, and the lack of a reference to the Trans Pennine Trail In addition, the following changes were identified as required after the submission of CDC's RR [RR-001]: • Para 1.3.4 - it should read <i>Moss 6 and Fenwick 14...</i> 14 is missing. • Table 2 on page 10 – Thorpe in Balne 7, the last sentence to be corrected to read <i>River Don</i> • Table 2 on Page 11 – Thorpe in Balne 13, the last sentence says...<i>Barnby Dun with K Sandall...</i> this should be Barnby Dun with Kirk Sandall. • Section 3.3 Permanent PRow Diversions on page 14 will need to be amended to include the short section of Fenwick 10, as outlined above.	The Framework Public Rights of Way Management Plan [REP4-025] outlines how PRow will be managed by the Applicant for the Scheme to ensure they have been suitably considered and able to operate as well as possible, in terms of both user safety and accessibility. Engagement with CDC regarding maintenance and the minimum widths of PRows can continue during the preparation of the Public Right of Way Management Plan and the Operational Environmental Management Plan which are both secured by Schedule 2, Requirements 12 and 17 of the draft DCO [REP1-005]. Following the submission of CDC's RR [RR-001], the Council identified that the closure of a short section of Footpath 10 was also required, to align with the closure of Sykehouse 29. This closure has been accommodated in the updated Deadline 1 documents, including the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plan [REP1-004], the draft DCO [REP1-005] and ES Volume I, Chapter 12: Socio Economics and Land Use [REP1-013] (as set out in section 13.3 below). Amendments to sheet 4 of the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans and an amendment to the legend on all sheets was provided to and agreed by CDC on 25 June 2025. The same updated Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans (Revision 04) [REP3-004] and REP3-005] are submitted at Deadline 3. The Framework Public Rights of Way Management Plan [REP4-025] has also been updated to reflect the closure of Footpath 10 and to respond to the comments raised in CDC's RR [RR-001], and was submitted into Examination at Deadline 1 as follows: 1.3.2: '<i>...the network is mostly used by the local community residents for recreational purposes such</i>	Agreed	Agreed

Ref.	Subject	Relevant Application Document	CDC Position	Applicants Position	Status	Likelihood of Resolution
			Section 4, Operation, on page 17, paragraph 4.1.1 will need amending to include Fenwick 10. <u>Amendments to sheet 4 of the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans and an amendment to the legend on all sheets was requested by CDC on 17 June 2025. CDC agreed to the updated Plans received on 25 June 2025 from the Applicant and are understood to be submitted by the Applicant at Deadline 3.</u> The changes set out in the Applicant's response are fully agreed following agreement between the Applicant and CDC to those sections of the draft DCO [REP3-006] (Revision 04) which is understood to be submitted at Deadline 3.	<i>as dog walking, with some use by groups leading and guided walks around the area, by equestrians and that the usage tended to be low compared to paths in the town centre or urban fringe'.</i> 1.3.4: '...Moss 6 and Fenwick 14 were discussed...It was agreed with City of Doncaster Council that the routes walked by the public differ to the definitive map was incorrect and that users followed a path that is similar to the suggested permanent diversions...' 2.1.6: '...National Cycle Route 62 is the nearest national cycle route (which also forms part of the Trans Pennine Trail), approximately...' 4.1.1: '...Sykehouse 29, Fenwick 10, Moss 6...' Table 2, page 10: '...the River Don'. Table 2, page 11: '...with Kirk Sandall 2'. Table 3, page 14: 'Sykehouse 29 and Fenwick 10'		
13.3	PRoW	ES Volume I , Chapter 12:Socio Economics and Land Use [REP1-013]	As stated with CDC's RR [RR-001], in respect of ES Volume I, Chapter 12: Socio Economics and Land Use [APP-226], the following comments are noted: 12.3.18 refers to the proposed permanent diversion of footpath No.29 Sykehouse. This will also involve part of footpath No.12 Fenwick, which No.29 joins and the eastern part of footpath No.10 Fenwick. Since earlier discussions with the applicant, CDC can confirm it has received a definitive map modification order application to upgrade footpath No. 29 Sykehouse and footpath No.12 Fenwick to bridleway. - The applicants have been made aware of this and is referenced further in the document at paragraphs 12.5.73, 12.6.10 and 12.7.31. 12.5.26 ...there are currently no bridleways within the Solar PV site although there are two located along or abutting it. See comment above regarding application to upgrade	The Applicant notes that CDC informed them about the definitive map modification order application. Consequently, paragraphs 12.5.73, 12.6.10 and 12.7.31 of ES Volume I, Chapter 12: Socio Economics and Land Use [REP1-013] confirms that, if the application is accepted and the upgrade is confirmed, the Applicant will ensure that the diverted Sykehouse 29 route meets the requirements for a bridleway. Paragraph 12.5.6 of ES Volume I, Chapter 12: Socio Economics and Land Use [REP1-013] describes the current baseline. Reference is made to the application to upgrade 29 Sykehouse and Fenwick 12 to bridleway in paragraph 12.5.73 because this is where the future baseline is described. The assessment in paragraph 12.6.10 that the diversion of a PRoW Sykehouse 29 footpath would constitute a not significant effect remains valid. As noted in paragraph 12.6.10, if the application is accepted and the upgrade is confirmed, the Applicant will ensure that the diverted Sykehouse 29 route meets the requirements for a bridleway.	Agreed	Agreed

