

# Rosefield Solar Farm

## Examination Progress Tracker

EN010158/APP/8.4  
Deadline 1  
March 2026  
Rosefield Energyfarm Limited

APFP Regulation 5(2)(q)  
Planning Act 2008  
Infrastructure Planning  
(Applications: Prescribed Forms  
and Procedure) Regulations 2009



# Table of Contents

- 1. Introduction and Purpose of this Document..... 2**
  - 1.1. Introduction .....2**
  - 1.2. Purpose of this Document.....2**
- 2. Examination Progress Tracker..... 3**

# 1. Introduction and Purpose of this Document

## 1.1. Introduction

1.1.1. This Examination Progress Tracker (the ‘document’) has been prepared on behalf of Rosefield Energyfarm Limited (the ‘Applicant’) to support the Development Consent Order (DCO) Application for the construction, operation (including maintenance), and decommissioning of Rosefield Solar Farm (hereafter referred to as the ‘Proposed Development’).

1.1.2. This DCO Application has been accepted for examination.




## 1.2. Purpose of this Document

1.2.1. This document has been prepared by the Applicant in response to the Examining Authority’s (‘ExA’s’) letter dated 27 January 2026 (‘The Infrastructure Planning (Examination) Rules 2010 – Rules 6, 9 and 13’) (the ‘Rule 6 letter’) **[PD-008]**, requesting the submission of an Examination Progress Tracker which *“should be in the form of a table, reporting on what it considers are the principal and other notable issues in the examination. It should be set out by issue and/ or sub-issue, the interested parties which have raised them, the summary of the concerns raised, the progress being made to address them (if any), the up-to-date position and any progress to resolution.”*

1.2.2. **Table 2.1** in **Section 2** summarises the principal issues the Interested Parties’ have raised and sets out the Applicant’s position on these matters.

1.2.3. The Applicant anticipates that further revisions of this document will be provided throughout the Examination Stage as discussions on the matters raised within this document progress.

1.2.4. The status of the issues within the document is based on a Red, Amber, Green (‘RAG’) rating as follows:

	<b>Currently subject to disagreement</b>
	<b>Subject to further/ on-going discussion</b>
	<b>Agreed</b>

## 2. Examination Progress Tracker

Table 2.1 Examination Progress Tracker

Ref.	Topic	Interested Party	Summary of Issue	Summary of Progress Made (if Any)	RAG Rating
1	Impacts to bats - habitat connectivity	Natural England, Buckinghamshire Council and BBOWT	Concerns over bat activity due to fragmentation and isolation of ecological connectivity across the Site which would be disrupted by solar development. The interested parties would like to see more buffers and the removal of sections of solar development from certain fields.	<p>The Applicant has designed the layout of the Proposed Development to ensure locations of mitigation areas have been chosen to ensure the connections between the existing SSSIs and ancient woodland adjacent to the Site would be enhanced, by creating species-rich grassland and arable margins along with scrub and tree planting. This will create a coherent ecological network that will link the Site to the wider landscape, reducing fragmentation across the wider landscape and supporting the movement of local wildlife, particularly bats. Where key areas of bat activity (in particular <i>Myotis</i> activity) have been identified, specific measures have been embedded into the design of the Proposed Development and, therefore, the Applicant does not intend to make any further changes to the design.</p> <p>During the design development, Solar PV modules have been removed from a number of fields, including from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fields B17 and part of B9, located adjacent to the northern edge of Sheephouse Wood and connecting to hedgerows identified as a bat mitigation corridor between Sheephouse Wood, Shrub's Wood and Decoypond Wood.</li> <li>• Fields C1, C2 and C3, located between Sheephouse Wood and Greatsea Wood adjacent to the key</li> </ul>	

