



## Application by Rosefield Energyfarm Limited for the Rosefield Solar Farm

The Examining Authority's first written questions and requests for information (ExQ1): issued on 2 April 2026

Responses are due by deadline 2: 22 April 2026

The following table sets out the Examining Authority's (ExA) first written questions and requests for information - ExQ1. If necessary, the examination timetable enables the ExA to issue a further round of written questions in due course. If this is done, the further round of questions will be referred to as ExQ2.

Questions are set out using an issues-based framework derived from the initial assessment of principal issues provided as **annex C** to the Rule 6 Letter dated 27 January 2026. Questions have been added to the framework of issues set out there as they have arisen from representations and to address the assessment of the application against relevant policies.

Column 2 of the table indicates which interested parties (IP) and other persons each question is directed to. The ExA would be grateful if all persons named could answer all questions directed to them, providing a substantive response, or indicating that the question is not relevant to them for a reason. This does not prevent an answer being provided to a question by a person to whom it is not directed, should the question be relevant to their interests.

Each question has a unique reference number which starts with 1 (indicating that it is from ExQ1) and then has an issue number and a question number. For example, the first question on general and cross-topic issues is identified as Q1.1.1. When you are answering a question, please start your answer by quoting the unique reference number.

Any references to the National Policy Statements below refer to those published in 2023 (last updated in 2024), unless otherwise stated.

You should respond to the questions by using the [Have your say](#) function on the [project page of the National Infrastructure website](#) and selecting 'Responses to Examining Authority's First Written Questions (ExQ1)' when asked.

To aid the beneficial use of artificial intelligence (AI) in casework evidence, all participants in the examination are directed to [guidance](#) for submitting information that has been generated or altered by AI. **If you do not declare the use of AI in any evidence submission where it has been used or remove evidence such as watermarks the ExA reserves the right to reject the submission.**

If you are responding to a small number of questions, you can submit your answers by choosing 'Make a comment' and entering your answers in the 'Your comments' box. If you are answering a larger number of questions you should download a copy of the Microsoft Word version of



the document, enter your answers and save the document using an appropriate file name. You can then submit the completed document by selecting 'Upload files'.

Microsoft Word version: Examining Authority's Written Questions 1 (ExQ1) - Word version

## Abbreviations used:

|              |  |             |  |
|--------------|--|-------------|--|
| <b>AAL</b>   | Area of Attractive Landscape                   | <b>HGV</b>  | heavy goods vehicle                            |
| <b>AC</b>    | alternating current                            | <b>HS2</b>  | High Speed Rail 2                              |
| <b>AIL</b>   | abnormal indivisible load                      | <b>IP</b>   | interested party                               |
| <b>ALC</b>   | agricultural land classification               | <b>km</b>   | kilometre                                      |
| <b>BESS</b>  | battery energy storage system                  | <b>LEMP</b> | Landscape and Ecological Management Plan       |
| <b>BBOWT</b> | Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust | <b>LGV</b>  | light goods vehicle                            |
| <b>BMV</b>   | best and most versatile                        | <b>LIR</b>  | Local Impact Report                            |
| <b>BNG</b>   | biodiversity net gain                          | <b>LLFA</b> | Local Lead Flood Authority                     |
| <b>BoSS</b>  | balance of solar system                        | <b>LVIA</b> | Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment         |
| <b>CA</b>    | compulsory acquisition                         | <b>m</b>    | metres   |
| <b>CAH</b>   | compulsory acquisition hearing                 | <b>MW</b>   | megawatts                                      |
| <b>CEMP</b>  | Construction Environmental Management Plan     | <b>MWh</b>  | megawatt hours                                 |
| <b>CCTV</b>  | closed-circuit television                      | <b>NGET</b> | National Grid Electricity Transmission Limited |
| <b>CNP</b>   | critical national priority                     | <b>NPA</b>  | Neighbourhood Planning Act                     |
| <b>CSAG</b>  | Claydons Solar Action Group                    | <b>NPPF</b> | National Planning Policy Framework             |
| <b>CTMP</b>  | Construction Traffic Management Plan           | <b>NPS</b>  | National Policy Statement                      |
| <b>DAD</b>   | Design Approach Document                       | <b>OAMP</b> | Onsite Access Management Plan                  |



# Planning Inspectorate

|              |  |               |   |
|--------------|--|---------------|---|
| <b>dAMS</b>  | draft Archaeological Management Strategy         | <b>oBSMP</b>  | Outline Battery Safety Management Plan                |
| <b>dB</b>    | decibel  | <b>oCEMP</b>  | Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan    |
| <b>DCO</b>   | Development Consent Order                        | <b>oDEMP</b>  | Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan |
| <b>dDCO</b>  | draft Development Consent Order                  | <b>oLEMP</b>  | Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan      |
| <b>Defra</b> | Department for Environment, Food & Rural Affairs | <b>oOEMP</b>  | Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan     |
| <b>DESNZ</b> | Department for Energy Security and Net Zero      | <b>oRoWAS</b> | Outline Rights of Way Access Strategy                 |
| <b>EA</b>    | Environment Agency                               | <b>oSMP</b>   | Outline Soil Management Plan                          |
| <b>EIA</b>   | Environmental Impact Assessment                  | <b>PRoW</b>   | public right of way                                   |
| <b>EM</b>    | Explanatory Memorandum                           | <b>PV</b>     | photovoltaic  |
| <b>ES</b>    | Environmental Statement                          | <b>RVAA</b>   | Residential Visual Amenity Assessment                 |
| <b>ExA</b>   | Examining Authority                              | <b>SoCG</b>   | Statement of Common Ground                            |
| <b>ExQ1</b>  | Examining Authority's first written questions    | <b>SoS</b>    | Secretary of State                                    |
| <b>FRA</b>   | flood risk assessment                            | <b>TA</b>     | Transport Assessment                                  |
| <b>GHG</b>   | greenhouse gas                                   | <b>TP</b>     | temporary possession                                  |
| <b>ha</b>    | hectares   | <b>TPO</b>    | tree protection order                                 |

## The Examination Library

References in these questions set out in square brackets (for example [[APP-010](#)]) are to documents catalogued in the Examination Library. The Examination Library can be obtained from the following link: [EN010158-000329-Rosefield Solar Farm - Examination Library.pdf](#)

It will be updated as the examination progresses.

## Citation of questions

Questions in this table should be cited as follows:

Question reference: issue reference: question number, for example ExQ1 1.1.1 – refers to question 1 in this table.



|  |           |   |           |
|--|-----------|---|-----------|
| <b>1. General and cross-topic questions .....</b>  | <b>6</b>  | <b>14. Land and groundwater.....</b>                          | <b>28</b> |
| <b>2. Design, parameters and other details of the proposed development.....</b>                      | <b>6</b>  | <b>15. Landscape and visual (including good design) .....</b> | <b>29</b> |
| <b>3. The Environmental Statement (general) .....</b>  | <b>6</b>  | <b>16. Noise and vibration .....</b>                          | <b>32</b> |
| <b>4. Need, site selection and alternatives.....</b>   | <b>7</b>  | <b>17. Population .....</b>                                   | <b>33</b> |
| <b>5. Air quality .....</b>  | <b>8</b>  | <b>18. Soils .....</b>  | <b>35</b> |
| <b>6. Associated development.....</b>  | <b>8</b>  | <b>19. Transport and access .....</b>                         | <b>37</b> |
| 6.1 Battery energy storage systems (BESS).....   | 9         | <b>20. Water environment.....</b>                             | <b>40</b> |
| <b>7. Biodiversity and ecology.....</b>  | <b>9</b>  |   |           |
| 7.1 Arboricultural impacts .....   | 13        |   |           |
| 7.2 Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG).....   | 13        |   |           |
| <b>8. Climate resilience .....</b>   | <b>13</b> |   |           |
| <b>9. Compulsory acquisition, temporary possession and other land or rights considerations .....</b> | <b>14</b> |   |           |
| <b>10. Cultural heritage .....</b>   | <b>16</b> |   |           |
| <b>11. Cumulative effects .....</b>  | <b>18</b> |   |           |
| <b>12. The draft Development Consent Order (dDCO).....</b>   | <b>22</b> |   |           |
| 12.2 Articles .....  | 23        |   |           |
| 12.3 Schedule 1 – Authorised development.....  | 26        |   |           |
| 12.4 Schedule 2 - Requirements .....   | 26        |   |           |
| 12.5 Schedule 3 – Legislation to be disapplied .....   | 27        |   |           |
| 12.6 Schedule 13 – Documents and plans to be certified .....   | 27        |   |           |
| 12.7 Schedule 14 – Arbitration rules.....  | 27        |   |           |
| 12.8 Schedule 15 – Protective provisions.....  | 27        |   |           |
| 12.9 Schedule 16 - Procedure for discharge of requirements .....                                     | 27        |   |           |
| <b>13. Health and wellbeing .....</b>  | <b>28</b> |   |           |

| ExQ1   | Question to:                                  | Question:   |
|--|---|---|
| <b>1. General and cross-topic questions</b>                                |   |   |
| Q1.1.1   | The applicant                                 | <p><b>Installation capacity and lifetime energy production</b></p> <p>ES Chapter 8 (Climate) [APP-051] paragraph 8.8.14 states that the proposed development is anticipated to have an installed capacity of 334.1 megawatts (MW), and generation of 324,864 megawatt hours (MWh) in the first year of operation. Taking into account an annual degradation factor of 0.4%, the total energy generation from the proposed 40-year operational life is predicted to be approximately 12,030,492 MWh.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do these figures account only for the solar energy generation, as well as the installed energy capacity of the battery energy storage system (BESS)? Set out the installation capacities of the solar energy generation and the BESS separately.</li> <li>Have any changes to the grid connection arrangements affected the likely installed energy capacities for the solar energy generation and the BESS, and if so, how does this effect the conclusions of the Environmental Statement (ES) more widely?</li> </ol>   |
| Q1.1.2   | The applicant                                 | <p><b>Plans</b></p> <p>Update Environmental Statement Background and Context Figures, Figure 1.1 Location Plan [APP-061] to identify land parcels 1, 1a, 2 and 3.</p>   |
| Q1.1.3   | The applicant                                 | <p><b>Grid connection</b></p> <p>In your responses to the relevant representations [PDA-006], you refer to updated grid connection offers for the solar and BESS elements of the proposed development. Provide an update on the grid connection arrangements for the proposed development following the National Energy System Operator review, including the status of these offers and the energy capacity of any grid connection offers. Does the outcome of the review have any implications for the updated grid connection agreement due to be updated by Q1 2026 as identified in the Grid Connection Statement [APP-137].</p> <p>The ExA understands that the BESS element of the proposed development has a 'Gate 1' offer, meaning that the indicative dates of the connection window for the BESS have not yet been confirmed. Explain what would happen if the BESS element of the proposed development did not obtain a more formal grid connection offer prior to commencement of the proposed development and how this would affect the delivery of the proposed development, given that the Planning Statement [REP1-019] suggests that the BESS is needed to support the operation of the main solar element of the proposed development. How would this affect the assessments in, and findings of the ES if the BESS element of the proposed development could not be delivered?</p> |
| Q1.1.4   | The applicant                                 | <p><b>Grid connection</b></p> <p>If the proposed development was consented but the proposed replacement National Grid East Claydon substation did not receive permission and/ or the approved substation was not built, what implications would the unavailability of a new substation at East Claydon have for the delivery of the proposed development?</p>   |
| Q1.1.5   | The applicant                                 | <p><b>Interrelationships with other nationally significant infrastructure projects and major development schemes</b></p> <p>Prepare and submit an interrelationship report which considers other nationally significant infrastructure projects and other major development schemes in Buckinghamshire. The report should consider the different project delivery timelines, how they may overlap with the proposed development and what inter-project coordination measures have been or might be put in place. The ExA draws the applicant's attention to the structure of the '<a href="#">Interrelationships with other Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects and Major Development Schemes</a>' report submitted as part of the Springwell Solar Farm DCO application which the ExA requests is followed, including provision of a diagram which shows any overlapping timelines.</p>   |
| Q1.1.6   | The applicant<br>All other interested parties | <p><b>Solar Roadmap 2025</b></p> <p>The applicant and all interested parties are invited to make comments or representations about the <a href="#">Solar Roadmap 2025</a> and its applicability and implications for the proposed development.</p>  |
| <b>2. Design, parameters and other details of the proposed development</b> |   |   |
| Q.1.2.1  | The applicant                                 | <p><b>Horlock Rules</b></p> <p>NPS EN-5 paragraph 2.9.18 states that The Horlock Rules – guidelines for the design and siting of substations – were established by National Grid in 2009 in pursuance of its duties under Schedule 9 to the Electricity Act 1989, and these principles should be embodied in applicants' proposals for the infrastructure associated with new overhead lines. Direct the ExA to where The Horlock Rules have been considered in the design of the proposed development and explained in the application documents. If they have not been, why not?</p>  |
| <b>3. The Environmental Statement (general)</b>                            |   |   |
| Q.1.3.1  | The applicant                                 | <b>Rochdale envelope</b>  |

| ExQ1  | Question to:  | Question:  |
|---|---------------|--|
|   |               | How was the worst-case scenario determined and assessed within the ES where options are proposed in the Rochdale envelope, such as the options for the balance of solar system plant, or options for enclosure of the electrical equipment for the main collector compound (Work No. 5)?   |
| <b>4. Need, site selection and alternatives</b> |               |  |
| Q1.4.1  | The applicant | <p><b>National Policy Statement (NPS) EN-3</b></p> <p>The Policy Compliance Assessment Tables in the Planning Statement <a href="#">[REP1-016]</a> do not address NPS EN-3 paragraph 2.10.17. Provide the following information:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. How many acres (and hectares) of land is required for each megawatt (MW) of output?</li> <li>2. How does the above relate to the range of 2 to 4 acres cited in NPS EN-3 and the range of 4 to 5.6 acres cited in paragraph 2.10.9 of NPS EN-3 2026?</li> <li>3. How does the proposed development compare with the statement in paragraph 2.10.17 that “A typical 50MW solar farm will consist of around 100,000 to 150,000 panels and cover between 125 to 200 acres”?</li> <li>4. How does the above (acres required and number of panels) compare with other recently consented NSIP scale solar farms? Provide an explanation for any variations.</li> </ol> |
| Q1.4.2  | The applicant | <p><b>NPS EN-3</b></p> <p>The Planning Statement <a href="#">[REP1-016]</a> does not directly address paragraph 2.10.32 of NPS EN-3 regarding the use of agricultural land. Set out how this policy has been met. Is any continued agricultural use secured? If so, how? If not, why not? (also see questions Q1.7.17 and Q1.18.4)</p>   |
| Q1.4.3  | The applicant | <p><b>NPS EN-3</b></p> <p>Confirm that maximum combined capacity of the installed inverters measured to determine the site capacity is measured in alternating current (AC) as per NPS EN-3 paragraph 2.10.53.</p>   |
| Q1.4.4  | The applicant | <p><b>Overplanting</b></p> <p>Section 7.6 of the Statement of Need <a href="#">[APP-036]</a> states that the applicant “limits” overplanting, “does not propose overplanting” but also “...that it is possible that, at the application stage, applicants may not be sufficiently informed to commit to an overplanting strategy for their scheme”. Provide answers to the following queries:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is overplanting proposed? If so, how much and why? If not, why not?</li> <li>2. To what extent would panel degradation reduce the output of the proposed development over its lifetime in the absence of overplanting?</li> <li>3. If overplanting is not proposed, would this increase the need to replace solar panels during the 40-year operational phase? (also see question 1.8.8)</li> </ol>  |
| Q1.4.5  | The applicant | <p><b>Irradiance</b></p> <p>The Planning Statement <a href="#">[REP1-016]</a> refers to irradiance levels in Buckinghamshire being higher than the UK average. What are the irradiance levels in the vicinity of the Order limits?</p>   |
| Q1.4.6  | The applicant | <p><b>Load factor</b></p> <p>Section 7.4 of the Statement of Need <a href="#">[APP-036]</a> refers to an average load factor of 10.4% in the UK for solar generation since 2016. What is the load factor of the proposed development?</p>  |
| Q1.4.7  | The applicant | <p><b>Site selection – objectives</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. How were the objectives for the site selection process as set out at paragraph 4.1.3 of the Site Selection Report <a href="#">[REP1-016]</a> established?</li> <li>2. Were they subject to consultation?</li> <li>3. To what extent do they encapsulate the full extent of relevant policy requirements?</li> </ol>  |
| Q1.4.8  | The applicant | <p><b>Site selection – area of search</b></p> <p>Paragraph 4.2.3 of the Site Selection report <a href="#">[REP1-016]</a> states that a 10 kilometre (km) radius is the commercially viable cable distance from National Grid East Claydon Substation, taking into account the capacity, distance from the grid connection, underground cable costs, capital costs and market conditions. Provide further evidence in support of this position.</p>   |