Ref.	Subject	Relevant Application Document	CDC Position	Applicants Position	Status	Likelihood of Resolution
			footpath 29 Sykehouse and footpath No.12 Fenwick to bridleway. 12.3.19 ...indicating that the network is mostly used by local residents for recreational purposes such as dog walking and guided walks by equestrians... The applicant has previously been advised that the rights of way network is mostly used by the local community for recreation, with some use by groups leading guided walks around the area. The network mainly comprises public footpaths, but some are used by equestrians. It would therefore be helpful for clarification to be provided. The changes set out in the Applicant’s response are fully agreed following agreement between the Applicant and CDC to those sections of the draft DCO [EN010152/APP/3.1] (REP3-006) which is understood to be submitted at Deadline 3.	ES Volume I, Chapter 12: Socio Economics and Land Use, [REP1-013] has been updated to reflect these changes, including changes relating to the closure of a short section of Fenwick 10, and was submitted into Examination at Deadline 1 as follows: 12.3.19: <i>‘The Council also provided baseline context on the existing PRow network within the Solar PV Site, indicating that the network is mostly used by the local community residents for recreational purposes such as dog walking and, with some use by groups leading guided walks around the area by equestrians, and that the usage tended to be low compared to paths in the town centre or urban fringe. The Council also confirmed that the network mainly comprises public footpaths, but some are used by equestrians’.</i> 12.6.10: <i>ThreeFour PRow would be permanently diverted...PRow Sykehouse 29 footpath and a short section of Fenwick 10, which...’</i> 12.6.14: <i>‘...permanent diversion of fourthree PRow (Sykehouse 29, Fenwick 10, Moss 6...’</i> 12.7.31: <i>‘The Scheme would require the permanent diversion of PRow Sykehouse 29 Footpath and a short section of Fenwick 10 Footpath’.</i> 12.7.70: <i>‘The permanent diversion of Moss 6, Fenwick 14, and Sykehouse 29 and Fenwick 10 would remain during the operation and maintenance phase. As outlined during the construction phase, the permanent diversion of all fourthree PRow...’</i> 12.10.15: <i>‘The permanent diversion of PRow Sykehouse 29, Fenwick 10, Moss 6...’</i>		
14. Socio-Economics						
14.1	Framework Skills Employment and Supply Chain Plan	Framework Skills Employment and Supply Chain Plan [APP-204]	As stated with CDC’s RR [RR-001] , CDC would welcome the opportunity to engage in further dialogue in how these economic benefits of the scheme could be maximised during the construction phase, via the Doncaster Delivering Together Strategy.	The Framework Skills Employment and Supply Chain Plan [APP-204] sets out the likely economic benefits of the Scheme, and the context and characteristics of the local community and economy in which it is located. It identifies potential opportunities for activities relating to Skills, Supply Chain and Employment which the Applicant	Agreed	Agreed

