



Planning Inspectorate
c/o QUADIENT
69 Buckingham Avenue
Slough
SL1 4PN

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

The applicant, National Grid Electricity Distribution (East Midlands) Plc, National Grid Electricity Transmission Plc, Natural England

Your Ref:

Our Ref: EN010158

Date: 9 January 2026

By email only

Dear Sir/ Madam

The Planning Act 2008

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

The Planning Act 2008 (as amended) section 89(3)

The Examining Authority (ExA) notified that it had made procedural decisions on 15 December 2025 [[PD-005](#)]. Further to receipt and review of the submitted relevant representations (RR), the ExA has decided to make further procedural decisions to request clarification and additional information. The aim is to ensure that the examination of the application can be conducted and completed within the statutory timeframe, and to ensure that there would not be delays during the process.

Relevant representations

A number of RRs highlight matters that they consider require further assessment or justification. The ExA has reviewed the representations and considers it likely that additional submissions or surveys may be required in some cases, which may take time to prepare. Due to the potential seasonal restrictions or timescales in which it takes to undertake certain surveys, **the ExA requests that where these parties have requested additional survey information the applicant provide a programme of when they will be undertaken or explain why they are not necessary**. The ExA therefore requests early submission of responses to the following RRs and **how the applicant intends to proceed regarding any issues which have been identified by the interested party, including timeframes for provision of additional information where required**:

National Grid Electricity Transmission Plc (NGET) [[RR-201](#)]

NGET states in its RR that it “strongly opposes proposals for development within plots 7/9 and 7/12 and urges the Applicant to look for alternative sites” and that the proposed development in these plots would be “wholly inappropriate and will inhibit the

reconfiguration of the OHLs [overhead lines] which are required and necessary for the delivery of the East Claydon Project."

Responses required from the applicant: the ExA seeks reassurance how you intend to resolve this matter prior to the commencement of the statutory time period for examination of the application. In light of this RR, is there any potential for amendments to the above application resulting in a change to the proposed order limits, or any other material changes to the application? If so, set out how you propose to make these changes, including timeframes for submission and the likely information which would be submitted.

Responses required from National Grid Electricity Distribution (East Midlands) Plc and National Grid Electricity Transmission Plc: in the Consultation Report Appendices J-1 to J-2 [[APP-029](#)] and K-1 to K-4 [[APP-030](#)] regarding the impact of the proposed development on the delivery of the replacement East Claydon Substation, the applicant states that relevant National Grid standards were adopted in the design of the proposed development for clearances and easements within the order limits and that protective provisions would be negotiated with NGET to ensure appropriate protection of NGET assets. With the use of appropriate clearances and easements, along with protective provisions as required, could the proposed development be designed to ensure that it did not prejudice the delivery of the replacement East Claydon Substation? If not, explain how the proposed development would prevent the delivery of the replacement East Claydon Substation.

Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust [[RR-020](#)]

The Wildlife Trust has submitted a detailed RR covering several issues and raises various concerns including on matters where early action on further assessment or justification may be necessary. The ExA highlights that the Wildlife Trust states that there are omissions of certain species surveys or states that some are unreliable, suggests that there is a lack of justification of conclusions in parts of the Environmental Statement (ES) Chapter 7: Biodiversity [[APP-050](#)] and raise concerns regarding ES Appendix 7.17: Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment [[APP-103](#)].

Response required from the applicant: Review the RR and confirm how you intend to address the Wildlife Trust's comments, with timeframes for submission of additional information, or if you do not intend to provide information requested by the Wildlife Trust, explain why not.

Natural England (NE) [[RR-203](#)]

NE have raised some concerns regarding the ES and supporting ecological survey work. The ExA highlights that NE makes comments on the submitted bat surveys and field parcel analysis, and NE recommends removal of proposed infrastructure from fields B6, B7 and B8. Regarding the acceptability of the bat surveys in field parcels B7 and B10, the ExA notes that NE advises that it is working with the applicant to address the issues identified.

Response required from the applicant: Confirm what amendments to the application or supporting surveys you intend to make, over what time period and how you anticipate this could change the conclusions of the assessments.