| ExQ1                             | Question to:            | Question:   |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------|---|
|                                  |                         | Other than the sites identified on Buckinghamshire Council's Brownfield Register as identified in Table 1 of the Site Selection Report and the industrial area referenced at paragraph 4.2.22, were any other specific sites within the area of search considered? If so, which sites were considered, how were they assessed and why were they not taken forward? If not, why not?   |
| Q1.4.9                           | The applicant           | <b>Site selection – Best and Most Versatile (BMV) agricultural land</b><br>The Site Selection report [REP1-016] identifies that the south-western extent of the area of search demonstrated a larger presence of grade 4 non-BMV land. What consideration was given to further utilising land within the south-western extent of the area of search to reduce the use of BMV land?  |
| Q1.4.10                          | The applicant           | <b>Site selection – consolidation with other projects</b><br>Did the applicant engage with the promoters of other nearby energy generation and storage projects to consider the scope for consolidation of infrastructure with a view to reducing overall land take and effects? If not, why not?   |
| Q1.4.11                          | The applicant           | <b>Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) location</b><br>Submit a copy of the BESS Location Review as referenced in Buckinghamshire Council's Local Impact Report [REP1-112]. If the review does not already consider them, also provide commentary on the implications of the clearances sought by National Grid Electricity Transmission Limited in its written representation [REP1-130] on the scope to accommodate the BESS in the vicinity of the East Claydon National Grid Substation.   |
| <b>5. Air quality</b>            |                         |   |
| Q1.5.1                           | The applicant           | <b>Environmental Statement (ES) Chapter 6 (Air Quality) - Methodology</b><br>NPS EN-1 paragraph 5.2.9 states that ES assessments on air quality and emissions should describe the predicted absolute emissions, concentration change and absolute concentrations as a result of the proposed development, after mitigation methods have been applied and any potential eutrophication impacts. Neither ES Chapter 6 [APP-049], the Air Quality Assessment [APP-086], nor the Scoping Report [APP-079] appear to refer to these matters. Explain why they are not addressed, or update the ES in accordance with the requirements of NPS EN-1.   |
| Q1.5.2                           | The applicant           | <b>ES Chapter 6 (Air Quality) - Methodology</b><br>Was the 'guide to the assessment of air quality impacts on designated nature conservation sites' (Institute of Air Quality Management, 2020) considered in the assessment methodology for ES Chapter 6 [APP-049]? If so, how has this guidance been incorporated into the assessment methodology? If not, why not?   |
| Q1.5.3                           | The applicant           | <b>ES Chapter 6 (Air Quality) - Methodology</b><br>Why was the Greater London Authority guidance on 'Non-Road Mobile Machinery Practical Guide V.6' determined to be the most appropriate guidance to inform the methodology for ES Chapter 6 [APP-049] regarding non-road mobile machinery?  |
| Q1.5.4                           | The applicant           | <b>ES Chapter 6 (Air Quality) - Methodology</b><br>Direct the ExA to where ES Chapter 6 [APP-049] considered the impacts of the proposed development on 'critical levels' and national air quality objectives with regards to the protection of vegetation and ecosystems? If it has not, explain why not.  |
| Q1.5.5                           | The applicant           | <b>Mitigation</b><br>Buckinghamshire Council stated [REP1-112] that it seeks certainty that the proposed 75% of staff arrivals during construction through a minibus scheme would be fully managed and enforced to ensure that the stated maximum impact is accurate and can be achieved. Otherwise, the Council suggests that there is potential for the Environmental Protection UK and Institute of Air Quality Management guidance screening criteria to be breached and therefore the air quality assessment should be updated.<br><ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. How would you ensure that 75% of staff would utilise the proposed minibus service? The Transport Assessment [APP-131] states that this would be controlled via the Staff Travel Plan secured through the outline Construction Traffic Management Plan [REP1-084]. However, this document does not refer to the minimum use of 75% of staff using a minibus, therefore the ExA queries whether this is adequately secured.</li><li>2. How could you enforce the use of a minibus service rather than use of the private vehicle to meet the 75% target?</li><li>3. Would staff travel patterns be monitored during construction, if so how and what measures could be put in place if the 75% target was not being met?</li></ol> |
| Q1.5.6                           | Buckinghamshire Council | <b>Mitigation or monitoring</b><br>Do you have any outstanding requests for amendments to any of the control documents regarding air quality mitigation or monitoring? If so, set out what these are and why you consider them necessary.   |
| <b>6. Associated development</b> |                         |   |

| ExQ1   | Question to:  | Question:  |
|--|---|--|
| <b>6.1 Battery energy storage systems (BESS)</b> |   |  |
| Q1.6.1   | The applicant   | <p><b>Health and Safety Guidance for Grid Scale Electrical Energy Storage Systems (Department for Energy Security and Net Zero)</b></p> <p>In March 2024, the Department for Energy Security and Net Zero published guidance on <a href="#">Health and Safety Guidance for Grid Scale Electrical Energy Storage Systems</a>. The ExA notes that this is not referred to in the Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (oBSMP) [REP1-092]. The ExA requests that this guidance is reviewed and its recommendations are incorporated into the oBSMP, or an explanation is provided as to why the recommendations would not be appropriate.</p>   |
| Q1.6.2   | The applicant   | <p><b>BESS Capacity</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Grid Connection Statement [APP-137] confirms that the proposed development seeks a grid connection to support import of 335 megawatts (MW) (alternating current) of electricity. Is this the same as the capacity for the proposed BESS? If not, explain why, and confirm the capacity of the proposed BESS. (Also see question Q1.1.1)</li> <li>2. The Planning Statement [REP1-016] explains that the BESS is proposed to support the operation of the main solar nationally significant infrastructure project, to store energy generated by it and export it to the National Electricity Transmission System when it is needed. Explain why an import capacity of 335MW from the grid is sought, if the main purpose of the BESS is to store energy generated by the solar panels serving the proposed development?</li> <li>3. Are there any measures as part of the application control documents to ensure that any energy stored in the BESS comes directly from the proposed development? If not, why not and explain how the BESS would meet the definition of associated development in the Planning Act 2008 and in accordance with <a href="#">guidance on associated development applications for major infrastructure projects April 2013</a>.</li> </ol> |
| Q1.6.3   | The applicant   | <p><b>Waste</b></p> <p>To what extent has the Environmental Statement and supporting information considered waste generated by the need to replace BESS? Provide more information on the degradation of the batteries in the BESS. Amongst other matters, explain in particular what is the typical lifespan of batteries and how often, if at all, they require replacement.</p>  |
| <b>7. Biodiversity and ecology</b>               |   |  |
| Q1.7.1   | Natural England, Buckinghamshire Council, Environment Agency, Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust (BBOWT), Claydons Solar Action Group (CSAG) | <p><b>General - review of deadline 1 documents</b></p> <p>Review the updates to the application documents (see table 1 of the applicant's cover letter [REP1-001] for an overview of the updated documents) and the additional documents (see table 2 of the applicant's cover letter) submitted at deadline 1, the applicant's responses to the relevant representations [PDA-006] and confirm whether the comments or amendments have addressed your concerns regarding the impacts on biodiversity and ecology (as applicable). If the changes have not sufficiently addressed your concerns, set out how the documents could be further updated to overcome them.</p>  |
| Q1.7.2   | The applicant   | <p><b>General - CSAG deadline 1 submission</b></p> <p>Provide a comprehensive response to the submission by CSAG on ecological matters ([REP1-127] Part 2 – Ecology (CSAG-02) - CRITIQUE OF ECOLOGICAL COMPONENTS OF EIA and the supporting letter from Dominic Woodfield dated 3 December 2024 - PDF pages 53 – 58 of [REP1-128]). It would be helpful to the ExA if you could respond in a table format which replicates and responds to the points identified by CSAG. Provide the completed Biodiversity Net Gain metric in Excel form as requested by CSAG [REP1-127]. For expediency this should also be provided directly to CSAG to review at the earliest opportunity and at deadline 2 to the examination.</p>   |
| Q1.7.3   | The applicant   | <p><b>General - confidential documents</b></p> <p>The ExA notes that 2 preliminary ecological appraisals were provided with the application; the version dated 2022 [APP-087] was marked as confidential, whereas the version dated 2025 [APP-093] was redacted to allow for publication on the project website. Could the 2022 version be redacted in a similar way to allow for publication on the project website, if not, why not? The Examining Authority (ExA) requests that you review all documents marked as confidential to ascertain if they could be appropriately redacted for publication on the project page.</p>   |
| Q1.7.4   | The applicant   | <p><b>National Policy Statement (NPS) EN-1</b></p> <p>Paragraph 4.6.16 of NPS EN-1 states that applicants should make use of available guidance and tools for measuring natural capital assets and ecosystem services, such as the Natural Capital Committee's 'How to Do it: natural capital workbook', the government's guidance on Enabling a Natural Capital Approach, and other tools that aim to enable wider benefits for people and nature. Explain how you met this requirement.</p>  |
| Q1.7.5   | The applicant   | <p><b>NPS EN-1</b></p>   |

| ExQ1    | Question to:  | Question:  |
|---------|---|--|
|         |   | NPS EN-1 paragraph 5.4.45 states that the Secretary of State (SoS) will need to consider whether the statutory nature conservation body has granted or refused, or intends to grant or refuse, any relevant licences, including protected species mitigation licences. The ExA notes in the Schedule of Other Consents and Licences <a href="#">[REP1-014]</a> that protected species licences would be applied for prior to the commencement of construction. However, why have letters of no impediment for protected species licences not been sought in order to provide reassurance for the SoS that the relevant licences would be offered if applied for?   |
| Q1.7.6  | The applicant   | <b>NPS EN-3</b><br>NPS EN-3 paragraph 2.10.82 states that where pole mounted closed-circuit television (CCTV) facilities are proposed, the location of these facilities should be carefully considered to minimise impact. The ExA notes that the draft Development Consent Order (dCO) <a href="#">[REP1-008]</a> lists associated development which includes (i) “works for the provision of security and monitoring measures such as CCTV columns and CCTV...”. However, CCTV columns are not referenced in Environmental Statement (ES) Chapter 7 (Biodiversity) <a href="#">[REP1-036]</a> . Explain how the proposed development meets paragraph 2.10.82 of NPS EN-3.  |
| Q1.7.7  | The applicant   | <b>Environmental Improvement Plan 2023 and Local Nature Recovery Strategy for Buckinghamshire and Milton Keynes</b><br>Buckinghamshire Council suggests <a href="#">[REP1-112]</a> that the potentially significant effects identified on Bechstein’s bats appear to contravene goal 1 of the Environmental Improvement Plan 2023 that the proposed development would result in fragmentation of an existing established ecological network, which goes against government’s national policies and strategies for nature recovery.<br>1. Do you agree with these statements? If not, why not?<br>2. If the effects on Bechstein’s bats were determined to be significant (rather than potentially significant) do you consider that this would result in conflict with the aims of the Environmental Improvement Plan 2023 or Local Nature Recovery Strategy for Buckinghamshire and Milton Keynes?  |
| Q1.7.8  | The applicant   | <b>Presentation of likely effects and mitigation in ES Chapter 7 (Biodiversity)</b><br>The ExA identifies the following points in ES Chapter 7 <a href="#">[REP1-036]</a> which it requests are updated:<br>1. The ES has not clearly set out the secondary mitigation measures where they are proposed. For example, in various sections, the ES states “The outline OEMP [EN010158/APP/7.3] details and secures measures to mitigate and manage operational related effects on habitats to prevent pollution.” This does not identify which mitigation measures specifically proposed in the Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan (oOEMP) <a href="#">[REP1-080]</a> address the impacts identified. Update the ES to be more specific.<br>2. Where residual effects are identified, the ES does not specify what the significance of effect is – the effects should not be reported as just either ‘significant’ or ‘not significant’, but should be reported as, for example, negligible/ minor adverse/ moderate adverse/ major adverse, as well as whether the effect would be significant or not significant. Review and update the ES for both adverse and beneficial effects. This will assist the ExA to report the residual effects and offer appropriate weight to them in the planning balance.<br>3. The assessment of residual effects appears to include additional mitigation measures in addition to those identified in the secondary mitigation measures. Update the assessment to include all mitigation measures.<br>4. The conclusions on various ‘not significant’ effects are somewhat unclear. For example, paragraph 7.10.91 states that “There is not anticipated to be an adverse effect on cereal and non-cereal crops during operation (including maintenance), which is considered to be not significant” – the ExA queries whether this means that there an effect which is not significant, in which case it should be confirmed if this would be a negligible or minor adverse effect, or there would no adverse effects at all? Review all of the document and update similar statements for clarity.<br>5. In terms of reporting effects during decommissioning, would any effects identified during construction also apply to the decommissioning phase?<br>6. The ExA note your response to Action Point 3 from compulsory acquisition hearing 1 <a href="#">[REP1-107]</a> . However, the ExA seeks additional clarification in the ES regarding the extent of ecological mitigation, compensation and enhancements proposed – these are 3 distinct elements of the ES assessment which need to be understood and whilst the ExA accepts that the same parcel of land can provide more than one function, the ExA must have confidence that adequate mitigation or compensation is provided where effects have been identified. Enhancements should also be identified where they could be achieved. |
| Q1.7.9  | The applicant   | <b>Surveys of ground nesting birds</b><br>Provide further justification for not surveying the cable corridor route, given its potential to support ground-nesting bird species, and outline how the ecological assessment remains robust and adequate in the absence of dedicated survey data for the cable corridor route. Clarify any assumptions made, evidence used to rule out potential impacts, and whether any additional survey, avoidance, or mitigation measures are required to address any gaps.  |
| Q1.7.10 | Buckinghamshire Council, North Bucks Bat Group, BBOWT, CSAG | <b>Surveys of Bechstein’s bats</b><br>Provide a view on Natural England’s position regarding the survey work for Bechstein’s bats <a href="#">[RR-203, AS-038, REP1-124]</a> – to what extent do you agree or disagree with this and why?  |
| Q1.7.11 | The applicant   | <b>Mitigation hierarchy - brown and black hairstreak butterfly</b>   |

| ExQ1    | Question to:  | Question:   |
|---------|---------------|---|
|         |               | Explain how you have appropriately applied the mitigation hierarchy regarding brown and black hairstreak butterflies.   |
| Q1.7.12 | The applicant | <p><b>Mitigation hierarchy - Bechstein's bat roosts</b></p> <p>ES Chapter 7 [REP1-036] states that 3 trees with suitability to support maternity roosts would be removed to facilitate the proposed development. Why can't these trees be avoided?</p>  |
| Q1.7.13 | The applicant | <p><b>Effects on Bechstein's bats</b></p> <p>ES Chapter 7 [REP1-036] describes effects on Bechstein's bats as being 'potentially significant', but that this would not equate to 'substantial harm'. Confirm the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Whilst the ExA acknowledges the presented knowledge gaps regarding the effects of solar farms on Bechstein's bats as set out in ES Chapter 7, in accordance with paragraph 2.10.155 of NPS EN-3, environmental effects should be presented on a worst-case scenario basis. Update your assessment to provide a definitive conclusion on the significance of effects for Bechstein's bats or provide further justification for the inclusion of 'potentially'.</li> <li>2. Provide a more detailed explanation of the point that a significant effect would not result in substantial harm. Are you able to provide an example of a precedent for a similar example which has been accepted by the SoS?</li> <li>3. If the ExA or SoS were to determine that the effects on Bechstein's bats would equate to substantial harm, do you consider that benefits derived from the proposed development would outweigh such harm – justify your answer.</li> <li>4. Natural England identifies [RR-203, AS-038] the ecological value of field parcels B6, B7 and B8 and Buckinghamshire Council expresses concerns around field parcels B10, B11, D28 and D29 [RR-026, REP1-112]. The ExA notes that you propose compensation measures to address the ecological value loss of these field parcels. Explain how you have applied the mitigation hierarchy to these areas and why avoidance measures are not considered appropriate to mitigate potential effects?</li> </ol>  |
| Q1.7.14 | The applicant | <p><b>Barbastelle bats - effects</b></p> <p>Provide further justification for the conclusion of no likely significant effects on barbastelle bats when a long-term permanent effect on this district level species has been identified.</p>   |
| Q1.7.15 | The applicant | <p><b>Ground nesting birds – effects</b></p> <p>Given the extent of habitat loss within the proposed solar array area and the sensitivity of species such as skylark, provide the evidence base and justification that supports the conclusion of a long-term beneficial effect on ground nesting birds at a local level identified in ES Chapter 7 [REP1-036].</p>   |
| Q1.7.16 | The applicant | <p><b>Habitat Fragmentation</b></p> <p>Buckinghamshire Council identify [REP1-112] that the proposed development would result in the loss of 2,060m of hedgerow, with up to 1,310m anticipated to be a permanent loss. The ExA notes that the applicant proposes [PDA-006] 4.17km of new and reinstated hedgerow planting. However, whilst this new and replacement hedgerow planting is establishing, to what extent would this provide sufficient habitat to support species such as black and brown hairstreak butterflies to mitigate the loss of habitat for species affected by their loss? Clarify how long all proposed habitat replacements would take to be effective.</p>  |
| Q1.7.17 | The applicant | <p><b>Proposed grassland</b></p> <p>In your response to the relevant representations [PDA-006], you refer to the provision of 93 hectares of open grassland. However, the Commitments Register [REP1-076] states that there would be the "Creation of 95 ha of species-rich neutral grassland" (commitment 67):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Confirm which amount of grassland is correct and to what extent the proposed grazing land would provide mitigation, how much would provide compensation and what proportion would provide enhancements for each species it is intended to support.</li> <li>2. The ExA note that the Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) [REP1-086] refers to grazing by cattle or sheep 'if possible'. The ExA queries how grazing would be controlled during operation to ensure that any benefits derived from it (such as those as set out in the Bat Technical Study [REP1-105]) would take place – for example, would there need to be a minimum number of cattle or sheep grazed across an area across a year for a minimum amount of time to deliver the associated benefits and how would this be controlled?</li> <li>3. Explain to what extent you rely on the benefits from grazed areas of grassland. If grazing of grassland during operation of the proposed development cannot be controlled, then to what extent can any benefits from grazing be offered weight?</li> <li>4. The ExA also notes that the oLEMP [REP1-086] states that "The neutral grassland will be managed either through grazing or a hay cut late in the summer after ground nesting birds have fledged." Would there be the same level of mitigation/ compensation/ enhancements provided if the grassland is used for hay-making, rather than cattle grazing? If not, provide justification for your approach in the context of the above questions.</li> </ol> <p>(also see questions Q1.4.2 and Q1.18.4)</p> |