Ref.	Subject	Relevant Application Document	CDC Position	Applicants Position	Status	Likelihood of Resolution
			Within the context of the ongoing engagement with the applicant, CDC would ask that consideration be given to increasing the number employed within a 60-minute drive time, as this would have a positive impact on the local workforce.	will explore taking forward post-consent, including consideration to increasing the number employed within a 60-minute drive time. The Applicant welcomes the offer to engage with CDC via the Doncaster Delivering Together Strategy.		
14.2	Socio-Economic Impacts	ES Volume I, Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use [REP1-013]	No further comments to make.	ES Volume I, Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use [REP1-013] provides an assessment of socio-economic effects including effects upon employment, PRoW, private and community assets during the various phases of the Scheme. The assessment concludes that no significant adverse effects are anticipated from any of those impacts during the various phases of the Scheme.	Agreed	Agreed
15. Traffic and Transport						
15.1	Construction Traffic Management Plan	Framework Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) [REP4-027 and APP-251]	As stated with CDC's RR [RR-001], in respect of Framework CTMP [REP4-027 and APP-251], the following comments are noted: - Prohibition should be included to prevent the use of the nearby Fenwick Lane which due to its width / alignment is unacceptable for any route to any site. - CDC would advise that further information is required in respect of Traffic Marshalls, including confirmation as to what qualifications they will be required to hold in order to control traffic on the highway - Any such works will require a 'Permit to Work', managed by the council's Streetworks team. Any works relating to temporary traffic signals require authorisation and should be coordinated with other works ongoing within the vicinity. Enshrining these requirements within the documents would be useful. - Similarly, any temporary traffic management measures to facilitate implementation to be set out within the detailed CTMP should be informed by the contractor and the local highway authority, including on site where deemed necessary The changes set out in the Applicant's response are fully agreed following agreement between the Applicant and CDC to those sections of the draft	The Framework CTMP [REP4-027 and APP-251] sets out mitigation and control measures to limit the traffic impacts during construction. The following comments are noted: - The vehicle routing will be from the A19, then continuing along Moss Road and turning onto Fenwick Common Lane. Vehicles would therefore not use Fenwick Lane. This routing will be included in the Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) secured by Schedule 2, Requirement 13 of the draft DCO [REP1-005] and will also be shared with all workers on site to ensure adherence to the route. If the Scheme workers did not comply with the CTMP and its routing, then CDC could pursue enforcement action under the PA 2008 to ensure compliance under Requirement 13. The CTMP and DCO Requirement therefore already apply as a prohibition on the use of Fenwick Lane. - The Traffic Regulation Measures Plan [APP-009] identify that either a Banksperson or Traffic Signal Control will be utilised where access locations will be constructed or widened. This will allow the Contractor the necessary flexibility to introduce a form of traffic control that is both appropriate and safe for the type of works being undertaken. - The Applicant notes the request and confirms that, where any works require temporary traffic management or traffic signals, it will seek the necessary Permit to Work in consultation with CDC's Street Works team. The Applicant seeks to discuss with CDC further	Agreed	Agreed