Response required from NE: confirm what changes you consider should be made to the bat surveys for field parcels B7 and B10, and how you anticipate this could change the conclusions of the assessment.

Environment Agency (EA) [RR-081]

The EA raises various concerns including on matters where early action on further assessment appears to be necessary. The ExA highlights that the EA states that there is inadequate assessment of potential impacts on aquatic ecological receptors and impact on the conclusions drawn in ES Appendix 7.17: Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment [APP-103], identifies issues with ES Appendix 16.1: Flood Risk Assessment [APP-132] and raises concerns regarding the adequacy of the assessments on groundwater and contaminated land which may require early action.

Response required from the applicant: Liaise with the EA to provide information as requested and agree a timeframe in which to provide any further necessary information, and provide an update to the ExA. If you do not intend to provide the information requested by the EA, explain why.

Buckinghamshire Council [RR-026]

The Council raise a number of concerns, including on matters where early action on further assessment appears to be necessary. The ExA highlight that the Council raises concern regarding the adequacy of the assessments and supporting surveys across the ES, the ES methodology across various chapters, states that there is a lack of clear health effects assessment, missing information from the ES in various chapters and questions the adequacy of the cumulative effects assessment, which may require early action.

Response required from the applicant: Review the RR and confirm how you intend to address the Council's comments, with timeframes for submission of additional information, or, if you do not intend to provide information requested by the Council, explain why not.

Statkraft UK Limited [RR-252]

Response required from the applicant: Stratkraft UK Limited states that their interest in land within the order limits has not been referred to in the Book of Reference [APP-018] – review and update the relevant documents accordingly.

UK Health Security Agency [RR-276]

Response required from the applicant: confirm whether a detailed plume assessment will be provided in accordance with the information contained in [RR-276]. If not, explain why.

Anglian Water Services (AWS) [RR-012]

Response required from the applicant: review the Book of Reference [APP-018] to ensure that all of AWS's land interests in the order limits are recorded. Agree a timeframe in which to provide a clash detection and technical assurance review in relation to AWS's assets with AWS and provide an update to the ExA, or set out why this is not required.

Request for additional information from the applicant

Carry out a full review of the Book of Reference [APP-018] to ensure that all land interests are accurately recorded.

In The Planning Inspectorate's (PINS) scoping opinion [APP-080], PINS advised that effects on human health could be considered in the relevant ES chapters including Air Quality, Landscape and Visual, Noise and Vibration, Traffic and Access and Population; and in the standalone glint and glare assessment. However, whilst the individual ES chapters consider the effects on human health, they do not reach conclusions on the likely significance of effects. Conversely, whilst the Health and Wellbeing Summary Statement [APP-083] draws conclusions on the significance of effects on human health, it does not set out clearly how these conclusions were derived. The ExA requests that the assessment of, and conclusions on likely effects on human health should be contained in one document, either in the individual ES chapters, or in a separate report. The applicant is requested to update the documents accordingly and provide a timeframe for submission to the ExA.

Any presented effects in the ES should make clear whether they are significant or not significant. Where mitigation is proposed, the ES should clearly state to what extent would the mitigation reduce the significance of effect. For example, ES Chapter 7: Biodiversity [APP-050] paragraph 7.10.133 states that the proposed development could have a *potentially significant adverse effect* on the Bechstein's bats population and it is also unclear whether mitigation measures reduce the significance of effect. The applicant is requested to review the ES to ensure that all effects are presented clearly and that where mitigation measures are proposed, it is clearly stated whether that mitigation would reduce the significance of effects and to what degree. Provide an update to the ExA for the submission of any amended information.

The required information will assist the ExA to finalise the date of the preliminary meeting and is requested to be submitted by no later than **23 January 2026**. If you have any queries regarding these matters, please contact the case team.

Yours sincerely,

Helena Obremski

Lead Panel Member for the Examining Authority

This communication does not constitute legal advice.

Please view our '[Privacy Notice](#)' before sending information to The Planning Inspectorate.