| ExQ1    | Question to:   | Question:  |
|---------|--|--|
| Q1.7.18 | The applicant  | <p><b>Proposed grassland</b></p> <p>The oLEMP [REP1-086] includes calculations to deliver approximately 95 hectares of grassland intended to provide open nesting habitat for ground-nesting birds, as compensation for habitat lost due to the placement of the solar photovoltaic modules. The calculation appears to consider only the footprint of the solar photovoltaic modules when assessing habitat loss.</p> <p>Explain:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. why the assessment of habitat loss has been restricted solely to the area occupied by the solar photovoltaic modules</li> <li>2. whether other infrastructure—such as access roads, cable routes, inverter/ transformer stations, fencing, substations, construction compounds, and areas subject to shading or disturbance—have been considered in calculating the extent of habitat loss for ground-nesting birds</li> <li>3. and, if these elements were excluded, how the calculation can be considered robust given the potential for additional habitat loss, fragmentation, disturbance, or displacement arising from these features</li> </ol> <p>Provide justification, supporting evidence, and any recalculated figures if other infrastructure components materially affect the assessment.</p> |
| Q1.7.19 | BBOWT  | <p><b>Mitigation - woodland buffer distance</b></p> <p>In your relevant representation [RR-020] and written representation [REP1-125] you suggest that a minimum buffer distance of 50 metres is required to designated woodland. Whilst noting the study referred to in your relevant representation, this does not represent guidance or a legislative requirement. The applicant has based the minimum buffer distance on guidance from Natural England and the Forestry Commission – why is this not deemed sufficient?</p>  |
| Q1.7.20 | The applicant  | <p><b>Mitigation - hedgerow buffers</b></p> <p>Natural England recommends [REP1-124] that hedgerow buffer mitigation for bat commuting routes and foraging areas is created based on measuring from the edge of existing hedgerows in line with the precautionary principle, so that the mitigation buffer is wholly additional to the feature itself. Natural England advises that the existing material ecological baseline is maintained, and that the buffer expands upon this, otherwise there would be diminishing returns with the size of the buffers. However, the ExA notes that you have measured the buffer distance from the central point of hedgerow rather than the edge of the receptor. Whilst the ExA acknowledges that the outer extent of the habitat may fluctuate over time due to management practices, a precautionary worst-case scenario should be applied when defining and measuring buffer distances for mitigation purposes. Explain therefore, how a worst-case scenario has been accounted for when applying an approach that measures the buffer from the central point of the affected receptor rather than from its precautionary outer edge?</p>  |
| Q1.7.21 | The applicant  | <p><b>Mitigation – nesting birds</b></p> <p>The oOEMP [REP1-080] states that vegetation clearance would avoid the nesting bird season or would be checked for the presence of any nests by a suitably experienced ecologist within 48 hours prior to vegetation removal or ground clearance. Why would vegetation clearance be required during operation of the proposed development?</p>  |
| Q1.7.22 | The applicant  | <p><b>Mitigation – nesting birds</b></p> <p>ES Chapter 7 [REP1-036] states that once habitats for nesting birds are established during operation, the proposed development would be able to deliver a net gain in habitats required to support a diverse breeding farmland bird assemblage of ground nesting birds similar to that currently present. How long would it take for habitats to be established to support the current assemblage of ground nesting birds?</p>   |
| Q1.7.23 | The applicant  | <p><b>Monitoring</b></p> <p>ES Chapter 7 confirms [REP1-036] confirms that management and monitoring of mitigation habitats would be required for a period of 30 years. Why is this not proposed for the lifetime of the proposed development?</p>   |
| Q1.7.24 | The applicant, Natural England, Buckinghamshire Council, BBOWT | <p><b>Monitoring</b></p> <p><b>The applicant:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The oOEMP [REP1-080] refers to the need for monitoring of bat activity during the operation of the proposed development. The oLEMP [REP1-086] provides more information on the requirements for a bat monitoring strategy. Whilst oLEMP states that this would be developed in consultation with Natural England, it does not require their agreement, nor does it require that Buckinghamshire Council or the BBOWT are party to its agreement – why is this?</li> <li>2. The oLEMP refers to a monitoring report which would be produced following bat surveys at year 1, 3, 5 and 10 of operation, and would detail any actions or adaptive management practices required where appropriate, which would be actioned before the next monitoring survey visit where possible.</li> <li>3. Who would review the monitoring report?</li> </ol>   |

| ExQ1                                   | Question to:            | Question:  |
|--|-------------------------|--|
|  |                         | <p>4. If it were found that the existing mitigation measures were not effective, what additional measures could be put in place to mitigate the effects and who would agree that they are suitable?</p> <p>5. The aforementioned wording of the oLEMP suggests that implementing additional mitigation measures between surveys may not be possible. Why would it not be possible to implement additional measures given that the surveys are proposed a number of years apart?</p> <p>6. The ExA also notes that Buckinghamshire Council suggest <a href="#">[REP1-112]</a> that a more comprehensive monitoring programme in the form of a detailed research project is required for the proposed development. Is this something which you would be prepared to accommodate? If not, why not?</p> <p><b>Natural England, Buckinghamshire Council and BBOWT:</b> do you consider that you should be consulted on, and approve the details of any proposed monitoring of bat activity during the operation of the proposed development, including any monitoring reports and adaptive mitigation measures – justify your answer.</p> |
| <b>7.1 Arboricultural impacts</b>      |                         |  |
| Q1.7.1                                 | The applicant           | <p><b>Survey data</b></p> <p>Ground-derived data and drone survey data have been used to establish the arboricultural baseline <a href="#">[APP-099]</a>. Provide a brief methodology note explaining how the 2 datasets were captured, processed, and integrated, and how you have assured positional and attribute accuracy in line with relevant technical guidance. In particular, outline the accuracy tolerances, any limitations, and how conflicts or gaps between the datasets were resolved.</p>   |
| Q1.7.2                                 | The applicant           | <p><b>Survey methodology</b></p> <p>Paragraph 4.24 of the Arboricultural Impact Assessment <a href="#">[APP-099]</a> states that there are numerous large woodlands recorded. However, only ancient semi-natural woodland is noted in the data tables in the assessment. Explain the methodology used to classify woodland, including the classification criteria applied to distinguish woodland parcels from tree groups.</p>  |
| <b>7.2 Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)</b> |                         |  |
| Q1.7.3                                 | The applicant           | <p><b>Biodiversity units</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is it the applicant's intention to sell any of the biodiversity net gain units which it intends to create in the order limits, if development consent were granted? If so, how many of the biodiversity units would likely be offered for sale?</li> <li>2. If some of the biodiversity units were sold, would this reduce the weight to be offered to the benefits of net biodiversity gain of the proposed development in the planning balance and why?</li> <li>3. What is the likelihood that the proposal would substantially overprovide biodiversity net gain in comparison to that which is set out in requirement 7 of the dDCO <a href="#">[REP1-008]</a> and if so, would these units likely be sold? Justify your answers.</li> </ol>   |
| Q1.7.4                                 | The applicant           | <p><b>Woodland creation</b></p> <p>Are any areas of woodland proposed to be created? If not, why not?</p>  |
| Q1.7.5                                 | Buckinghamshire Council | <p><b>BNG calculation</b></p> <p>The ExA notes your comments in your Local Impact Report <a href="#">[REP1-112]</a> regarding the weight to be offered to the benefits from BNG in the planning balance. However, confirm whether you consider that the calculations and methodology of the Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment <a href="#">[REP1-060]</a> to be accurate.</p>  |
| Q1.7.6                                 | The applicant           | <p><b>Decommissioning</b></p> <p>ES Chapter 7 <a href="#">[REP1-080]</a> states that likely effects of the decommissioning phase on habitats may potentially be greater than those experienced during construction. Quantify the significance of the effect on biodiversity and habitats during decommissioning, with justification. Are there opportunities to secure some or all of the BNG delivered during the operation of the proposed development during decommissioning or once the land is handed back to the landowners, such as through a 'conservation covenant'?</p>  |
| <b>8. Climate resilience</b>           |                         |  |
| Q1.8.1                                 | The applicant           | <p><b>National Policy Statement (NPS) EN-1</b></p> <p>NPS EN-1 paragraph 4.10.9 states that the Environmental Statement (ES) should use government guidance and industry standard benchmarks such as the British Standards for climate change adaptation. Has this guidance been used to inform the ES and its conclusions, and if so where? If not, why not?</p>  |
| Q1.8.2                                 | The applicant           | <p><b>NPS EN-1</b></p>   |

| ExQ1   | Question to:  | Question:  |
|--|---------------|--|
|  |               | The ExA notes the contents of table 8.7 of ES Chapter 8 [APP-051], however, the greenhouse gas (GHG) assessment only appears to consider the impacts of the proposed development on carbon emissions. How have other GHG emissions been accounted for in the assessment?   |
| Q1.8.3   | The applicant | <b>NPS EN-1</b><br>Explain how reduction in energy demand and consumption during operation of the proposed development have been prioritised in comparison with other measures, in accordance with the requirements of NPS EN-3 paragraph 5.3.4.   |
| Q1.8.4   | The applicant | <b>NPS EN-1</b><br>Explain how operational emissions have been reduced as much as possible through the application of best available techniques, in accordance with the requirements of NPS EN-3 paragraph 5.3.4.  |
| Q1.8.5   | The applicant | <b>NPS EN-1</b><br>NPS EN-3 paragraph 5.3.7 states that steps taken to minimise and offset emissions should be set out in a GHG Reduction Strategy, secured under the Development Consent Order (DCO). Whilst the ExA note the response to this paragraph in the Planning Statement [REP1-016], which states that “Steps taken to minimise and offset emissions are demonstrated within Appendix 1: Green and Blue Infrastructure Parameters to the Outline LEMP” [REP1-087], this appendix does not refer to minimising or reducing GHG emissions and therefore does not fulfil the requirements set out in paragraph 5.3.7. Provide a GHG Reduction Strategy and update the draft DCO (dDCO) [REP1-008] accordingly.   |
| Q1.8.6   | The applicant | <b>Climate Change Resilience Assessment - Methodology</b><br>Regarding the significance of effect matrix (table 8) in the Climate Change Resilience Assessment [APP-105], there are scenarios presented where the effect could be ‘minor or moderate’ or ‘moderate or major’ and the overall significance of effect is determined by professional judgement.<br><ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Why is the approach of ‘minor or moderate’ and ‘moderate or major’ used in the matrix – why has a significance of ‘moderate’ or ‘major’ in these examples not been used as a worst-case scenario approach?</li> <li>2. Are there instances where professional judgement has reduced likely effect from a significant to a not significant effect?</li> <li>3. Why are only major effects deemed to be significant effects, why are moderate effects not deemed as significant (as they are in other ES chapters)?</li> </ol> |
| Q1.8.7   | The applicant | <b>Climate Change Resilience Assessment - Methodology</b><br>Regarding tables 9, 10 and 11 of the Climate Change Resilience Assessment [APP-105]:<br><ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Explain why are increased summer temperatures, heat waves and high heat days classed as ‘unlikely’ during construction, but ‘likely’ for operation and decommissioning?</li> <li>2. Why are they not considered ‘very likely’ given current climate trends?</li> <li>3. Why are other climate scenarios either ‘unlikely’ or ‘very unlikely’ given recent climate trends?</li> </ol>  |
| Q1.8.8   | The applicant | <b>ES Chapter 8 (Climate)</b><br>ES Chapter 8 [APP-051] paragraph 8.13.1 states that the quantity of solar panels assumed in the assessment presents a worst-case scenario regarding the emissions resulting from construction, operation, and decommissioning, however, this also represents the best-case scenario regarding emissions savings. ES Chapter 8 confirms that even with a reduction in the quantity of solar panels, the outcome of the assessment regarding significance would not change. Confirm to what extent a reduction in the quantity of the solar panels and their degradation over the lifetime of the proposed development would affect the overall energy output of the proposed development in terms of megawatt hours. Confirm if solar panel degradation has been considered in assessing the overall net carbon emissions – if not why not? (also see Q1.4.4)  |
| <b>9. Compulsory acquisition, temporary possession and other land or rights considerations</b> |               |  |
| Q1.9.1   | The applicant | <b>Land Rights and Negotiations Tracker and Statement of Reasons</b><br>The applicant is invited to amend future iterations of the Land Rights and Negotiations Tracker [REP1-108] to identify the specific purposes for which each plot is required, including the works number, as per the Examining Authority’s (ExA) procedural decision in Annex F of its Rule 6 letter [PD-008].<br><br>The ExA also notes that table 3.2 of the Book of Reference [REP1-012] states that Annex A of the Statement of Reasons [REP1-010] “...provides details of the purpose for which compulsory acquisition and temporary possession powers are sought and reference each plot in the book of reference to these purposes”. However, Annex A appears to be missing. Update the Statement of Reasons accordingly.   |
| Q1.9.2   | The applicant | <b>The applicant’s approach to minimising private loss</b>   |