Ref.	Subject	Relevant Application Document	CDC Position	Applicants Position	Status	Likelihood of Resolution
			DCO [REP3-006] (Revision 04) which is understood to be submitted at Deadline 3.	additional drafting which can be included within the draft DCO and CTMP to set out how controls under those documents will interact with the Council's permitting process. Any proposals to install temporary traffic management will be suitably co-ordinated with other roadworks in the vicinity to minimise disruption to local traffic.		
15.2	Hours of construction	ES Volume I, Chapter 13: Transport and Access, [REP1-015]	As stated with CDC's RR [RR-001], in respect of ES Volume I Chapter 13: Transport and Access [APP-065], the following comments are noted: Future Baseline (page 23 13.5.10) and Construction and Decommissioning Phase (page 41, 13.6.6) should be updated. Paragraph 13.5.10 incorrectly describes a junction with Station Road. In respect of paragraph 13.6.6, the council defines 'off peak' periods as being between 0930hrs and 1530hrs which not only ensures the busier school drop off / pick up times are protected, but also heavy traffic on route to and leaving premises during core working hours. CDC has requested further dialogue take place with the applicant following the detailed considerations above having been shared with them, with the applicant has agreed to.	ES Volume I Chapter 13: Transport and Access [REP1-015] identifies and proposes measures to address the potential impacts and likely significant effects of the Scheme on Transport and Access during the construction, operation and maintenance, and decommissioning phases. ES Volume I Chapter 13 [REP1-015] was updated and submitted at Deadline 1 as follows: 13.5.9: <i>'The A19 passes through more built-up areas such as Whitley to the north of the A19 and Askern, where it joins with Moss Station Road via a 34-arm signalised junction'.</i> The traditional network peak hours of 08:00-09:00 and 17:00-18:00 were assumed as part of the assessment. Table 7 of the Transport Assessment [APP-179] identifies the majority of movements within the hours of 06:00-07:00 and 18:00-19:00 which would be outside of the extended peak hours indicated by CDC. It is also noted that, further management of any movements scheduled within or close to the AM and PM peak hours would be introduced to lessen the impacts of vehicles in these periods, which can be identified through the preparation of the Construction Traffic Management Plan secured by Schedule 2, Requirement 13 of the draft DCO [REP1-005]	Agreed	Agreed
15.3	Access Design	Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plan [REP1-004]	No further comments to make. The access design and locations are considered to be appropriate and acceptable in technical terms, subject to the final version of the DCO including all necessary approval/permitting regimes.	Access design and locations shown on the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plan [REP1-004] are considered appropriate and acceptable.	Agreed	Agreed
15.4	Traffic and Transport Impacts	ES Volume I, Chapter 13: Transport and Access, [REP-015]	No further comments to make in this respect. It is agreed that the Scheme will be acceptable in this respect, subject to the implementation of mitigation measures.	ES Volume I Chapter 13: Transport and Traffic [REP1-015] presents an assessment of the impacts of the construction traffic resulting from the Scheme on sensitive receptors. The associated Transport Assessment (ES Volume III Appendix 13-4: Transport Assessment [APP-179]) considers whether the Scheme will be acceptable in transport and highway terms. The assessment concludes that, following the implementation of mitigation measures,	Agreed	Agreed