Ref.	Topic	Interested Party	Summary of Issue	Summary of Progress Made (if Any)	RAG Rating
				<p>Bechstein’s Bat commuting route identified by Natural England along the southern end of Three Points Lane.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Field D27, adjacent to the eastern edge of Runts Wood.</li> <li>• Fields D30 to D37 adjacent to the southern edge of Finemere Wood SSSI (known to support breeding colonies of Bechstein’s Bats and other bat species).</li> </ul> <p>Instead, these areas would be used to provide mitigation for bats including increased foraging resources, woodland edge habitat and connectivity. The creation of large areas of species-rich grassland within these fields will provide a nectar source for invertebrates, which in turn provides a foraging resource for bats. A mosaic of scrub and grassland will improve foraging habitat for bats and provide habitat to support invertebrates. Restoration of defunct ponds and creation of additional ponds will help to enhance the pond network in the area, provide additional bat foraging habitat (see <b>Appendix 2: Landscape and Ecological Mitigation and Enhancements</b> of the <b>Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan [EN010158/APP/7.6.2]</b>).</p>	<p style="background-color: yellow; text-align: center;">RAG Rating</p>
2	Impacts to bats - disturbance	Natural England	Concerns over potential noise disturbance from construction activity to roosting bats.	The Applicant has undertaken an assessment of the potential for the construction works to disturb roosting bats and for high frequency noise from electrical infrastructure and batteries to disturb commuting and roosting bats species, with the conclusion that any disturbance effects are not likely to be significant. This assessment has been submitted at Deadline 1.	

Ref.	Topic	Interested Party	Summary of Issue	Summary of Progress Made (if Any)	RAG Rating
3	Proposed Bernwood SSSI	Natural England	Natural England intend to designate a new SSSI, the Bernwood SSSI, and requests the Applicant assess the Site as if the proposed designation were already in place.	<p>The Applicant has not assessed the proposed Bernwood SSSI specifically in the assessment presented in <b>ES Volume 2, Chapter 7: Biodiversity [EN010158/APP/6.2.2]</b> as a receptor in its own right because of the limited publicly available information on the proposed Bernwood SSSI designation. The Environmental Statement has however fully considered impacts to the existing SSSIs as well as the proposed Bernwood SSSI's individual citation features.</p> <p>Following engagement since submission of the DCO Application, Natural England has confirmed that the Applicant has assessed the proposed Bernwood SSSI as best it can, given the status of the proposed designation, which the Applicant welcomes. Natural England agree with the conclusion that there are no residual impacts (after mitigation) on SSSIs and this has been agreed in the SoCG submitted at Deadline 1.</p>	
4	Impacts to ancient woodland and SSSI sites	BBOWT, Buckinghamshire Council and National Trust	Offsets/mitigation to ancient woodland and SSSI are considered unsuitable, and the interested parties also consider that the Proposed Development would reduce ecological connectivity across the wider landscape. It is not accepted that the residual	A minimum 30m buffer zone is proposed around ancient woodland to prevent root damage and support habitat creation and connectivity, exceeding the standard 15m guidance from Natural England and the Forestry Commission. These buffers will enhance ecological connectivity between the site, nearby SSSIs, and ancient woodland, benefiting local wildlife such as bats. In addition, Natural England have confirmed they agree with the conclusion that there are no residual impacts (after mitigation) on SSSIs.	

Ref.	Topic	Interested Party	Summary of Issue	Summary of Progress Made (if Any)	RAG Rating
			effects on these woodlands will not be significant.	The Applicant does not consider that further offsets or mitigation is required. Full explanatory commentary is set out in <b>Consultation Report Appendices J-1 to J-2 [EN010158/APP/5.2] [APP-029]</b> and the <b>Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations [EN010158/APP/8.3] [PDA-006]</b> and <b>ES Volume 2, Chapter 7: Biodiversity [EN010158/APP/6.2.2]</b> .	
5	Survey scope	Buckinghamshire Council and BBOWT	<p>Disagreement as to the appropriateness of the survey effort for some of the receptors, for the following surveys:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Bats (Buckinghamshire Council);</li> <li>- Breeding birds (Buckinghamshire Council);</li> <li>- Wintering birds (Buckinghamshire Council);</li> <li>- Invertebrates (Both);</li> <li>- Reptiles (Both); and</li> <li>- DNA testing for Black Poplar Trees</li> </ul>	The Applicant does not consider that further surveys and/or data is required. Full explanatory commentary is set out in <b>Consultation Report Appendices J-1 to J-2 [EN010158/APP/5.2] [APP-029]</b> and the <b>Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations [EN010158/APP/8.3] [PDA-006]</b> . Consideration of these species and habitats is set out in <b>ES Volume 2, Chapter 7: Biodiversity [EN010158/APP/6.2.2]</b> .	