| ExQ1   | Question to:  | Question:   |
|--------|---|---|
|        | Affected persons  | <p>The ExA notes the applicant's response to action point 4 of compulsory acquisition hearing 1 (CAH1) that is provided in Appendix 1 of its written summary of oral submissions at CAH1 <a href="#">[REP1-107]</a>, which provides further details of its approach to minimising private loss that may be experienced by affected persons.</p> <p><b>To the applicant:</b><br/>Measures identified for the Claridge family include access provision referenced in the Design Approach Document (DAD) <a href="#">[REP1-018]</a>, including at paragraph 5.5.31, 5.5.28 and 5.5.29 of the DAD. The ExA notes that the DAD is not a control document. Please confirm how all of the measures identified to minimise private loss are secured.</p> <p><b>To affected persons:</b><br/>Affected persons are invited to comment on the applicant's approach and confirm if the measures proposed are appropriate. If not, what other measures should the applicant implement?</p>   |
| Q1.9.3 | <p>The applicant</p> <p>A E J &amp; FJ Claridge (John Claridge, Pauline Claridge, Philip Claridge)</p> <p>Preston Farms Ltd</p> | <p><b>Replacement land</b></p> <p><b>To the applicant:</b><br/>The applicant is invited to provide the following information in relation to replacement land offered to registered tenants:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Location, including a site plan.</li> <li>2. Amount of land (in hectares) compared with the amount of corresponding land subject to compulsory acquisition.</li> <li>3. Commentary on the extent to which the replacement land could adequately function as part of the farming operation and serve as alternative provision. If any improvements are required to the replacement land to ensure that it is suitable, who would be responsible for delivering them?</li> <li>4. Identify measures that could minimise disruption to ongoing farming operations during any transfer to replacement land.</li> </ol> <p><b>To A E J &amp; FJ Claridge (John Claridge, Pauline Claridge, Philip Claridge):</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. Please provide feedback regarding the suitability of replacement land offered by the applicant.</li> <li>6. Identify measures that could minimise disruption to the ongoing operation of farming during any transfer to replacement land.</li> <li>7. If agreement is reached with the applicant regarding the provision of replacement land, to what extent would this address any concerns that you may have regarding the compulsory acquisition of your land interests?</li> </ol> <p><b>To Preston Farms Ltd:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>8. The ExA notes feedback provided by Preston Farms Ltd in its written representation <a href="#">[REP1-133]</a> in relation to the replacement land proposed by the applicant. However, in the context of the above, Preston Farms Ltd is invited to comment further, particularly if it is in a position to provide an update.</li> </ol> |
| Q1.9.4 | Mr Terrence W Ives  | <p><b>Land interests</b></p> <p>Please provide further details of the impacts to your land interests, including farming system, livestock enterprises and drainage as outlined in your written representation <a href="#">[REP1-126]</a>. Please also confirm if the Book of Reference <a href="#">[REP1-012]</a> accurately records your land interests.</p>   |
| Q1.9.5 | Anglian Water Services Limited  | <p><b>Land interests</b></p> <p>Provide an update on discussions with the applicant regarding any interests that might be missing from the application following the applicant's refreshed Land Registry search as outlined in the draft Statement of Common Ground <a href="#">[REP1-029]</a>. Identify any necessary amendments to relevant application documents, including the Book of Reference <a href="#">[REP1-012]</a>.</p>  |
| Q1.9.6 | National Grid Electricity Transmission Limited (NGET)   | <p><b>Alternatives</b></p> <p>Does NGET agree with the applicant's response to its relevant representation <a href="#">[PDA-006]</a> that there is "...no need for applicant to seek alternatives sites since the proposed development is sufficiently flexible to be designed around NGET's works"? If not, why not?</p>   |
| Q1.9.7 | The applicant   | <p><b>Alternatives</b></p> <p>Elaborate on the justification for the creation and compulsory acquisition of new rights over plots 7/2 and 7/1 in the Land Plans <a href="#">[REP1-004]</a>. Whilst both plots would comprise part of Works no. 6 (Grid Connection Cabling Corridor), neither plot adjoins land identified in the Works Plans <a href="#">[REP1-005]</a> for Works no. 2A (Rosefield Substation Compound) or other components of the proposed development from which the grid connection cable may originate.</p>  |

| ExQ1                         | Question to:                             | Question:   |
|------------------------------|--|---|
| Q1.9.8                       | Statkraft UK Limited                     | <p><b>Interface agreement</b></p> <p>The ExA notes the potential for an interface agreement between the 2 parties as identified in Stakraft UK Limited's written representation [REP1-134] and the applicant's Status of Negotiations with Statutory Undertakers [REP1-109]. The Status of Negotiations with statutory undertakers states that this would be in lieu of protective provisions. Does Statkraft UK Limited agree that such an agreement (if made) would replace the need for protective provisions? If not, why not? Should any provision be made in the draft Development Consent Order [REP1-008] to address concerns?</p>  |
| Q1.9.9                       | The applicant                            | <p><b>Battery Energy Storage System (BESS)</b></p> <p>Provide further commentary on why land is required for the Works no. 4 (BESS) in the context of its Gate 1 status following the National Energy System Operator review. Does Gate 1 status ensure a future connection to the grid? If not, are the tests in section 122 (2) of the Planning Act 2008 met?</p>   |
| <b>10. Cultural heritage</b> |  |   |
| Q1.10.1                      | The applicant                            | <p><b>National Policy Statement (NPS) EN-1</b></p> <p>Paragraph 5.9.13 of NPS EN-1 encourages applicants to consider opportunities to enhance access to, or interpretation, understanding and appreciation of, the heritage assets affected by the proposed development. Paragraph 9.11.1 of Environmental Statement (ES) Chapter 9 (Cultural Heritage) [APP-052] states that interpretation boards for Claydon House and Claydon Registered Park and Garden on the proposed permissive path to Knowl Hill to be secured by the Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans [REP1-006] and the Outline Rights of Way and Access Strategy [REP1-090]. However, it is not clear how these documents secure interpretation boards. Answer the following questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Provide clarification of how the interpretation boards enhancement would be secured.</li> <li>2. Elaborate on the initiatives to improve the access and visitor experience at Claydon House as referenced at paragraph 9.11.1 and how they are secured.</li> <li>3. Has similar consideration been given or other consideration for enhancements been given for other heritage assets affected by the proposed development? If not, why not?</li> </ol> |
| Q1.10.2                      | The applicant<br>Buckinghamshire Council | <p><b>NPS EN-3</b></p> <p>Paragraph 2.10.110 of NPS EN-3 acknowledges that solar photovoltaic (PV) developments may have a positive effect on cultural heritage, for example archaeological assets may be protected by a solar PV farm as the site is removed from regular ploughing and the use of shoes, or low-level piling is stipulated as footings for solar pv modules. The ExA notes the references at paragraph 5.1.1 in the draft Archaeological Management Strategy (dAMS) [REP1-094] to the "Use of non-intrusive foundations for Solar PV modules in areas of sensitive archaeological remains...". However, the paragraph also indicates that such mitigation "could" be included, "where allowed". Should the dAMS provide a firm commitment to use non-intrusive foundations in areas of sensitive archaeological remains? If not, why not? To what extent has the order limits been subject to regular ploughing?</p>  |
| Q1.10.3                      | Buckinghamshire Council                  | <p><b>Scope of the assessment</b></p> <p>Paragraph 80 of Buckinghamshire Council's relevant representation [RR-026] identified concerns regarding scoping in certain listed buildings that are within conservation areas. The applicant's subsequent response [PDA-006] indicates that the list of assets scoped into ES Chapter 9 [APP-052] was agreed with Buckinghamshire Council's built heritage advisor as noted in table 9.1. Confirm if the Council agree with the scope of the assessment. If not, why not?</p>  |
| Q1.10.4                      | The applicant                            | <p><b>Worst case scenario</b></p> <p>Table 9.4 of ES Chapter 9 [APP-052] states "The reasonable worst-case location for cultural heritage assumes that the Main Collector Compound will be sited on the area of greatest archaeological interest within Field E11 (unless this is used for the Rosefield Substation)." The ExA notes that the worst-case scenario for the substation does include Field E11. Provide clarification for the worst-case scenario applied for the main collector compound.</p>   |
| Q1.10.5                      | The applicant                            | <p><b>Assessment assumptions</b></p> <p>Paragraphs 9.6.4 and 9.6.5 of ES Chapter 9 [APP-052] state that it is assumed that hedgerows required for cultural heritage mitigation would achieve a minimum height of 3.5 metres (m) by year 10 of operation and that this is secured in the Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) [REP1-086]. However, the oLEMP refers to a target height of 3-3.5m for hedgerows. Confirm if any amendments are necessary to either the oLEMP or the assessment assumptions of cultural heritage to ensure consistency and that proposed cultural heritage mitigation would be adequately secured in the oLEMP.</p>  |
| Q1.10.6                      | The applicant                            | <p><b>Embedded mitigation</b></p> <p>Table 9.8 of ES Chapter 9 [APP-052] includes the following embedded mitigation "15m width belt of structural native woodland planting along northern boundary of Field D3 (South)". Appendix 2 of the oLEMP [REP1-086] appears to show only partial planting on the northern boundary, with proposed tree belt screening. Should the oLEMP be updated to accord with the mitigation set out in table 9.8? If not, why not?</p>   |

| ExQ1     | Question to:                             | Question:  |
|----------|--|--|
| Q1.10.7  | The applicant                            | <p><b>Upper floors of Claydon House</b></p> <p>Provide confirmation of when the additional photomontages and visualisations from the upper floors of Claydon House as indicated in the Statement of Common Ground with the National Trust [REP1-028] and Historic England [REP1-027] will be submitted for consideration in the examination. Will this be accompanied by an updated cultural heritage assessment [APP-052]? The ExA is keen to stress the urgent need for this information to be provided as soon as possible in order to ensure adequate examination time for its consideration and review of any potential related mitigation.</p>   |
| Q1.10.8  | The applicant                            | <p><b>Additional mitigation – Pond Farmhouse</b></p> <p>Table 9.15 of ES Chapter 9 [APP-052] identifies “Controls on hours of work, and on noise and dust.” as additional mitigation during the operation phase for changes to the setting of Grade II Pond Farmhouse. Are controls on hours of work, and on noise and dust proposed as additional mitigation for the operation phase or is this an error? If this is an error, does this have any implications for the ES and is any alternative additional mitigation proposed to reduce the magnitude of effect?</p>  |
| Q1.10.9  | The applicant                            | <p><b>Assessment of likely effects (with additional mitigation)</b></p> <p>There are numerous examples in section 9.10 of ES Chapter 9 [APP-052] where conclusions drawn by the applicant regarding the significance of effects are not adequately justified. In particular, where table 9.7 (criteria for assessing the significance of effect) indicates that one of 2 conclusions could be drawn from the specified degree of importance and magnitude (e.g. slight or moderate), there is insufficient explanation given as to why the chosen conclusion is drawn. Whilst the ExA acknowledges the applicant’s position that professional judgment can be applied, this is not fully supported by evidence and explained in section 9.10. For example, paragraph 9.10.59 regarding changes to the setting of Middle Claydon Conservation Area identifies high importance and minor magnitude but concludes slight adverse effects. Table 9.7 indicates that a conclusion of slight or moderate could be drawn in such instances with moderate effects being significant.</p> <p>Furthermore, there are examples where the conclusion of the significance of effects contradicts the criteria in table 9.7 entirely without an adequate explanation. For example, paragraph 9.10.45 regarding physical impacts to area of Iron-Age to Romano-British settlement activity in Parcel 3 (HA1/MBC45205) during construction concludes slight adverse effects, when medium importance and moderate magnitude is identified. Table 9.7 would suggest that the conclusion should be moderate effects which is significant in line with paragraph 9.6.18.</p> <p>Undertake a full review of section 9.10 and provide further justification for the conclusions drawn where they deviate from table 9.7 or where table 9.7 indicates that one of 2 conclusions on the significance of effects could be identified.</p> |
| Q1.10.10 | The applicant                            | <p><b>Assessment of settings</b></p> <p>Buckinghamshire Council’s Local Impact Report [REP1-112] and the Claydons Solar Action Group written representation [REP1-127] identify concerns regarding the applicant’s approach to considering the contribution of settings to the significance of heritage assets and subsequent conclusions. Provide further justification for the overall approach taken alongside addressing each specific issues raised by the interested parties.</p>  |
| Q1.10.11 | The applicant                            | <p><b>Botolph Claydon Conservation Area</b></p> <p>The applicant’s response [PDA-006] to the Claydons Solar Action Group’s relevant representation [RR-049] regarding effects on the Botolph Claydon Conservation Area states that changes to the design of the proposed development “have ensured that the Proposed Development is no longer visible from the Conservation Area and that the Conservation Area would continue to be experienced within a largely agricultural setting on the approaches from the west and north. The changes to the approach to the Conservation Area from the south have been assessed within the detailed setting assessment”.</p> <p>However, figure 10.9 of ES Chapter 10 (Landscape and Visual) [AS-031] appears to indicate that the proposed development would be partially visible from Parcel 1 (to the west) as well as Parcel 3 (to the north-east) even with detailed screening. Provide further commentary on the visibility of the proposed development from the Botolph Claydon Conservation Area and confirm any implications for the assessment.</p>   |
| Q1.10.12 | Buckinghamshire Council                  | <p><b>Proposed East Claydon Conservation Area</b></p> <p>The Claydons Solar Action Group’s written representation [REP1-127] indicates that there is a proposal to designate a new conservation area at East Claydon. Provide details for the timescales of any such proposals and confirm any implications for the applicant’s assessment of cultural heritage.</p>   |
| Q1.10.13 | The applicant<br>Buckinghamshire Council | <p><b>Pond Farmhouse</b></p> <p>The ExA observed on its unaccompanied site inspection [EV1-001] that the setback between the proposed solar PV arrays and the listed building is reduced at the north-eastern corner of Field B4 as identified at appendix 1 of the oLEMP [REP1-086]. How was the extent of the setback determined and why does it</p>   |

| ExQ1                          | Question to:                                  | Question:  |
|-------------------------------|---|--|
|                               |   | narrow at the north-eastern corner of field B4? Could the north-eastern corner of Field B4 with the PV arrays be set further back from the farmhouse to provide additional embedded mitigation? If not, why not?   |
| Q1.10.14                      | Buckinghamshire Council                       | <b>dAMS</b><br>Confirm if the updated dAMS <a href="#">[REP1-094]</a> and related management plans adequately address concerns identified in the Local Impact Report <a href="#">[REP1-112]</a> , including the extent of pre-construction trial trenching and inclusion of related wording from the good practice guide referenced in your Local Impact Report?   |
| <b>11. Cumulative effects</b> |   |  |
| Q1.11.1                       | The applicant                                 | <b>Environmental Statement (ES) Chapter 17 (Cumulative effects) - assessment methodology</b><br>Provide more information on the 'Tier 3' projects which were scoped out of the stage 1 cumulative effects assessment <a href="#">[REP1-044]</a> and reasons why.   |
| Q1.11.2                       | Buckinghamshire Council<br>Highways Authority | <b>ES Chapter 17 (Cumulative effects) - assessment methodology</b><br>Do you consider the methodology used for assessment of the cumulative effects on the highways network to be acceptable and do you agree with the findings of ES Chapter 17 <a href="#">[REP1-044]</a> regarding highways matters? If not, explain why.   |
| Q1.11.3                       | The applicant                                 | <b>ES Chapter 17 (Cumulative effects) - assessment methodology</b><br>Why did all 3 of the criteria you identified for short-listing projects in the cumulative effects assessment <a href="#">[REP1-044]</a> have to be met for a project to be carried forwards for further assessment? Would have meeting 2 of the criteria for example, meant more projects were considered in the short-list?   |
| Q1.11.4                       | The applicant                                 | <b>ES Chapter 17 (Cumulative effects) - assessment methodology</b><br>Explain why project ID number 4 from Appendix 17.1 Long list of Other Approved or Existing Developments <a href="#">[REP1-072]</a> was not taken forward for assessment.   |
| Q1.11.5                       | The applicant                                 | <b>ES Chapter 17 (Cumulative effects) - assessment methodology</b><br>ES Chapter 17 <a href="#">[REP1-044]</a> does not quantify significant cumulative effects in terms of whether they would be major or moderate – update the ES chapter to quantify the significance of effect for all significant cumulative effects identified.  |
| Q1.11.6                       | The applicant                                 | <b>ES Chapter 17 (Cumulative effects) - assessment methodology</b><br>Provide a plan which identifies the residential properties within 250m of the order limits referred to in paragraph 17.5.8 of ES Chapter 17 <a href="#">[REP1-044]</a> , or direct the ExA to a plan which identifies these properties. The ExA notes that figure 10.3 <a href="#">[AS-031]</a> shows residential properties initially scoped into the assessment for the Residential Visual Amenity Assessment <a href="#">[APP-114]</a> , however, the names of the property addresses do not match those listed in paragraph 17.5.8.  |
| Q1.11.7                       | The applicant                                 | <b>ES Chapter 17 (Cumulative effects) - assessment methodology</b><br>Paragraph 17.5.9 of ES Chapter 17 <a href="#">[REP1-044]</a> refers to public rights of way (PRoW) which are considered in relation to cumulative effects. Some of the PRoWs have names, such as 'North Buckinghamshire Way', which can be identified on figure 10.5 <a href="#">[AS-031]</a> . However, there are other PRoWs listed without specific names, such as "PRoW between Calvert Rd and HS2", which cannot be identified from the plans. Update paragraph 17.5.9 to include PRoW references so that these can be cross-referenced to the existing plans for identification purposes, or provide a plan which labels the PRoWs with the same descriptions as those used in ES Chapter 17.  |
| Q1.11.8                       | The applicant                                 | <b>ES Chapter 17 (Cumulative effects) - potential error</b><br>Finemerehill House: this property is referred to as "Finmere Hill House" and "Finemerehill House" in ES Chapter 17 <a href="#">[REP1-044]</a> – the ExA assumes this is an error and these are the same property. Review ES Chapter 17 for mistakes and update it accordingly.  |
| Q1.11.9                       | The applicant                                 | <b>ES Chapter 17 (Cumulative effects) - assessment methodology and presentation of effects</b><br>Provide justification or clarification on the following points regarding table 17.6 of ES Chapter 17 <a href="#">[REP1-044]</a> :<br><ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Finemerehill House – why do landscape and visual effects not apply to this receptor, when they are applied to other residential receptors?</li> <li>2. Dry Leys Farmhouse - why do air quality, landscape and visual effects not apply to this receptor, when they applied to other residential receptors?</li> <li>3. Granborough – why is air quality not applied to this receptor?</li> <li>4. The ExA is unclear which significant intra-project effects identified should be considered as being in addition to those significant effects already identified in the individual ES topic areas – update table 17.6 to make this clearer in the last column by setting out which combination of effects leads to significant effects and whether they would be in addition to effects reported already in the other chapters of ES.</li> </ol> |
| Q1.11.10                      | The applicant                                 | <b>ES Chapter 17 (Cumulative effects) - assessment methodology and presentation of effects</b>   |