Ref.	Subject	Relevant Application Document	CDC Position	Applicants Position	Status	Likelihood of Resolution
				potentially significant adverse effects at road links 9 (Moss Road – Askern Village), 10 (Moss Road – East of Askern), 11 (Fenwick Common Lane), 12 (Trumfleet Lane – South of Moss), 13 (Marsh Road) and 14 (Thorpe Bank) remain – all relating to increase in traffic and some also with regard to severance and driver delay and effects on NMUs . However, the routes currently experience low baseline traffic numbers which is the reason for the higher percentage increase in traffic and, therefore, the overall impact is not deemed significant with regard to increase in traffic. In addition, effects are temporary in nature and not due to a lack of capacity on the road network.		
16. Noise and Vibration						
16.1	Noise and Vibration Mitigation Measures	Framework Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) [REP1-019] Framework DEMP [REP1-021]	As stated with CDC’s RR [RR-001], the provisions set out in the CEMP and DEMP remain under review by CDC, and more detailed consideration will be set out in the Local Impact Report. CDC accepts that specific requirements contained in the DCO would secure these.	The Framework CEMP [REP1-019] and Framework DEMP [REP4-019] set out mitigation measures to reduce noise and vibration impacts through the construction and decommissioning phases. Final versions of these documents would be secured through Requirements 12 and 18 of the draft DCO [REP-005]. Requirement 14 of the draft DCO [REP1-005] secures an operational noise assessment to be submitted prior to the commencement of Works No. 1, 2 or 3. The assessment should contain details of how the design of the authorised development has incorporated mitigation to ensure the operational noise rating levels as set out in the environmental statement are to be complied with.	Agreed	Agreed
17. Health						
17.1	Health and Wellbeing Impacts	ES Volume I Chapter 9: Water Environment [APP-061] ES Volume I Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity [APP-062] ES Volume I Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [REP4-012] ES Volume I Chapter 13: Transport and Access [REP1-015]	No comments to make	Potential effects to human health are set out in the following technical assessments: ES Volume I Chapter 9: Water Environment [APP-061] ES Volume I Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual Amenity [APP-062] [ES Volume I Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration [REP4-012] ES Volume I Chapter 13: Transport and Access [REP1-015] ES Volume I Chapter 14: Other Environmental Topics, Air Quality, Ground Conditions, Major Accidents and Disasters, Electromagnetic Fields [APP-066].	Agreed	Agreed

Ref.	Subject	Relevant Application Document	CDC Position	Applicants Position	Status	Likelihood of Resolution
		ES Volume I Chapter 14: Other Environmental Topics, Air Quality, Ground Conditions, Major Accidents and Disasters, Electromagnetic Fields [APP-066].		In accordance with the findings of the above chapters, likely significant adverse effects are not expected to arise during the various phases of the Scheme with respect to the impacts on health.		
18. Land Use and Agriculture						
18.1	Agricultural Land	ES Volume I, Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use [REP1-013]	As stated with CDC’s RR [RR-001], CDC accepts that only a relatively small proportion of the agricultural land is BMV land (less than 20 ha) and furthermore agrees that overall, the loss of the BMV agricultural land is temporary and reversible (after operation for the Solar PV Site and after construction for the Grid Connection Corridor). It also appreciates what is said regarding the lack of any suitable and available areas of brownfield or non-agricultural land at the appropriate scale having been identified. CDC welcomes the fact that the scheme has been designed to consider the quality of agricultural land insofar as practicable such as positioning the permanent infrastructure to avoid BMV land and avoiding other socio-economic and other sensitive environmental receptors. However, it is requested that further consideration is given to excluding the south-western fields referenced 5/02 and the field to the north of this – as these areas contain both Grade 2 and subgrade 3a soils. This would also have the consequence of creating a larger buffer between the development and Jett Hall/the settlement of Moss. This is also a point of consideration emphasised in the discussion in respect of Chapter 10 and removing these areas from the developable area would also have positive consequences from this perspective. CDC would therefore welcome the opportunity to continue to work with the applicant on this aspect of the scheme to establish any scope for a further reduction to BMV loss, with the further positive consequence of reducing landscape impact and	The Applicant has considered CDC’s suggestion but does not intend to remove the southwestern fields from the Scheme. In summary, this is because: a) there is an urgent national need for ‘critical national priority’ infrastructure; b) there is a lack of suitable and available alternative sites; c) the design has sited permanent elements (such as the substation) outside of BMV land; and d) the impact on BMV land is reversible, as construction and operation of the Scheme in these fields (in accordance with the Soil Management Plan [REP4-021]) will not impact on the grading of the land, and once the Scheme is decommissioned the land will be available for agricultural use again (and is secured by Schedule 2, Requirements 18 of the draft DCO [APP-220]). Consequently, ES Volume I, Chapter 12: Socio-Economics and Land Use [REP1-013] concludes that the Scheme will have a negligible effect on the use of BMV agricultural land. Even if residual effects were identified, paragraph 4.1.7 of NPS EN-1 states that, for projects which qualify as CNP infrastructure (such as the Scheme), the need case will generally outweigh the residual effects in “<i>all but the most exceptional cases</i>”. None of the exceptional circumstances set out in paragraph 4.1.7 apply in respect of the Scheme. CDC also notes that the removal of the fields would create a larger buffer with Jett Hall and the settlement of Moss, which goes to landscape matters as opposed to BMV matters. This is considered in the Applicant’s response of 30 January 2025 to the landscape review undertaken by LUC on behalf of CDC. It should also be noted that the owner-occupier of Jett Hall supports the inclusion of the	Agreed	Agreed