Ref.	Topic	Interested Party	Summary of Issue	Summary of Progress Made (if Any)	RAG Rating
			(Buckinghamshire Council).		
6	Embedded mitigation and Proposed Development design	Buckinghamshire Council and BBOWT	Stakeholders consider that the design of the Proposed Development should be more site and species-specific as the current embedded mitigation is considered too generic. They consider that it is unclear how measures have been decided based on the survey results.	The Applicant disagrees that buffers are generic. Bespoke offsets have been incorporated into the design of the Proposed Development which have been informed by both the results of surveys and through consultation with stakeholders. Full explanatory commentary is set out in <b>Consultation Report Appendices J-1 to J-2 [EN010158/APP/5.2] [APP-029]</b> and the <b>Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations [EN010158/APP/8.3] [PDA-006]</b> . Consideration of these species and habitats is set out in <b>ES Volume 2, Chapter 7: Biodiversity [EN010158/APP/6.2.2]</b> .	
7	Archaeological Trial Trenching	Buckinghamshire Council	Request for trial trenching to be undertaken pre-determination for 4% of the areas of deeper impacts (Rosefield Substation etc.) and where geophysical surveys recorded anomalies. This should be alongside a 2% coverage of any 'blank' areas of Solar PV development.	The Draft Archaeological Management Strategy has been updated in response to comments from Buckinghamshire Council and is submitted at Deadline 1. It is agreed that fixed percentages of trenching are not in accordance with the emerging best practice guidance and that written schemes of investigation for post-DCO consent evaluation will be developed in accordance with the <b>Draft Archaeological Management Strategy [EN010158/APP/7.10.2]</b> .	

Ref.	Topic	Interested Party	Summary of Issue	Summary of Progress Made (if Any)	RAG Rating
8	Impacts on heritage assets	National Trust and Historic England	There are concerns over the visual impact on the setting and significance of Claydon House, Claydon Park Grade II Registered Park and Garden and Conservation Area, Claydon House Grade I listed building and Public Rights of Way users, Scheduled Monuments and Middle Clayton and Botolph Claydon Conservation Area.	The Applicant has gained access to the upper floors of Claydon House and undertaken photography in order to provide the requested views and will continue to liaise with Historic England and The National Trust on this matter once the photomontages are available. The two locations for additional photomontages have been agreed with National Trust and Historic England. The photomontages will be submitted at Deadline 2.	
9	Floodplain Compensation	Environment Agency	There are concerns around the impact of the proposed solar arrays impacting floodplain storage areas of fluvial floodplain to the west of the Claydon Brook tributary.	<p>For areas within the fluvial floodplain, only Solar PV modules will be placed there. These panels have been designed to be elevated 1800mm above ground level and there will be negligible loss of floodplain and no interruption of flood flow paths as a result of the frame supporting the solar PV modules. There are no ground raising requirements in the areas of Solar PV modules.</p> <p>As the PV panels will be supported on C-section galvanised steel posts driven into the ground which are estimated to be less than 0.5% of the panel area, this is negligible in terms of loss of floodplain storage and would not give rise to off-site impacts or increased flood risk, despite this, floodplain compensation will be provided to ensure no net loss in</p>	