| ExQ1     | Question to:                          | Question:  |
|----------|---------------------------------------|--|
|          |                                       | Provide justification or clarification on the following points regarding table 17.7 of ES Chapter 17 [REP1-044]: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Designated habitats – why do land and groundwater not apply to this receptor?</li> <li>2. Finemerehill House – why do landscape and visual effects not apply to this receptor, when they are applied to other residential receptors?</li> <li>3. Dry Leys Farmhouse - why does air quality not apply to this receptor, when it applied to other residential receptors?</li> <li>4. The ExA is unclear which significant intra-project effects identified should be considered as being in addition to those significant effects already identified in the individual topic areas – update table 17.7 to make this clearer in the last column by setting out which combination of effects leads to significant effects and whether they would be in addition to effects reported already in the other chapters of ES.</li> </ol>   |
| Q1.11.11 | The applicant                         | <b>ES Chapter 17 (Cumulative effects) - presentation of effects</b><br>Are the significant intra-project cumulative effects listed in paragraphs 17.5.10 and 17.5.11 of ES Chapter 17 [REP1-044] additional significant effects to those already identified in the relevant ES chapters?   |
| Q1.11.12 | National Grid Energy Transmission Plc | <b>ES Chapter 17 (Cumulative effects) - inter-project effects with the proposed replacement National Grid East Claydon substation</b><br>Are the assumptions made regarding the proposed replacement National Grid East Claydon substation accurate in paragraphs 17.6.2, 17.6.6 and 17.6.8 of ES Chapter 17 [REP1-044]? If not, explain which assumptions are incorrect and if they would materially impact the assessments.  |
| Q1.11.13 | The applicant                         | <b>ES Chapter 17 (Cumulative effects) – inter-project effects with the proposed replacement National Grid East Claydon substation</b><br>Provide justification or clarification on the following points regarding table 17.8 of ES Chapter 17 [REP1-044]: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Bechstein’s bat – ES Chapter 7 (Biodiversity) [REP1-036] identifies potentially significant effects on Bechstein’s bats during operation of the proposed development; given the proximity of the proposed replacement substation to the order limits, explain why you have ruled out similar effects for the proposed replacement National Grid East Claydon substation?</li> <li>2. Designated heritage assets – provide greater justification regarding the conclusions on this matter, given that the assessment acknowledges that there would be increased impacts on designated heritage assets in-combination with the replacement National Grid East Claydon substation.</li> </ol>   |
| Q1.11.14 | The applicant                         | <b>ES Chapter 17 (Cumulative effects) – inter-project effects with the proposed replacement National Grid East Claydon substation</b><br>From paragraph 17.6.5, ES Chapter 17 [REP1-044] presents an assessment of the inter-project cumulative effects on the climate. However, the ExA notes that there appears to be no conclusion on whether there would be an inter-project cumulative effect, or not. Update the assessment to provide a conclusion, with justification.   |
| Q1.11.15 | The applicant                         | <b>ES Chapter 17 (Cumulative effects) – inter-project effects with the proposed replacement National Grid East Claydon substation</b><br>From paragraph 17.6.9, ES Chapter 17 [REP1-044] presents an assessment of the inter-project cumulative effects on landscape character and visual amenity. Clarify the following points: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Where the ES identifies that there would be cumulative effects which would be significant adverse, but this is no worse than what was identified for the proposed development, would this be an additional effect which should be offered weight accordingly in the planning balance?</li> <li>2. Paragraph 17.6.109 states that the in-combination effect at year 1 of operation on some PRowS in East Claydon would be major/ moderate “(tending towards major)”. The ES should clearly set out what the significance of effect is on a worst-case scenario basis and not utilise vague wording of this nature. Given that the earlier paragraphs (17.6.105-106) confirm that in-combination with proposed replacement National Grid East Claydon substation, the magnitude of effect would increase, and that the proposed development alone would have major/ moderate effect, further justification is required as to why the in-combination effect has not been reported as a major cumulative effect. Review this matter and update the ES accordingly. Moreover, if the year 1 effect would be major adverse, would this affect the conclusions at year 10 of operation?</li> <li>3. The ES states that cumulative effects during decommissioning on landscape and visual amenity would be similar to, or no greater than those identified during construction – should the same weight therefore be offered to any effects identified during decommissioning as there have been identified during construction of the proposed development?</li> </ol> |
| Q1.11.16 | The applicant                         | <b>ES Chapter 17 (Cumulative effects) – inter-project effects with other development</b><br>Explain the conclusions drawn in table 17.10 and 17.15 of ES Chapter 17 [REP1-044] that there would be no heavy goods vehicle (HGV) movements during construction, when table 15.7 of ES Chapter 15 [APP-058] shows that there would be a number of HGV movements associated with the proposed development.  |
| Q1.11.17 | The applicant                         | <b>ES Chapter 17 (Cumulative effects) – inter-project effects with other development</b>   |

| ExQ1     | Question to:  | Question:   |
|----------|---------------|---|
|          |               | Table 17.11 of ES Chapter 17 [REP1-044] does not define the inter-project effects with other development for the different phases of the proposed development. Update the table and supporting information to identify the likely inter-project cumulative effects during each phase of the proposed development to ensure consistency with the rest of the ES.   |
| Q1.11.18 | The applicant | <b>ES Chapter 17 (Cumulative effects) - inter-project effects with other development</b><br>Paragraph 17.7.17 of ES Chapter 17 [REP1-044] refers to habitat mitigation being provided for ground nesting birds during the construction phase – direct the ExA to where in the control documents this is captured specifically during the construction phase.  |
| Q1.11.19 | The applicant | <b>ES Chapter 17 (Cumulative effects) – inter-project effects with other development</b><br>Explain further what ES Chapter 17 [REP1-044] paragraph 17.7.20 means by the inter-project cumulative effects on ground nesting birds being an “independent” effect. Whilst the ES has not identified significant adverse effects on ground nesting birds as a result of the proposed development, would minor adverse effects as a result of the proposed development still contribute to cumulative inter-project effects? If not, why not?   |
| Q1.11.20 | The applicant | <b>ES Chapter 17 (Cumulative effects) – inter-project effects with other development</b><br>Table 17.12 of ES Chapter 17 [REP1-044] presents an assessment of the inter-project cumulative effects with other development on cultural heritage. Clarify the following points:<br><ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Minor adverse effect on Finemerehill House in-combination with High Speed Rail 2 – would the cumulative effects represent substantial or less than substantial harm to this heritage asset? If this represents less than substantial harm, what level of harm on the scale of less than substantial would this be?</li> <li>2. Minor adverse effects on various heritage assets in-combination with East West Rail - would the cumulative effects represent substantial or less than substantial harm to these heritage assets? If this represents less than substantial harm, what level of harm on the scale of less than substantial would this be? Confirm specifically which heritage assets would be affected by these cumulative effects.</li> <li>3. Minor adverse effects on Botolph Conservation Area in-combination with Longbreach Solar Farm - would the cumulative effects preserve or enhance the conservation area in accordance with regulation 3 of the Infrastructure Planning (Decisions) Regulations 2010?</li> <li>4. Minor adverse effects on the scheduled monument of the Deserted Medieval Village at Fulbrook Farm - would the cumulative effects represent substantial or less than substantial harm to this heritage asset? If this represents less than substantial harm, what level of harm on the scale of less than substantial would this be?</li> </ol> |
| Q1.11.21 | The applicant | <b>ES Chapter 17 (Cumulative effects) – inter-project effects with other development</b><br>ES Chapter 17 [REP1-044] identifies that there would not be a significant effect on below ground archaeological remains - given that archaeological remains can be classified as non-designated heritage assets, confirm the extent of any potential effect on these items, such as a negligible or minor adverse effect.   |
| Q1.11.22 | The applicant | <b>ES Chapter 17 (Cumulative effects) – inter-project effects with other development</b><br>The ExA is unclear regarding the significance of the inter-project cumulative effects with other developments on soils from ES Chapter 17 [REP1-044] – are there significant effects, and if so, would they be major or moderate? Set out which other projects would contribute to significant effect and for which phases of the proposed development this would relate to.  |
| Q1.11.23 | The applicant | <b>ES Chapter 17 (Cumulative effects) – inter-project effects with other development</b><br>The ExA is unclear regarding the significance of the inter-project cumulative effects with other developments on traffic from ES Chapter 17 [REP1-044] – are there significant effects, and if so, would they be major or moderate? Set out which other projects would contribute to any significant effect and for which phases of the proposed development this would relate to.  |
| Q1.11.24 | The applicant | <b>ES Chapter 17 (Cumulative effects) – inter-project effects with other development</b><br>There are various instances where ES Chapter 17 [REP1-044] identifies cumulative inter-project effects which would not be significant, but does not clarify if these would be ‘no effect, negligible, minor, or minor/ moderate’. Update the ES to quantify the cumulative inter-project effects identified.  |
| Q1.11.25 | The applicant | <b>ES Chapter 17 (Cumulative effects) – inter-project effects with other development</b><br>Table 17.3 of ES Chapter 17 [REP1-044] provides a summary of the effects presented in Appendix 17.2: Landscape and Visual Inter-project Cumulative Effects Assessment [REP1-074]. Review both documents alongside each other to ensure that any findings reported in table 17.3 reflect those identified in the main body of Appendix 17.2 [REP1-074] and are also robustly justified; give a clear explanation for the conclusions of the cumulative effects on each landscape character area and for visual receptors, for each phase of the proposed development. At present, there appears to be discrepancies between the conclusions in the documents and there are instances where conclusions have not been sufficiently justified. For example the following are identified:   |

| ExQ1     | Question to:            | Question:  |
|----------|-------------------------|--|
|          |                         | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Major/ moderate adverse effects are identified on recreational users of PRowS between Botolph Claydon and Runt's Wood during construction in table 17.3, but this does not appear to be assessed or explained in Appendix 17.2.</li> <li>2. Table 17.3 suggests that there would be a major/ moderate adverse effect on PRowS between East Claydon/ East Claydon Road and within Parcel 3, in-combination with Littleton Manor Farm at year 1 of operation, but this does not appear to be reflected in the assessment in Appendix 17.2.</li> <li>3. Table 17.3 suggests for recreational users of PRow between Steeple Claydon and Calvert Road there would be moderate/ minor adverse effect in combination with Littleton Manor Farm which would be significant. The ExA queries whether the corresponding section which considers this matter in Appendix 17.2 is 'PRow and roads between Steeple Claydon/ Queen Catherine Road and Calvert Road'? If so, Appendix 17.2 suggests that Littleton Manor Farm is not taken forward in the assessment.</li> </ol> <p>(also see question Q1.11.29)</p>              |
| Q1.11.26 | The applicant           | <p><b>ES Chapter 17 (Cumulative effects) – mitigation hierarchy</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Explain how you have followed the mitigation hierarchy regarding cumulative effects and why additional significant cumulative effects cannot be avoided.</li> <li>2. What measures do you propose to mitigate any of the identified cumulative effects? If you are not proposing any, why not, and set out how this would meet with the requirements of the mitigation hierarchy.</li> </ol>   |
| Q1.11.27 | The applicant           | <p><b>Appendix 17.3: Cumulative Visualisations</b></p> <p>How did you determine which viewpoints to provide visualisations of the cumulative effects for Appendix 17.3 Cumulative Visualisations [APP-136]? The ExA notes that significant inter-project cumulative effects were identified at North Buckinghamshire Way and The Midshires Way in relation to Viewpoints 21, 22, 25, 27 and 29 [REP1-074], however, none of these viewpoints were selected to provide a cumulative visualisation, why is that the case?</p>  |
| Q1.11.28 | The applicant           | <p><b>Appendix 17.2: Landscape and Visual Inter-project Cumulative Effects Assessment</b></p> <p>Update Appendix 17.2: Landscape and Visual Inter-project Cumulative Effects Assessment [REP1-074] to refer to the viewpoints which are relevant to that particular landscape character area for the cumulative effects in section 3.2.</p>  |
| Q1.11.29 | The applicant           | <p><b>Appendix 17.2: Landscape and Visual Inter-project Cumulative Effects Assessment</b></p> <p>Table 2 of Appendix 17.2: Landscape and Visual Inter-project Cumulative Effects Assessment [REP1-074] does not appear to accurately present the effects identified in sections 3 and 4 of the report. For example, significant cumulative effects are identified at as a result of Longbreach Solar Farm at paragraphs 3.2.30, 3.2.66, 3.3.31, 3.3.67, 4.2.10, 4.2.60, 4.2.77, 4.2.87, 4.2.111, however they are not reported in table 2. Review the document to accurately report the effects or explain why they have not been reported in table 2 as this is not clear to the ExA. Review all of the document to ensure that the cumulative effects are accurately reported in table 2.</p> <p>The conclusions summarised in table 17.13 of ES Chapter 17 [REP1-044] do not appear to align with the conclusions drawn in table 2 of Appendix 17.2: Landscape and Visual Inter-project Cumulative Effects Assessment [REP1-074]. Review the documents to ensure that they align or explain why these differences occur. (also see question Q1.11.25)</p> |
| Q1.11.30 | Buckinghamshire Council | <p><b>ES Chapter 17 (Cumulative effects)</b></p> <p>In your Local Impact Report [REP1-112] you state that the applicant's cumulative effects chapter "fails to provide a proportionate or accurate evaluation of the cumulative harm arising in this location". Provide more information on this position – specify how the applicant's assessment methodology, or the conclusions it draws are unacceptable, or fail to meet relevant guidance for example.</p>   |
| Q1.11.31 | Buckinghamshire Council | <p><b>Cumulative effects on soil and agriculture</b></p> <p>Provide additional justification for your position [REP1-112] that the proposed development would result in negative cumulative effects on soil and agriculture – do you consider the applicant's assessment in this regard to be inadequate and if so, set out why? Do you consider any negative effects are likely to be significant, and if so, explain why?</p>  |
| Q1.11.32 | The applicant           | <p><b>Update to the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan</b></p> <p>In your response to the relevant representations [PDA-006], you stated that the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) [REP1-078] would be updated to commit to consultation with nearby developments prior to construction on programmes and at the discharge of requirements phase to manage interactions and reduce any associated impacts. Direct the ExA to where in the oCEMP this has been captured. If it has not been, explain why not.</p>   |
| Q1.11.33 | Buckinghamshire Council | <p><b>Updated Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan</b></p>  |