Ref.	Subject	Relevant Application Document	CDC Position	Applicants Position	Status	Likelihood of Resolution
			increasing the buffer to Moss. Nevertheless CDC acknowledges that the overall loss of Best and Most Versatile agricultural soils within the context of the wider site is not deemed to be 'significant' as per the requirements of local plan Policy 60 due to the overall percentage loss of BMV. It is further acknowledged, however, that the ExA will need to weigh the harm arising from this minor loss against the public benefits of the proposed development. It is also accepted that the development would meet the requirements of policy 60(A)(2) insofar that the loss of agricultural land would be for a temporary period, and the land can be reinstated back to its previous state following decommissioning.	southern western fields within the Scheme. Engagement between the Applicant, LUC and CDC continues in respect of landscape and visual matters.		
19. Trees, woodland and hedgerows						
19.1	Arboricultural Impact Assessment	ES Volume III, Appendix 10-7: Arboricultural Impact Assessment [APP-237 and APP-237]	No comments to make on arboricultural impacts/mitigation specifically, notwithstanding position regarding landscape and ecology set out elsewhere.	ES Volume III, Appendix 10-7: Arboricultural Impact Assessment [APP-237 and APP-237] presents an assessment of the likely Arboricultural impacts of the Scheme. This assessment includes consideration of the likely direct and indirect impacts to trees as a result of the Scheme and how impacts may be mitigated. The Assessment and Mitigation outlined is considered appropriate.	Agreed	Agreed
20. Water resources, flood risk and drainage						
20.1	Flood Risk	Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) (ES Volume III Appendix 9-3: Flood Risk Assessment [APP-158])	No comments to make.	The FRA (Appendix 9-3: Flood Risk Assessment, ES Volume III) [APP-158] considers the flood risk posed to, and from the Scheme from all sources of flooding. Annex B of the FRA [APP-159] sets out how the Scheme meets both the exception and sequential tests set out in the National Policy Statement for Energy EN-1. The assessments set out in the FRA and Annex B are considered to be appropriate.	Agreed	Agreed
20.2	Water Environment	ES Volume I, Chapter 9: Water Environment [APP-061]	No comments to make other than to note that CDC would normally defer to the Environment Agency as it is the authority responsible for delivering the Water Framework Directive.	ES Volume I, Chapter 9: Water Environment [APP-061] presents the findings of an assessment of the likely significant effects on the water environment as a result of the Scheme. The inclusion of mitigation measures as set out within the Framework CEMP [REP1-019], Framework OEMP [REP4-017] and Framework DEMP [REP4-019] ,	Agreed	Agreed

