



Planning Inspectorate

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

Customer
Services: 0303 444 5000
e-mail: Rosefieldsolar@planninginspectorate.gov.uk

Ms A Higgin
Quod
Rosefield Energyfarm Limited

Your Ref:

Case ref: EN010158

Date: 23 October 2025

By email only

Dear Alex

Planning Act 2008 – section 51

Application by Rosefield Energyfarm Limited for an order granting development consent for the Rosefield Solar Farm

Advice following issue of decision to accept the application for examination

On 23 October 2025 the Secretary of State decided that the application for the above project satisfied the acceptance tests under section 55 of the Planning Act 2008 (PA2008). The Planning Inspectorate's acceptance checklist and the application documents have been published and made available on the project page of our website.

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

Consultees identified on a precautionary basis

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

Minor errors and omissions

There are minor errors and omissions, as reflected in Box 30 of the acceptance checklist, which the applicant is advised to review.

It is noted that the **Flood Risk Assessment** (FRA) relies on the 2050s epoch for fluvial modelling from 2040 up to the year 2069. ES Chapter 3 paragraph 3.15.2 states that the grid connection date is 2031. This equates to the last day of service (40 years lifetime) being in 2071 which is two years beyond the final year in the epoch used in the flood modelling. The 2080s epoch for fluvial modelling accounts for flood levels up to 2115 and would apply a 30% higher projection rather than 11% uplift; it is not explained why this epoch has not been applied. This has potential to influence the adequacy of the proposed mitigation set out in the FRA and the Outline Drainage Strategy.

The applicant is advised to either update the assessment to account for potential flood risk for the whole lifetime of the proposed development or else justify the approach taken. It should be explained why the mitigation proposed remains adequate in line with any alterations/justifications. This should be addressed prior to the commencement of the preliminary meeting.

The **Explanatory Memorandum** (Doc. 3.2) includes visible tracked changes. Please provide a clean version.

Please clarify the labelling of field numbers in **Volume 3 Chapter 2: Location of the Proposed Development Figures Figure 2.4 (Doc. 6.3)** where some of the details are not legible.

It is difficult to differentiate between ALC grades as presented in **Volume Chapter 12: Soil Figure 12.1** (Doc. 6.3) due to the shading used. Similarly, the shading applied in Volume 3 Chapter 3: Proposed Development Description Figures 3.1A – 3.1D makes it difficult to distinguish between proposed development heights of up to 6m from those of up to 15m. Please update the plans accordingly.

Draft Development Consent Order (Doc 3.1) contains a typographical error in schedule 4 where it states 'Three Points Land' instead of 'Three Points Lane'. Also, plot 3/10 is missing under acquisition of new rights

In **Statement of Reasons** (Doc 4.1) plot 6/9 is missing.

Plans

The plans only have an arrow to indicate North. It would be useful if this arrow also included the letter 'N' to clarify the purpose of the arrow.

There are a number of plans which have red line bleeding such as in the **Illustrative layout plans and sections** (Doc 2.6) and **Works Plans** (Doc 2.3).

A number of plans incorrectly state on the contents page that all sheets are key plans such as on **Illustrative layout plans and sections** (Doc 2.6) and **Location, Order Limits and Grid Coordinates** (Doc 2.1)

The applicant will need to ensure that identifying road names and landmarks are shown on the plans such as on **Land Plans** (Doc 2.2) and **Works Plans** (Doc 2.3). On **Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans** (Doc 2.4) 'Fidlers Field (also known as Snake Lane), Quanton is not stated between A1 and A12 as mentioned in the draft Development Consent Order.

Sheet 8 of both the **Traffic Regulations Plans** (Doc 2.5) and **Land Plans** (Doc 2.2) show an inset plan which is not visible on the plan. It would be useful to have an extra sheet showing this area of land.

The **Illustrative layout plans and sections** (Doc 2.6) shows grey shading in the northernmost part of order limits but this is not included in the key. It seems to relate to the existing National Grid substation but also includes a large area of land not shown as developed on the plans. Also, existing vegetation outside of the order limits seems to be shown in a different shade of green but is not listed in the key. All colours on the plans will need to be shown in the key.

The **Illustrative layout plans and sections** (Doc 2.6) sheet 8 appears to be missing a Solar PV area on illustrative sections B-BB and C-CC.

The **Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans** (Doc 2.4) is missing works ECL/7/3 between points SW15/SW16 which is mentioned in the draft Development Consent Order. Also on sheet 4, the plan shows ECL/8/1 but the draft Development Consent Order states ECL/8/11.

On the **Works Plans** (Doc 2.3) sheets 6 and 7 there are some areas where many works overlap making it difficult to decipher where the limits are for each work.

On the **Land Plans** (Doc 2.2) the wording in the key is not consistent with the wording in the Book of Reference. Also, the plans should be clearly labelled to identify land within the Order limits that is not Order land as referenced at paragraph 4.1.1 of the Statement of Reasons (Doc. 4.1)

Please pay close attention to the advice set out in this letter and act on it accordingly. It is requested that you action these points before the commencement of the relevant representation period or, if specified, before the commencement of the preliminary meeting. This will contribute towards a more efficient examination and give any future Examining Authority comfort that the documentation is complete and accurate.

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

Yours sincerely

Rebecca Luxton

Rebecca Luxton
Case Manager

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