| ExQ1  | Question to:                           | Question:   |
|---|--|---|
|   |  | Do the updates to the Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan <a href="#">[REP1-079]</a> setting out the applicant's proposed operational phase noise complaints procedure satisfy the concerns you identified in your relevant representation <a href="#">[RR-026]</a> regarding cumulative noise impacts? If not, set out why and what could be actioned to resolve this matter.  |
| <b>12. The draft Development Consent Order (dDCO)</b>   |  |   |
| Note: questions/ comments below relate to dDCO Rev 2 <a href="#">[REP1-008]</a> (clean)/ <a href="#">[REP1-009]</a> (tracked) |  |   |
| The Examining Authority's suggested changes or amendments to the dDCO are identified in red in the questions below.           |  |   |
| Q1.12.1   | The applicant                          | <p><b>Explanatory Memorandum (EM)</b></p> <p>The Examining Authority (ExA) considers that overall, insufficient information has been provided in the EM <a href="#">[AS-012]</a> to sufficiently justify various elements of the wording used in the dDCO. The ExA has set out specific examples below which need addressing, but also requests that the applicant reviews the EM and provides more robust justification for wording used in the dDCO; full justification should be provided for each power and provision, taking into account the facts of <b>this particular Development Consent Order (DCO) application</b>. Where drafting precedents in previous made DCOs have been relied on, these should be checked to identify whether they have been subsequently refined or developed by more recent DCOs so that the DCO provisions reflect the Secretary of State's (SoS) current policy preferences. If any general provisions (other than works descriptions and other drafting bespoke to the facts of this particular application and dDCO) differ in any way from corresponding provisions in the SoS's most recent made DCOs, an explanation should be provided as to how and why they differ. Furthermore, stating that wording has been used from previously made DCOs is not sufficient on its own to justify similar or the same wording in the dDCO – an explanation should also be included as to why that wording is necessary for the specific circumstances of the proposed development.</p> |
| Q1.12.2   | The applicant                          | <p><b>EM</b></p> <p>Paragraph 1.1.5 of the EM <a href="#">[AS-012]</a> refers to upcoming amendments to the law which came into force on 31 December 2025 to increase the output capacity threshold for nationally significant infrastructure project generating stations which generate electricity directly from sunlight, from 50 megawatts (MW) to 100MW. However, the change does not apply to such generating stations having a capacity when constructed of not more than 100MW, if the application was accepted before but not decided before 31 December 2025. Update the EM accordingly.</p>  |
| Q1.12.3   | The applicant                          | <p><b>EM</b></p> <p>Paragraph 1.6.12 of the EM <a href="#">[AS-012]</a> refers to various plans having control over decommissioning. However, requirements 15 and 17 of the dDCO referred to in this paragraph do not refer to decommissioning. Review both documents and update them accordingly.</p>  |
| Q1.12.4   | The applicant                          | <p><b>EM</b></p> <p>Paragraph 3.3.4 of the EM <a href="#">[AS-012]</a> references section 172 of the Planning Act 2008. Should this refer to section 127 of the Planning Act 2008? Update the EM accordingly.</p>   |
| Q1.12.5   | The applicant                          | <p><b>EM</b></p> <p>Paragraph 4.5.2 of the EM <a href="#">[AS-012]</a> suggests that article 49 is a "Crown Rights" article, but no Crown Rights article appears in the dDCO, so this reference in the EM appears to be an error. Review the document and update it accordingly.</p>  |
| Q1.12.6   | The applicant, Buckinghamshire Council | <p><b>EM</b></p> <p>Paragraph 5.2.3 of the EM <a href="#">[AS-012]</a> refers to the need for the Local Planning Authority, rather than the applicant needing to consult third parties to discharge some of the proposed requirements in the dDCO. Can the applicant confirm whether this approach has been accepted in any previously made DCOs and can Buckinghamshire Council confirm whether it would accept this arrangement.</p>  |
| Q1.12.7   | The applicant                          | <p><b>EM</b></p> <p>Review paragraph 5.2.9 of the EM <a href="#">[AS-012]</a> to ensure that it correctly references the relevant parts of requirement 2 of the dDCO.</p>   |
| Q1.12.8   | The applicant                          | <p><b>Outline landscape and ecological management plan</b></p> <p>In the dDCO, the Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan <a href="#">[REP1-086]</a> is referred to as the "outline landscape and ecology management plan", which differs slightly from the title of the actual document. For accuracy update the dDCO accordingly.</p>   |
| Q1.12.9   | Buckinghamshire Council                | <b>Additional provision within the dDCO</b>   |

| ExQ1        | Question to:    | Question:   |
|-------------|-----------------|---|
|             |                 | In your Local Impact Report (LIR) <a href="#">[REP1-112]</a> you requested a provision which allows for a bond to be taken through a section 278 Highways Authority 1980 agreement, which would allow the Highway Authority to safeguard against works that do not meet adoptable standards. Provide wording which you consider would suitably address this point and set out where in the dDCO you would wish to see this included, with justification for its inclusion.  |
| <b>12.1</b> | <b>Articles</b> |   |
| Q1.12.10    | The applicant   | <b>Article 2. Interpretation</b><br>Should the definition of 'maintain' be amended to include reference to the development not giving rise to any materially new or materially different effects to those set out in the Environmental Statement (ES)? The ExA notes that similar wording which captures this point has been included in The Tillbridge Solar Order 2025 and The Oaklands Farm Solar Park Order 2025. If not, explain why you do not consider this to be necessary.   |
| Q1.12.11    | The applicant   | <b>Article 2. Interpretation</b><br>Should the definition of 'NGET' be updated to include "... or any successor as a licence holder within the meaning of Part 1 of the 1989 Act"? The ExA notes that the definition of NGET for The Tillbridge Solar Order 2025 and The Fenwick Solar Farm Order 2026 includes wording to this effect. If not, explain why you do not consider this to be necessary.   |
| Q1.12.12    | The applicant   | <b>Article 2. Interpretation</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The ExA has concerns regarding the extent of works included under the definition of 'permitted preliminary works' and whether it has been adequately demonstrated that they would not have environmental impacts which would need to be controlled by requirements. The ExA also draws the applicant's attention to recently made DCOs which do not contain the same extent of 'permitted preliminary works' (or works of a similar description) to those which are proposed in the dDCO, such as the The Helios Renewable Energy Project Order 2025, The Stonestreet Green Solar Order 2025 and The Tillbridge Solar Order 2025. For example, how could the applicant ensure that access works ((i) Work No. 9) or diversions of public rights of way (j) would not have environmental impacts which would need to be controlled?</li> <li>Provide further justification for the extent of the works included in the definition of 'permitted preliminary works' in the EM <a href="#">[AS-012]</a> and review the definition to reduce the extent of the 'permitted preliminary works' if possible. The ExA draws the applicant's attention to section 5.7.21 of PINS <a href="#">Advice Note 15: drafting development consent orders</a>.</li> <li>The ExA also notes that there is no reference in the definition of 'permitted preliminary works' for advance planting or screening mitigation to be planted. Paragraph 4.3.15 of the Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) <a href="#">[APP-145]</a>, table 10.9 of ES Chapter 10 (Landscape and Visual) <a href="#">[APP-053]</a> and table 9.8 of ES Chapter 9 (Cultural Heritage) <a href="#">[APP-052]</a> propose advance planting mitigation – explain how it is envisaged that the proposed development could deliver advance planting in practice and at what stage of the proposed development with the wording of dDCO at present?</li> </ol>  |
| Q1.12.13    | The applicant   | <b>Article 6. Disapplication and modification of statutory provisions</b><br><b>6(1):</b> why does the wording of this article disapply the provisions listed during decommissioning of the proposed development? Provide further justification.<br><b>6(1)(e):</b> what is the justification for the disapplication of these powers?<br><br><b>6(3):</b> what is the justification for the disapplication of these powers when the dDCO lists the hedgerows to be removed? Notwithstanding this, should the wording read: "Regulation 6 (permitted work) of the Hedgerows Regulations 1997 is modified so as to read for the purposes of this Order only as if there were inserted after paragraph (1)(j) the following...", rather than refer to paragraph (e)? If not, explain why not.<br><br><b>6(5) – (8):</b> it appears that these powers are intended to allow development not authorised by the dDCO to be carried out within the order limits pursuant to planning permission and would appear to obviate the need, in such circumstances, to apply to change the dDCO (through section 153 of the Planning Act 2008). In 6(8) it appears that the reference to "paragraph (3)" ought to be amended to "paragraph (6)" regarding "enforcement action".<br>The ExA notes that the provisions in articles 6(5) to 6(8) appear similar to ones removed from other dDCOs recently by the SoS for the Department for Energy Security and Net Zero (DESNZ) because it considered it unnecessary and that it may create potential ambiguity (such as the removal of the applicant's proposed article 46 'inconsistent planning permissions' from The Byers Gill Solar Order 2025). On this basis, provide justification for why these powers are considered necessary for this specific project. The ExA directs the applicant to section 5.11.25 of PINS <a href="#">Advice Note 15: drafting development consent orders</a> .<br>For each power sought to be disappplied, the following information should be provided: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the purpose of the legislation/ statutory provision</li> <li>the persons or body having the power being disappplied</li> </ol> |

| ExQ1     | Question to:                              | Question:  |
|----------|---|--|
|          |   | <p>3. an explanation as to the effect of disapplication and whether any protective provisions or requirements are required to prevent any adverse impact arising as a result of disapplying the legislative controls</p> <p>4. (by reference to section 120 of and schedule 5 to the Planning Act 2008) how each disappplied provision constitutes a matter for which provision may be made in the dDCO</p> <p>5. where the consent falls within a schedule to the Infrastructure Planning (Interested Parties and Miscellaneous Prescribed Provisions) Regulations 2015, evidence that the regulator has consented to removing the need for the consent in accordance with section 150 of the Planning Act 2008 should be provided</p>  |
| Q1.12.14 | Buckinghamshire Council                   | <p><b>Article 7. Defence to proceedings in respect of statutory nuisance</b></p> <p>Are you satisfied with the wording of article 7 of the dDCO and satisfied that controls on noise elsewhere in the dDCO are sufficient to justify the defence being provided by this article to statutory nuisance claims relating to noise? If not, explain why not and what changes you suggest could be made to overcome any concerns you have.</p>  |
| Q1.12.15 | The applicant                             | <p><b>Article 10. Power to alter layout, etc., of streets</b></p> <p><b>10(1):</b> should this part of the article read as follows: “The undertaker may for the purposes of the authorised development temporarily alter the layout of or carry out any works in the street in the case of the streets specified in column 2 of the table in Schedule 5 (alteration of streets) and permanently in the manner specified in relation to that street in column 3.” If not, why not?</p> <p><b>10(2):</b> should this article also refer to the ability to “alter, remove, replace and relocate any street furniture, including bollards, lighting columns, road signs and chevron signs”? If not, why not?</p> <p>As currently drafted, article 10 would extend to allowing the undertaker to alter the layout of streets outside the order limits (as well as streets within the order limits). Explain why all highways works cannot be defined within the dDCO and why the extent of this power is needed, specifically in relation to the proposed development.</p>  |
| Q1.12.16 | The applicant                             | <p><b>Article 12. Temporary prohibition or restriction on use of streets and public rights of way</b></p> <p>Notwithstanding other precedents, justification should be provided as to why the power is appropriate and proportionate having regard to the impacts on pedestrians and others of authorising temporary working sites in these streets – for example, the EM <a href="#">[AS-012]</a> cites precedents for the wording of 12(6), but does not give information on why this power is needed specifically for the proposed development. Provide more information to justify the extent of this power, with specific reference to the circumstances of the proposed development.</p> <p><b>12(5):</b> provide more information on what is meant by ‘temporary working site’ and to what extent the impacts from these have been assessed more widely in the ES, such as (but not limited to) noise effects on sensitive receptors, ecological effects and landscape and visual effects. If these impacts have not been assessed, justify why this power should be included in the dDCO.</p> <p><b>12(8):</b> if a public right of way referred to in paragraph (3) was restricted using this power more than once, would the undertaker be required to consult the street authority before doing so after the first time it was restricted? If so, how is this captured by the current drafting? If not, why would this not be deemed necessary?</p> |
| Q1.12.17 | Buckinghamshire Council                   | <p><b>Article 12. Temporary prohibition or restriction on use of streets and public rights of way</b></p> <p>In your LIR <a href="#">[REP1-112]</a>, you express concerns that there is insufficient security to ensure that the applicant would be required to return the streets and/ or public rights of way to the same condition as prior to their use for temporary works purposes. You consider that a provision in article 12 to achieve this may be appropriate. Provide wording which you consider could suitably address this concern.</p>  |
| Q1.12.18 | The applicant                             | <p><b>Article 13. Permanent stopping up and diverting of public rights of way</b></p> <p><b>13(2)(b):</b> to what extent have the effects from temporary alternative routes, diverting public rights of way which would be captured by this article been assessed in the ES? How long could these temporary alternative routes be in place for? The article refers to the need for the street authority to be “reasonably satisfied” with the proposed alternative temporary routes – what is the process for the street authority to confirm its satisfaction with the proposed alternative? Why is this part of the article needed – the EM provides little explanation of why this would be required.</p>   |
| Q1.12.19 | The applicant,<br>Buckinghamshire Council | <p><b>Article 17. Traffic regulation measures</b></p> <p><b>17(6):</b> should this article also include a requirement to display a site notice prior to the provision taking effect? If not, why not?</p>  |
| Q1.12.20 | The applicant                             | <p><b>Article 21. Removal of human remains</b></p> <p>In recently made DCOs, the SoS for the DESNZ removed similar worded articles. Provide additional justification for why the circumstances differ for the proposed development and why this article should be included in the dDCO.</p>  |

| ExQ1     | Question to:  | Question:   |
|----------|---------------|---|
|          |               | <b>(2)(a) and (b):</b> there is no timeframe specified in which the newspaper notice and site notice should be displayed in advance of any proposed removal of human remains. Review the wording of the article and update it to include an appropriately justified timeframe.  |
| Q1.12.21 | The applicant | <p><b>Article 24. Compulsory acquisition of rights</b></p> <p>Article 24 would enable compulsory acquisition of new rights over all of the Order land, with a schedule which limits the compulsory acquisition power in defined plots to the defined rights listed in that schedule (Schedule 9).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Expand on the reasons for seeking undefined rights in land not listed in schedule 9 as outlined in the Explanatory Memorandum <a href="#">[AS-012]</a> and Statement of Reasons <a href="#">[REP1-010]</a>.</li> <li>Provide evidence to show that persons with an interest in the Order land were aware that undefined new rights were being sought over all of the Order land and were consulted on that basis.</li> </ol>   |
| Q1.12.22 | The applicant | <p><b>Article 31. Temporary use of land for constructing the authorised development and Article 32. Temporary use of land for maintaining the authorised development</b></p> <p>Whilst the ExA notes the applicant's existing commentary on this issue, including during compulsory acquisition hearing 1 (CAH1) <a href="#">[REP1-107]</a>:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>provide further justification for wider powers which allow temporary possession of land not listed in schedule 11</li> <li>explain what steps have been taken to alert all affected persons in the Order land to the possibility of temporary possession</li> </ol> <p>In addition:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide justification for the provisions in article 31 (5) that outline exemptions from the removal of temporary works and the restoration of land. Should this article include an explicit commitment to remove all equipment and vehicles in addition to temporary works before giving up possession of land? If not, why not?</li> </ol> <p>Furthermore:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In the context of the notice period of 3 months identified in the Neighbourhood Planning Act (NPA) 2017 (not yet in force), provide further justification for the 28 days proposed to be required under articles 31(3) and 32(3).</li> <li>Under the NPA 2017, the notice of temporary possession would also have to state the period for which the acquiring authority is to take possession. Should such a requirement be included in the dDCO? If not, why not?</li> <li>The provisions of the NPA 2017 Act include the ability to serve a counter-notice objecting to the proposed temporary possession so that the landowner would have the option to choose whether temporary possession or permanent acquisition was desirable. Should articles 31 and 32 of the dDCO make such provision? If not, why not?</li> </ol> |
| Q1.12.23 | The applicant | <p><b>Article 36. Benefit of the Order</b></p> <p>Could the definition of 'grid connection works' which is referred to be more defined within article 2? The ExA draws the applicant's attention to the wording "to the extent work numbers 8, 9 and 10 are necessary in connection with work number 6" and query whether this could be better defined?</p>   |
| Q1.12.24 | The applicant | <p><b>Article 40. Felling or lopping of trees and removal of hedgerows</b></p> <p><b>40(4):</b> this article refers to the "...the landscape and ecology management plan approved pursuant to requirement 8 in Schedule 2 (requirements)...". The ExA assumes that this is an error and should refer to requirement 7, rather than requirement 8 which relates to the provision of details for fencing and means of enclosure?</p> <p>The dDCO as drafted does not provide a schedule of trees which are likely to be affected, why is this? Could this be included?</p>  |
| Q1.12.25 | The applicant | <p><b>Article 41. Trees subject to tree preservation orders</b></p> <p>PINS <a href="#">Advice Notice 15: drafting Development Consent Orders</a> section 15.8.22 states trees subject to a tree protection order (TPO) and/ or are otherwise protected (and likely to be affected) should be specifically identified and it is not appropriate for this power to be included on a precautionary basis. However, the EM <a href="#">[AS-012]</a> effectively states that this article has been added on a precautionary basis, in the event that a TPO has been made since the submission of the application for the proposed development. Explain how this article meets the requirements of the aforementioned guidance in this regard.</p>   |