Ref.	Subject	Relevant Application Document	CDC Position	Applicants Position	Status	Likelihood of Resolution
				together with a detailed CEMP and DEMP secured by Requirements 11 and 18 of the Draft DCO [REP1-005] , will ensure that the Scheme will not have a significant adverse effect on water quality during all phases of the Scheme. Matters relating to the Water Framework Directive are set out (and agreed) within the Statement of Common Ground with the Environment Agency [REP1-033] .		
20.3	Drainage	ES Volume III Appendix 9-4: Framework Drainage Strategy [APP-160]	No further comments to make in this respect. Detailed comments have been provided to the applicant on certain matters that will be expected to come forward through Requirement 9.	ES Volume I, Chapter 9: Water Environment [APP-061] assesses the impacts on drainage. The proposed drainage design set out in the Framework Drainage Strategy (ES Volume III Appendix 9-4 [APP-160]) is appropriate and is secured through Requirement 9 of the Draft DCO [REP1-005] .	Agreed	Agreed
21. Glint and Glare						
21.1	Glint and Glare	ES Volume III, Chapter 14: Other Environmental Topics [APP-066]	As stated with CDC’s RR [RR-001], it is unclear whether the assessment contained within the Preliminary Environmental Impact Assessment assumed Doncaster Sheffield Airport to be closed or operational. It was therefore highlighted at that time that the council’s aspirations were for the airport to be operational again in the near future and accordingly requested that all assessments in respect of impacts to the airport should assume the scenario as being fully operational. CDC notes that these assumptions have been taken forward within the ES and that on the basis of a worst-case scenario, Table 6 - 5, the ES states there are no Glare impacts for the receptors at Doncaster Sheffield Airport. CDC is currently seeking to verify this from an airport safeguarding perspective and will make further submissions within the Local Impact Report as necessary. CDC has received confirmation that the assessment is fit for purpose. CDC has been advised that the assessment does not model the reflections against any flight profiles and directly from Air Traffic Control. Given that the airport is not currently operational (albeit private flights are operating), the difficulties in making this assessment are accepted. CDC would therefore request that consideration be given to a mechanism for longer term monitoring in the event that reports from aerodrome users are received.	ES Volume I, Chapter 14: Other Environmental Topics [APP-066] includes an assessment of the likely effects of glint and glare associated with the Scheme on the surrounding receptors, including Doncaster Sheffield Airport. The assessment confirms that, whilst Doncaster Sheffield Airport is currently closed, it remains in the glint and glare assessment as a worst case in the event that the airport reopens in future. The assessment concludes that the overall impacts on aviation assets are acceptable and not significant. The second paragraph of CDC’s position was received by the Applicant shortly before Deadline 1. The Applicant has provided a response below, but it is noted that this will require consideration by CDC following Deadline 1. The Applicant assessed the industry standard of the 2-mile approach path into the runways as well as the Air Traffic Control Tower (ATCT). The model showed that there were no impacts expected upon Doncaster-Sheffield Airport (which is located approximately 16.7km from the Site). Given that there are no impacts on the Airport and that there are no plans to re-align or add runways, a future assessment of specific flights paths by the Applicant is not considered necessary. This will be discussed with CDC and its aviation advisor and an update provided at Deadline 2.	Agreed	Agreed