Ref.	Topic	Interested Party	Summary of Issue	Summary of Progress Made (if Any)	RAG Rating
10	Interaction with the proposed National Grid Substation	National Grid Electricity Transmission (NGET)	<p>There are concerns over the retention of access and access protection rights of NGET's existing and planned future infrastructure. NGET's main concern is the land which the Applicant has identified (plots 6/13, 7/1, 7/2, 7/3, 7/4, 7/5, 7/6, 7/7, 7/8, 7/9, 7/11 and 7/12), as they commented it would impact the delivery of the East Claydon Project, including the rebuilding of substations and reconfiguration of overhead lines. NGET believes this would affect their statutory duty to</p>	<p>floodplain storage, as discussed and agreed with the Environment Agency. This compensation will be designed to ensure it is provided in an area where there is a loss of floodplain storage. Given the minor nature of the losses this is likely to be provided through localised groundworks with details provided at detailed design stage. This is secured through the <b>Outline CEMP [EN010158/APP/7.2.2]</b> which has been amended at Deadline 1.</p> <p>The Applicant has confirmed through ongoing engagement with NGET, that the Proposed Development would not detrimentally impact NGET's ability to deliver the East Claydon Project and the reconfiguration of existing overhead lines. The Applicant considers that there is no need to seek alternative sites since the Proposed Development is sufficiently flexible to be designed around NGET's works and the interface can be managed by protective provisions.</p> <p>As set out in the <b>Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations [EN010158/APP/8.3] [PDA-006]</b> and confirmed by <b>NGET's additional submission at Procedural Deadline A [AS-037]</b>, the Applicant is actively engaging with NGET to manage the land and technical interfaces between the projects and the parties agree that protective provisions are the appropriate mechanism to manage the interface between the projects. Negotiations to agree bespoke protective provisions are progressing positively.</p>	<p style="background-color: yellow; text-align: center;">9</p>

Ref.	Topic	Interested Party	Summary of Issue	Summary of Progress Made (if Any)	RAG Rating
			deliver, operate, and maintain current and future infrastructure.		
11	Population and human health	Buckinghamshire Council	Buckinghamshire Council consider that the likely significant effects on population and human health are not presented in a clear and integrated assessment within the DCO Application. Buckinghamshire Council have requested a standalone population and human health chapter in the Environmental Statement.	The Applicant considers that the approach taken to consider effects on human health is in line with the EIA Regulations. <b>ES Volume 4, Appendix 5.5: Health and Wellbeing Summary Statement [EN010158/APP/6.4.2]</b> provides clarity by demonstrating accordance with IEMA Guidance and conclusions on the effects to human health were reached. However, in order to provide further clarity, the Applicant has prepared an additional appendix, a <b>Health and Wellbeing Effects Report</b> , which is appended to <b>ES Volume 4, Appendix 5.5: Health and Wellbeing Summary Statement [EN010158/APP/6.4.2]</b> and draws together the health information already submitted with the DCO Application into one document. This has been submitted at Deadline 1.	
12	Impacts on businesses	TCS Biosciences Ltd and Preston Farms Ltd	TCS Biosciences Ltd and Preston Farms Ltd have concerns on the impact of the Proposed Development to their business	The Applicant appreciates the importance of the co-existence of the Affected Persons' business and the Proposed Development, which is why various mitigation measures had already been proposed in the DCO Application. This includes, <b>Design Commitment G2</b> (see <b>Design Commitments [EN010158/APP/5.9.3]</b> ) which commits to providing corridors for livestock to pass through the Site. The Applicant has amended the <b>Outline CEMP [EN010158/APP/7.2.2]</b> at Deadline 1 to include construction management measures specifically in response to the	

Ref.	Topic	Interested Party	Summary of Issue	Summary of Progress Made (if Any)	RAG Rating
				concerns raised about the impacts on the affected persons, related to biosecurity measures and noise.	



**Rosefield**  
Solar Farm

[rosefieldsolarfarm.co.uk](http://rosefieldsolarfarm.co.uk)