| ExQ1  | Question to:  | Question:   |
|---|---------------|---|
|   |               | <b>41(1):</b> update the wording in this part of the article to provide a more defined date after which the powers would apply to (i.e. the day in September 2025). Explain why this power is necessary for decommissioning – the ExA notes that in other recently made DCOs, similarly worded articles did not include the decommissioning phase.  |
| <b>12.2 Schedule 1 – Authorised development</b> |               |   |
| Q1.12.26  | The applicant | <p><b>1. Definitions</b></p> <p>Should the definition for ‘main collector compound’ read: “...connects Work Nos. 1, 3 and 4 to Work No. 2A to enable collection of electricity and transmission of electricity from and to Work No. 1, Work No. 2A and Work No. 4;”? If not, why not?</p> <p>Should the definition for ‘satellite collector compound’ read “...means a compound with electrical equipment required to collect electricity from the balance of solar system (BoSS) plant in Work No.1 which transmits it to Work No. 2A or Work No. 5, sitting on concrete pads or concrete columns;”? If not, why not?</p>  |
| Q1.12.27  | The applicant | <p><b>2. Authorised development</b></p> <p><b>Work No. 2A(a)(iii):</b> provide additional information on what the term ‘ancillary structures’ could cover. Provide justification for why this wording is needed in the dDCO.</p> <p><b>Work No. 2A(a)(v):</b> should this also include provision for fire safety infrastructure more generally (rather than just reference to transformers and barriers) and should this also be referred to in Work No. 3? If not, why not?</p> <p><b>Work No. 6(a):</b> should this read “...works to lay electrical cables including 400 kilovolt cables connecting Work No. 2A into the National Grid East Claydon Substation...”? If not, why not?</p> |
| Q1.12.28  | The applicant | <p><b>Further associated development</b></p> <p>Provide justification for the proposed works included under “In connection with and in addition to Work Nos. 1 to 10 further associated development within the Order limits” – the ExA note that no explanation is given in the EM <a href="#">[AS-012]</a> for these works.</p>  |
| <b>12.3 Schedule 2 - Requirements</b>           |               |   |
| Q1.12.29  | The applicant | <p><b>General</b></p> <p>A number of the proposed requirements require the submission of detailed management plans which must be ‘substantially’ in accordance with outline plans which have been submitted with the application. Provide justification for the inclusion of the word ‘substantially’. Could this allow for changes to the approved documents which would lead to effects which have not been assessed in the ES? If not, how is this controlled?</p>   |
| Q1.12.30  | The applicant | <p><b>4. Detailed design approval</b></p> <p>As drafted, requirement 4 could allow for Work No. 9 to take place prior to the approval of detailed design approval, despite requirement 4(1)(f) requiring approval of such details. Moreover, it would also allow works listed under ‘further associated development’ such as boundary treatments, bunds, surface water drainage systems, internal access tracks, landscaping measures and other works to take place which may need to be controlled by detailed design. Review the wording of this requirement or provide justification for your approach.</p>  |
| Q1.12.31  | The applicant | <p><b>7. Landscape and ecological management plan (LEMP)</b></p> <p>As drafted, requirement 7 would allow for the following preliminary permitted works to commence prior to the submission of the detailed LEMP: (a) – (g) and (j). Explain how these preliminary works would not have effects which should be controlled through the detailed LEMP – for example, could site preparation works or temporary means of enclosure lead to a loss of biodiversity, impact on habitats or have an effect on landscape character?</p>   |
| Q1.12.32  | The applicant | <p><b>8. Fencing and other means of enclosure</b></p> <p><b>8(2):</b> the ExA considers the drafting of this requirement to be confusing regarding the timing of when detailed information needs to be submitted. Review the wording to ensure that this information is clearer – the ExA directs the applicant’s attention to The Tillbridge Solar Order 2025 which separated out temporary construction fencing and permanent operational fencing.</p>  |
| Q1.12.33  | The applicant | <p><b>9. Drainage</b></p> <p>Should the requirement refer to the type of drainage information sought, ie the provision of details on “surface water” drainage? The ExA note that details of foul drainage are not referred to in this, or any other requirement. Why is this?</p>   |
| Q1.12.34  | The applicant | <p><b>11. Construction environmental management plan (CEMP)</b></p> <p><b>11(1):</b> why is the wording regarding consultation with the Environment Agency (EA) different to that of other requirements, ie why is the wording not drafted “...in consultation with the Environment Agency...”? Why are Natural England, and the local highways authority not listed as consultees on this requirement?</p>   |

| ExQ1  | Question to:  | Question:   |
|---|---|---|
|   |   | <b>11(4):</b> as drafted, requirement 11 would allow for the following preliminary permitted works to commence prior to the submission of the detailed CEMP: (a) – (h) and (j) – (k). Explain how these preliminary works would not have effects which should be controlled through the detailed CEMP – could these works impact on ecology for example?  |
| Q1.12.35  | The applicant   | <b>12. Operational environmental management plan</b><br><b>12(1):</b> why is the wording regarding consultation with the EA different to that of other requirements ie why is the wording not drafted “...in consultation with the Environment Agency...”? Should Natural England, and the local highways authority be listed as consultees on this requirement? If not, why not?   |
| Q1.12.36  | The applicant<br><br>National Highways<br>Buckinghamshire Council | <b>13. Construction traffic management plan (CTMP)</b><br><b>13(4):</b> as drafted, requirement 13 would allow for the following preliminary permitted works to commence prior to the submission of the detailed CTMP: (a) – (h) and (j) – (k). Explain how these preliminary works would not have effects which should be controlled through the detailed CTMP.<br>Should the requirement include the need for the relevant planning authority to consult with National Highways prior to approving relevant parts of the construction traffic management plan? If not, why not?   |
| Q1.12.37  | The applicant   | <b>16. Rights of way and access strategy</b><br>Is there anything in the drafting of this requirement which would prevent the landowner from preventing access to permissive paths during operation of the proposed development? If there is not, should there be?  |
| Q1.12.38  | The applicant   | <b>17. Soil management plan</b><br>Should Natural England be consulted on the detailed soil management plan? If not, why not?   |
| Q1.12.39  | The applicant   | <b>18. Decommissioning and restoration</b><br><b>(1)(a):</b> should this read: “...with respect to each phase of Work No. 1 must be no later than 40 years following the date of final commissioning as notified to the relevant planning authority pursuant to requirement 2(6)...”? If not, why not?  |
| <b>12.4 Schedule 3 – Legislation to be disapplied</b>             |   |   |
| Q1.12.40  | The applicant   | <b>General</b><br>Provide more information in the EM <a href="#">[AS-012]</a> as to why the legislation in this schedule is incompatible with the powers contained in the order.  |
| <b>12.5 Schedule 13 – Documents and plans to be certified</b>     |   |   |
| Q1.12.41  | The applicant   | <b>General</b><br>A relatively small number of documents to be certified are included in schedule 13 of the dDCO in comparison to the The Tillbridge Solar Order 2025 for example, which certified a far greater number of documents, including ES chapters, appendices, the Habitats Regulation Assessment, Flood Risk Assessment, indicative layout, figures etc – will a similar approach be taken for the dDCO at a later stage? If not, why not?   |
| <b>12.6 Schedule 14 – Arbitration rules</b>                       |   |   |
| Q1.12.42  | The applicant   | <b>Confidentiality</b><br><b>7(1):</b> why is it proposed that any arbitration hearings would take place in private? The ExA note that for other recently made DCOs this would not be the case and any arbitration case would be open to and accessible by the public, unless commercial sensitivity called for a private hearing.  |
| <b>12.7 Schedule 15 – Protective provisions</b>                   |   |   |
| Q1.12.43  | Anglian Water Services Limited                                    | <b>Suitability of protective provisions</b><br>In the draft Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) <a href="#">[REP1-029]</a> between you and the applicant, the applicant suggests that protective provisions would address and manage interfaces between the proposed development and your assets within the order limits, therefore there would be no additional benefit in repeating information related to the management of any interfaces between your assets and the proposed development in the relevant outline management plans. These comments are specifically in relation to requirements 11, 12, 13 and 18 of the dDCO. Do you agree or disagree with these statements? |
| <b>12.8 Schedule 16 - Procedure for discharge of requirements</b> |   |   |
| Q1.12.44  | Buckinghamshire Council   | <b>General</b><br>The ExA notes your comments in the LIR <a href="#">[REP1-112]</a> regarding schedule 16 of the dDCO and the concerns identified. The ExA also notes that you intend to liaise with the applicant to attempt to reach an agreed position on the matter - provide an update on these negotiations. If you have not been able to progress  |

| ExQ1                            | Question to:   | Question:   |
|---------------------------------|--|---|
|                                 |  | this matter to a satisfactory outcome with the applicant, set out how you would wish to see the wording of schedule 16 amended and justification for these changes.   |
| Q1.12.45                        | The applicant  | <b>1. Interpretation</b><br>Should 'discharge' and the 'relevant planning authority' be defined in the interpretation? If not, why not?   |
| Q1.12.46                        | Buckinghamshire Council, the applicant                 | <b>2. Applications made under requirement</b><br><b>Buckinghamshire Council</b><br><b>2(1):</b> would you be satisfied to accept applications for discharge of requirements by email?<br><br><b>the applicant</b><br><b>2(2):</b> provide justification for the inclusion of this wording in the dDCO - if the details submitted to discharge a requirement resulted in materially different environmental effects, would this mean that details would be in conflict with the approved information?<br><b>2(5):</b> have the relevant consultees captured by this wording confirmed their agreement to accept notification via email? If not, this should be obtained. |
| Q1.12.47                        | The applicant  | <b>4. Appeals</b><br><b>4(3):</b> provide justification for the timeframe of 5 working days to notify the appeal parties in writing specifying the further information required. In other recently made DCOs, the wording "as soon as practicable" has been used to define this timeframe – would this be a suitable timeframe for notification? If not, why not?   |
| <b>13. Health and wellbeing</b> |  |   |
| Q1.13.1                         | Buckinghamshire Council and any other interested party | <b>Health Effects Report</b><br>Provide a view on the Health Effects Report at annex A of the Health and Wellbeing Summary Statement <a href="#">[REP1-056]</a> submitted at deadline 1.  |
| Q1.13.2                         | Claydons Solar Action Group                            | <b>Effects on health and wellbeing</b><br>In paragraph 6.39 in part 3 of your deadline 1 submission <a href="#">[REP1-127]</a> you state that "In my opinion, the proposed development would significantly adversely affect people's health and wellbeing, and the quality of their lives". Provide additional clarity on this statement – who specifically does this relate to and justify why you consider that there would be significant adverse effects on health and wellbeing?   |
| Q1.13.3                         | The applicant  | <b>Health Effects Report</b><br>Explain how the conclusions in annex A of the Health and Wellbeing Summary Statement <a href="#">[REP1-056]</a> consider the worst-case scenario in terms of receptor sensitivity.  |
| Q1.13.4                         | The applicant  | <b>Health Effects Report</b><br>Explain whether the effects identified in annex A of the Health and Wellbeing Summary Statement <a href="#">[REP1-056]</a> on individual receptors (such as residential properties) consider if the inhabitants could be vulnerable members of the community with higher receptor sensitivities. If they do not, why does the assessment not consider this?   |
| Q1.13.5                         | The applicant  | <b>Health determinants</b><br>Does the information contained in the documents entitled "LOCAL DETERMINANTS AFFECTING HEALTH OF LOCAL POPULATION FROM PROPOSED ROSEFIELD SOLAR FARM" and the "PRACTICE POPULATION HEALTH REPORT" from Claydons Solar Action Group <a href="#">[REP1-128]</a> impact the findings of the Health Effects Report <a href="#">[REP1-056]</a> ? If so, update the report accordingly, or if not, explain how this information is accounted for and assessed in the report.  |
| Q1.13.6                         | UK Health Security Agency                              | <b>Public health risks</b><br>Review the updated BESS Plume Assessment <a href="#">[REP1-098]</a> and confirm if this provides you with sufficient information to assess the potential risks to public health. Confirm if you have any outstanding concerns or comments regarding the proposed development, and if so, how these could be rectified by the applicant.   |
| <b>14. Land and groundwater</b> |  |   |

| ExQ1  | Question to:  | Question:   |
|---|---|---|
| Q1.14.1   | Environment Agency (EA), Anglian Water Services Limited | <b>Review of deadline 1 documents</b><br>Review the updates to the application documents (see table 1 of the applicant's cover letter <a href="#">[REP1-001]</a> for an overview of the updated documents) and the additional documents (see table 2 of the applicant's cover letter) submitted at deadline 1, the applicant's responses to the relevant representations <a href="#">[PDA-006]</a> and confirm whether the applicant's responses or amendments have addressed your concerns regarding the impacts on land and groundwater matters. If the changes have not sufficiently addressed your concerns, set out how the documents could be further updated to overcome them. |
| Q1.14.2   | The applicant   | <b>Update to the Outline Drainage Strategy</b><br>In your responses to the relevant representations <a href="#">[PDA-006]</a> you stated that section 6.4.2 of the Outline Drainage Strategy <a href="#">[REP1-096]</a> would be updated at deadline 1 to replace 'restricted' to 'prevented' in line with ref. 217 of the Commitments Register to respond to comments from the EA. However, this does not appear to have been actioned. Update the document accordingly or explain why you no longer intend to make this amendment.  |
| Q1.14.3   | The applicant   | <b>Update to the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP)</b><br>In your responses to the relevant representations <a href="#">[PDA-006]</a> you stated that the oCEMP <a href="#">[REP1-078]</a> would be amended at deadline 1 to note that disposal of surplus material (if necessary) could be a waste operation, to respond to comments from the EA. However, this does not appear to have been actioned. Update the document accordingly or explain why you no longer intend to make this amendment.  |
| Q1.14.4   | The applicant   | <b>Update to the Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan (oOEMP)</b><br>In your responses to the relevant representations <a href="#">[PDA-006]</a> you stated that the oOEMP <a href="#">[REP1-080]</a> would be amended at deadline 1 to indicate that designated concrete washout areas should be sealed to prevent loss of fluid to ground or water, to respond to comments from the EA. However, this does not appear to have been actioned. Update the document accordingly or explain why you no longer intend to make this amendment.   |
| Q1.14.5   | Buckinghamshire Council                                 | <b>Battery energy storage systems (BESS)</b><br>Paragraph 4.10.21 of your Local Impact Report <a href="#">[REP1-112]</a> indicates that you consider that amendments may be required to the oOEMP <a href="#">[REP1-080]</a> to control firewater containment, spill pathways, emergency response procedures, and management of hazardous substances associated with the proposed BESS. Set out what updates you seek to the oOEMP and why you consider that they are required.   |
| Q1.14.6   | The applicant   | <b>Environmental permits</b><br>National Policy Statement EN-1 paragraph 4.12.8 states that wherever possible, applicants should submit applications for environmental permits and other necessary consents at the same time as applying to the Secretary of State for development consent. The Schedule of Other Consents and Licences <a href="#">[REP1-014]</a> states that only a limited number of environmental permits are likely to be required, and suggests that they would be applied for after development consent was granted. Could these permits be applied for now – if not why not, and if so, why have they not yet been applied for?                               |
| Q1.14.7   | EA, Natural England, Buckinghamshire Council            | <b>Finemere Wood Site of Special Scientific Interest</b><br>Review the applicant's updates to ES Chapter 11 (Land and Groundwater) <a href="#">[REP1-038]</a> regarding the effects on groundwater dependent terrestrial ecosystems at Finemere Wood Site of Special Scientific Interest – do you agree with the applicant's conclusions regarding the likely effects? If not, why not?   |
| <b>15. Landscape and visual (including good design)</b> |   |   |
| Q1.15.1   | The applicant   | <b>National Policy Statement (NPS) EN-1</b><br>In the context of paragraph 5.10.25 of NPS EN-1, provide examples of existing permitted infrastructure that the applicant is aware of with a similar magnitude of impact on equally sensitive receptors that may assist the Secretary of State in judging the weight given to the visual impacts of the proposed development.  |
| Q1.15.2   | The applicant   | <b>NPS EN-1</b><br>In the context of Buckinghamshire Council's request <a href="#">[REP1-112]</a> for the applicant to remove solar photovoltaic (PV) development from fields D28 and D29 due to landscape and visual effects, provide further comments on the applicant's approach to paragraph 5.10.26 of NPS EN-1. To what extent would reducing the scale or amending the design of the proposed development result in a significant operational constraint such as a reduction in electricity generation output? Would the benefit of any such change outweigh any identified loss of function? If not, why not?   |
| Q1.15.3   | The applicant   | <b>NPS EN-1</b><br>In the context of NPS EN-1 paragraph 5.10.27, provide further details to explain the choice of colours referenced in the Design Approach Document (DAD) <a href="#">[REP1-018]</a> and Design Commitments <a href="#">[REP1-020]</a> in relation to the setting and landscape:<br>1. What, if any, guidance would be considered to confirm colour choices at the detailed design stage? Should any such guidance be referenced in the Design Commitments?  |