Ref.	Subject	Relevant Application Document	CDC Position	Applicants Position	Status	Likelihood of Resolution
			Following receipt of the Applicant's response shortly before Deadline 1, CDC has obtained further advice from its aviation advisor and can confirm that CDC agrees with the Applicant's position.			
22. Safety and Security						
22.1	Safety and Security Measures	ES Volume I, Chapter 2: The Scheme [APP-054]	As stated with CDC's RR [RR-001], ES Volume I, Chapter 2: The Scheme [APP-054] outlines the security measures incorporated in the design of the scheme. Proposed fencing has been designed to minimise its visual prominence during operation, incorporating stock proof, or other mesh-type fencing, at a maximum height of 2.2m. It is also understood that security will be provided via pole mounted internal facing closed circuit television systems are proposed around the perimeter of the operational areas of the Solar PV Site. Ultimately, CDC would agree that this strikes an appropriate balance to achieving security to the site and would not wish to see any more substantial barriers in situ to address the risk of crime, and it is not considered that it would be appropriate to incorporate further physical barriers.	ES Volume I, Chapter 2: The Scheme [APP-054] presents the security measures that will be implemented on site. These measures are considered appropriate.	Agreed	Agreed
23. Cumulative Effects						
23.1	Cumulative Effects	ES Volume I, Chapter 15: Cumulative Effects and Interactions ES Volume I [APP-058 to REP4-012, APP-065 to APP067, APP-224 and APP-226].	As stated with CDC's RR [RR-001], CDC reserves its position to make more detailed commentary on this matter within the Local Impact Report. The two other NSIP solar farms previously referenced are at earlier stages of the process and will not be committed development during the examination of this application. TCPA application 23/00537/FULM (Thorpe Marsh) has now been granted (on 28.01.2025). There are no other comments to make in this respect.	An assessment of the cumulative effects of the Scheme along with these other developments is presented in each technical chapter (ES Volume I, Chapter 6 to Chapter 13) and throughout ES Volume I, Chapter 14: Other Environmental Topics). ES Volume I, Chapter 15: Cumulative Effects and Interactions, provides a summary of the cumulative effects for the Scheme. It is considered that there will not be any new likely significant effects associated with cumulative effects that are not already accounted for by the assessment of the Scheme	Agreed	Agreed
24. Development Consent Order						
24.1	Draft DCO	Draft DCO [EN010152/APP/3.1] (Revision 03)	With the amendments made at Deadlines 2, 3 and 4, and 5 the Council is agreed to the drafting of the draft DCO subject to:	The draft DCO [REP1-005] was updated and submitted into Examination at Deadline 1 to action the matters discussed at the Issue Specific Hearing 1 and in direct discussion between the Council and the Applicant. Further updates were provided at Deadline 2 [REP2-005] and	Agreed	Agreed

Ref.	Subject	Relevant Application Document	CDC Position	Applicants Position	Status	Likelihood of Resolution
			the wording of Article 22(3)(b) which the parties prefer different wording for but no longer pursue discussions on.	Deadline 3 [REP3-006], and Deadline 4 [REP4-004]. A summary of those changes has been provided for Deadline 2 and 3 in the Schedule of Changes to the draft DCO [REP2-056], [REP3-027] and [REP4-035] which includes explanation of the basis for each amendment. Since Deadline 4, the Applicant and CDC finalised the agreement as to costs to be incurred by CDC in the discharge of requirements and other consents or approvals required under the articles of the Order. The parties have also finalised a framework highways agreement between them, to manage the implementation of Part 3 of the draft DCO post consent. They have subsequently agreed an amendment to Article 16 (Agreements with street authorities) of the draft DCO to ensure that framework agreement is finalised, prior to the commencement of any works under Part 3 of the Order. With these changes included, the Applicant understands the only outstanding matter between the parties on the draft DCO is Article 22(3)(b), as the Council would prefer this not to be included, while the Applicant considers it is appropriate for it to be included in alignment with other CPO legislation and regulation. The parties have agreed this is simply a minor principled difference and are not discussing this disagreement further, nor that it reflects a fundamental disagreement on the DCO.		

4. References

- Ref. 1 Planning Act 2008. Available at:
<https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2008/29/contents>. [Accessed 6 February 2025].
- Ref. 2 Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009. Available at:
<https://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2009/2264/contents/made>. [Accessed 6 February 2025].

5. Abbreviations

Table 5-1: Abbreviations

Abbreviation/Term	Definition
AMS	Archaeological Mitigation Strategy
CDC	City of Doncaster Council
CEMP	Construction Environmental Management Plan
DCO	Development Consent Order
DEMP	Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan
FRA	Flood Risk Assessment
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
ES	Environmental Statement
ExA	Examining Authority
LEMP	Landscape and Ecological Management Plan
MW	Megawatts
OEMP	Operational Environmental Management Plan
PA 2008	Planning Act 2008
PRoW	Public Rights of Way
PV	Photovoltaic
RR	Relevant Representation
SoCG	Statement of Common Ground
SYAS	South Yorkshire Archaeological Service