| ExQ1     | Question to:                                 | Question:  |
|----------|--|--|
|          |  | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Design commitment D15 states that one of the options for the Main Collector Compound is white and/ or metallic. Design commitment D24 also identifies metallic as an option for perimeter fencing around Rosefield substation, Satellite Collector Compounds, Battery Energy Storage Systems (BESS) and Main Collector Compound. Provide further commentary to explain how such options would be sympathetic to the landscape.</li> <li>Table 1 of the Design Commitments identifies colour options for different components of the proposed development but not for the Rosefield substation aside from the perimeter fencing. Should the Design Commitment also specify colour options and design considerations for the Rosefield substation? If not, why not?</li> </ol>  |
| Q1.15.4  | Buckinghamshire Council                      | <p><b>NPS EN-1</b></p> <p>Having regard to NPS EN-1 paragraph 5.10.30, is the Council satisfied that sufficient design content would be secured through the draft Development Consent Order <a href="#">[REP1-008]</a> and related control documents, including the Design Commitments <a href="#">[REP1-020]</a>, to ensure that any future consenting would meet landscape, visual and good design objectives? If not, what further details should be added to the control documents at this stage?</p>  |
| Q1.15.5  | The applicant                                | <p><b>Rosefield substation</b></p> <p>Is the Rosefield substation proposed to be air-insulated or gas-insulated? If an option is preferred, provide justification for this in relation to good design and landscape and visual effects. If the proposed development does not commit to air or gas insulation technology, how would the choice of technology at the detailed design stage consider good design and landscape and visual effects? How does the worst-case scenario consider this potential design choice?</p>  |
| Q1.15.6  | The applicant                                | <p><b>DAD</b></p> <p>Project Principle 6.2 in the DAD <a href="#">[REP1-018]</a> refers to “enhancing field boundaries and retaining key views” towards the Quainton - Wing Hills Area of Attractive Landscape (AAL). How and where has the applicant sought to enhance field boundaries in line with this principle?</p>  |
| Q1.15.7  | The applicant                                | <p><b>Viewpoint analysis – additional planting</b></p> <p>The scale of visual and landscape change as identified in table 10.12 of Environmental Statement (ES) Chapter 10 (Landscape and Visual) <a href="#">[APP-053]</a> reduces at some viewpoints between year 1 and year 10 of operation. Paragraph 10.10.15 clarifies that it is assumed that at year 10 all new mitigation planting (including hedgerows and trees) would have been established. Can the applicant explain how the visual and landscape change brought about by the introduction of additional planting has been factored into this assessment given that it may increase the scale of change in some instances?</p>   |
| Q1.15.8  | The applicant                                | <p><b>Photomontages</b></p> <p>Paragraph 10.6.34 of ES Chapter 10 <a href="#">[APP-053]</a> states that 11 viewpoints were selected, in agreement with the Buckinghamshire Council, for the production of photomontages to illustrate the proposed development and that further information on selection is provided in Appendix 10.1: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) Methodology and Assessment Criteria <a href="#">[APP-110]</a>. However, the rationale for the selection of the 11 viewpoints for the production of photomontages is not entirely clear. Provide further justification for the viewpoints selected for photomontages. In particular, explain how the current selection adequately considers viewpoints along public rights of way (PRoW) and those in the vicinity of the Rosefield substation and BESS.</p>   |
| Q1.15.9  | The applicant<br><br>Buckinghamshire Council | <p><b>Embedded mitigation</b></p> <p>To the applicant and Buckinghamshire Council:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Table 10.9 of ES Chapter 10 <a href="#">[APP-053]</a> identifies embedded mitigation, including hedgerow planting and management. ES paragraph 10.9.5 states that the Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) <a href="#">[REP1-086]</a> ensures that all new planting would be successfully established by year 10 of operation. However, table A4.1 of the oLEMP indicates monitoring and replacement of planting to ensure establishment would not continue beyond year 5. Given the reliance on the establishment of hedgerow planting by year 10 as embedded mitigation, should the period for monitoring and management identified in the oLEMP be extended? If not, why not?</li> </ol> <p>To the applicant:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In addition, the ExA notes the applicant’s explanation of why 10 years has been assumed for landscape mitigation to establish, rather than 15 years or a longer period as set out in its response to the Claydons Solar Action Group’s relevant representation <a href="#">[PDA-006]</a>. Provide further justification for this approach drawing comparison with specific comparable consented Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects (NSIPs).</li> </ol> |
| Q1.15.10 | The applicant<br><br>Buckinghamshire Council | <p><b>BESS mitigation</b></p> <p>Buckinghamshire Council’s Local Impact Report <a href="#">[REP1-112]</a> identifies concerns regarding the BESS and related fencing. Would the provision of additional hedgerow and/ or tree planting in the vicinity of the BESS serve to reduce landscape and visual effects, having regard to the topography? If not, why not? If so, should this be reflected in the oLEMP <a href="#">[REP1-086]</a>?</p>  |

| ExQ1     | Question to:  | Question:   |
|----------|---|---|
|          | Claydons Solar Action Group   |   |
| Q1.15.11 | The applicant<br><br>Buckinghamshire Council                                    | <p><b>Defining the Special Qualities of Local Landscape Designations in the Aylesbury Vale District Report</b></p> <p>To the applicant:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Provide further commentary on how the applicant has applied the ‘Defining the Special Qualities of Local Landscape Designations in the Aylesbury Vale District Report’ (2016) in identifying effects and necessary landscape and visual mitigation, including in the oLEMP <a href="#">[REP1-086]</a>. Whilst the oLEMP references the report, it is not always clear how it has shaped specific and locally appropriate mitigation measures.</li> </ol> <p>To Buckinghamshire Council:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Submit a copy of the ‘Defining the Special Qualities of Local Landscape Designations in the Aylesbury Vale District Report’ for consideration in the examination.</li> </ol>  |
| Q1.15.12 | The applicant   | <p><b>Visual effects on Claydon House during the operation phase</b></p> <p>Should additional screening be included in the oLEMP <a href="#">[REP1-086]</a> such as a block of tree planting or a belt of poplars in order to mitigate the impact of the proposed Satellite Collector Compound in field B23 (south) as requested by the National Trust <a href="#">[REP1-132]</a>. If not, why not? The ExA notes the applicant’s position as summarised in the Statement of Common Ground with the National Trust <a href="#">[REP1-028]</a> that embedded mitigation already softens and partially screens views from Claydon House. Provide further information to demonstrate that the embedded mitigation would be effective.</p>  |
| Q1.15.13 | The applicant<br><br>Buckinghamshire Council<br><br>Claydons Solar Action Group | <p><b>“LVIA Visualisations Summer”</b></p> <p>At deadline 1, the applicant provided additional summer photography visualisations <a href="#">[REP1-050]</a>, <a href="#">[REP1-051]</a>, <a href="#">[REP1-052]</a>, <a href="#">[REP1-053]</a>, <a href="#">[REP1-054]</a>, <a href="#">[REP1-055]</a>.</p> <p><b>To the applicant:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Should ES Chapter 10 <a href="#">[APP-053]</a> be updated to provide commentary on how the visualisations have informed the LVIA and its conclusions? If not, why not?</li> </ol> <p><b>To Buckinghamshire Council and the Claydons Solar Action Group:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Do the visualisations have any implications for your respective positions in relation to the applicant’s LVIA?</li> </ol>  |
| Q1.15.14 | The applicant   | <p><b>LVIA conclusions</b></p> <p>The ExA notes concerns raised by Buckinghamshire Council <a href="#">[REP1-112]</a> and the Claydons Solar Action Group <a href="#">[REP1-127]</a> in relation to some of the applicant’s LVIA conclusions, with an indication that the significance may have been understated or not fully justified. In addition, the applicant’s conclusion on the significance of effects would appear to contradict the significance of effects criteria set out in table 10.8 and paragraph 10.6.22 of ES Chapter 10 <a href="#">[APP-053]</a> in some instances. For example, table 10.14 identifies major and major/ moderate adverse effects for visual effects at Bernwood Farm and Sion Hill Farm in the operation phase, but these effects are deemed to be “not significant”. Paragraph 10.6.22 indicates that a conclusion of significant should be identified in both instances.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Undertake a full review of conclusions in the LVIA to ensure consistency with the significance of effects criteria.</li> <li>2. In addition, in order to provide a clearer justification for conclusions where professional judgement has been applied, as suggested by Buckinghamshire Council at paragraph 4.4.61 of its Local Impact Report, re-score the magnitude of effects. Alternatively, provide a more detailed justification for conclusions where the significance of effects criteria indicate that the effects could be either significant or not significant.</li> </ol> |
| Q1.15.15 | The applicant   | <p><b>Residential Visual Amenity Assessment (RVAA) - conclusions</b></p> <p>No properties considered in the RVAA <a href="#">[APP-114]</a> are deemed by the applicant to meet the residential visual amenity threshold, although significant effects in Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) terms are identified for several properties in year 1 of operation. By year 10, significant effects are only identified to remain at Sion Hill Farm and Bernwood Farm as they would have views from elevated rooms. For the other properties, the magnitude would reduce due to the establishment of mitigation.</p>   |

| ExQ1                           | Question to:  | Question:  |
|--------------------------------|---------------|--|
|                                |               | Provide further justification for the conclusion that the residential visual amenity threshold is not met in instances when significant effects are identified. To what extent is the conclusion on the threshold not being met dependant on the successful establishment of mitigation planting?  |
| Q1.15.16                       | The applicant | <p><b>RVAA – property visits</b></p> <p>Table A10.5.1 in the RVAA [APP-114] identifies which properties have been visited by the applicant and where access was not obtained. In instances where access was not obtained, the applicant provides comments that the outlook was achieved from alternative locations such as a neighbouring property. Provide further commentary and analysis to support the applicant’s position that the alternative outlooks provide an accurate basis upon which to draw conclusions.</p>  |
| <b>16. Noise and vibration</b> |               |  |
| Q1.16.1                        | The applicant | <p><b>National Policy Statement (NPS) EN-1</b></p> <p>NPS EN-1 paragraph 5.12.6 sets out the requirements for noise assessments. This includes the need for an assessment of any likely impact on health and quality of life/ well-being where appropriate, particularly among those disadvantaged by other factors who are often disproportionately affected by noise-sensitive areas. Clarify how this policy requirement has been addressed in Environmental Statement (ES) Chapter 13 (Noise and Vibration) [REP1-040].</p>  |
| Q1.16.2                        | The applicant | <p><b>NPS EN-1</b></p> <p>Provide further information to demonstrate that the applicant has had due regard to the relevant sections of the Noise Policy Statement for England, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), and the government’s associated planning guidance on noise as required by paragraph 5.12.16 of NPS EN-1.</p>   |
| Q1.16.3                        | The applicant | <p><b>NPS EN-1</b></p> <p>Has the applicant considered contributing towards improvements to health and quality of life through the effective management and control of noise as outlined in NPS EN-1 paragraph 5.12.17? If so, how? If not, why not?</p>   |
| Q1.16.4                        | The applicant | <p><b>Study area</b></p> <p>Paragraph 13.4.1 of ES Chapter 13 [REP1-040] and ES Figure 13.1: Study Area and Receptors [REP1-048] identify a study area of 300 metres (m) from the order limits during the construction and decommissioning phases of the proposed development. Provide further justification for this having regard to the full length of the construction traffic route.</p>  |
| Q1.16.5                        | The applicant | <p><b>Noise-sensitive receptors</b></p> <p>Table 13.3 of ES Chapter 13 [REP1-040] identifies noise-sensitive receptors considered in the assessment. All of the listed receptors are residential.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Has the applicant considered other potentially noise-sensitive receptors in the assessment? If so, identify how they have been assessed, any conclusions on the effects and any necessary mitigation. If not, why not?</li> <li>2. Explain how the applicant has considered the effects of noise on livestock, other animals and related businesses.</li> </ol>  |
| Q1.16.6                        | The applicant | <p><b>Scope of the assessment – operational vibration</b></p> <p>Table 13.4 of ES Chapter 13 [REP1-040] identifies that vibration has been scoped out of the assessment during the operation (including maintenance) phase. The Examining Authority (ExA) notes that the Scoping Opinion [APP-080] provided by the Planning Inspectorate requested that the applicant should “demonstrate that operational plant and equipment is of a type that does not generate a perceptible level of vibration or is to be used in locations unlikely to result in significant vibration impacts on both human and ecological sensitive receptors”. Table 13.4 acknowledges this advice and the applicant states that it confirms “that operational elements, including fixed plant items/structures, would not emit discernible levels of vibration and are located at a sufficient distance away from sensitive receptors.” Provide further information in support of this conclusion.</p>  |
| Q1.16.7                        | The applicant | <p><b>Public Rights of Way (PRoW) users</b></p> <p>A qualitative assessment of effects on PRoW users during the construction phase is provided in section 13.8 of ES Chapter 13 [REP1-040].</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Why hasn’t a quantitative assessment been undertaken or consideration given to potential effects during the operation (including maintenance) phase?</li> <li>2. In this regard, does the applicant agree with Buckinghamshire Council’s conclusion in its Local Impact Report [REP1-112], that the applicant’s existing noise contours and methodology would indicate significant noise effects for PRoW users during operation? If so, identify suitable mitigation as appropriate. If not, why not?</li> <li>3. Does the applicant’s assessment include consideration of effects on users of existing and proposed permissive paths?</li> <li>4. Provide an update to Figures 13.3 and 13.4 [REP1-048] to identify existing and proposed permissive paths as well as PRoW.</li> </ol> |
| Q1.16.8                        | The applicant | <p><b>Embedded mitigation – offsets</b></p>  |

| ExQ1                  | Question to:  | Question:  |
|-----------------------|---|--|
|                       |   | Provide justification for the minimum distance of 50m specified for the offsets between residential properties and identified components of the proposed development in table 13.12 of the ES <a href="#">[REP1-040]</a> . Should offsets be specified for other potentially sensitive receptors? If not, why not?   |
| Q1.16.9               | The applicant   | <b>Embedded mitigation - use of equipment with low noise emissions</b><br>When would it not be feasible to use low noise emission equipment as identified in table 13.12 ES Chapter 13 <a href="#">[REP1-040]</a> ? Who would make this decision? What alternative mitigation would be applied in such instances?  |
| Q1.16.10              | The applicant   | <b>British Horse Society advice on construction sites and horses</b><br>The ExA notes the additional commitments included in the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan <a href="#">[REP1-078]</a> and Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan <a href="#">[REP1-082]</a> to implement measures in the British Horse Society document 'Advice on Construction sites and horses'. The advice acknowledges that its "guidance is general and does not aim to cover every variation in circumstances" and that advice for specific sites should be sought from the Society. Does the applicant intend to develop more detailed site-specific measures, in consultation with the British Horse Society and other relevant stakeholders? If so, should the relevant management plans make this commitment clear? If not, why not? |
| Q1.16.11              | The applicant   | <b>Additional mitigation</b><br>Section 13.9 ES Chapter 13 <a href="#">[REP1-040]</a> makes several references to additional mitigation measures that would be applied "where practicable". Provide further details on the circumstances when it would not be practical to apply additional mitigation as identified and what alternatives would be applied instead. If additional mitigation was not applied, would this have any implications for the findings of the ES?  |
| Q1.16.12              | The applicant   | <b>Additional mitigation – operational phase engineering refinements</b><br>Paragraph 13.9.6 of ES Chapter 13 <a href="#">[REP1-040]</a> states "In the case of the main transformers being a major component of the acoustic emissions from the Proposed Development, it is proposed that a minimum 5 dB(A) reduction is obtained at source through refinement of the engineering requirements in order to adopt lower noise emitting transformers. This is considered to be attainable and is secured through the Outline OEMP". What is the assumed baseline from which a 5 decibel (dB) reduction would be sought? Is this mitigation dependant on currently unknown engineering developments or advancements? If so, can it be relied upon as additional mitigation?  |
| Q1.16.13              | The applicant   | <b>Additional mitigation – operational phase barriers</b><br>Paragraph 13.9.17 of ES Chapter 13 <a href="#">[REP1-040]</a> states that a 5m high barrier would be provided around sections of the proposed Rosefield substation as secured in the Design Commitments <a href="#">[REP1-020]</a> . However, the Design Commitment states that the acoustic barrier around the substation would be no greater than 5m above ground level. Should the Design Commitment require a height of 5m? Which sections of the boundary around the substation would be provided with barriers and why?   |
| Q1.16.14              | Buckinghamshire Council,<br>Preston Farms Limited,<br>TCS Biosciences Limited,<br>Hogshaw Farm and Wildlife<br>Park,<br>Claydons Solar Action Group | <b>Mitigation and monitoring</b><br>To what extent do the applicant's updated Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan <a href="#">[REP1-078]</a> , Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan <a href="#">[REP1-080]</a> and Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan <a href="#">[REP1-082]</a> address your respective concerns regarding mitigation measures or monitoring for noise? Identify any further amendments to these documents that you consider to be necessary and explain why they are needed.  |
| Q1.16.15              | The applicant   | <b>Topography</b><br>The applicant's response <a href="#">[PDA-006]</a> to relevant representation <a href="#">[RR-083]</a> regarding concern that noise emitted by the battery energy storage system would travel due to the site's sloped topography states that the applicant's modelling takes account of topography. However, ES Chapter 13 <a href="#">[REP1-040]</a> does not appear to make any reference to this issue. Clarify how that applicant's modelling has taken account of topography.   |
| <b>17. Population</b> |   |  |
| Q1.17.1               | The applicant<br>Buckinghamshire Council  | <b>Critical National Priority (CNP)</b><br>Provide comments on the written representation submitted by Preston Farms Ltd and TCS Biosciences Ltd <a href="#">[REP1-133]</a> regarding the application of CNP. Could the potential impact on these businesses fall under the exceptions to CNP as described at paragraph 4.2.15 of National Policy Statement (NPS) EN-1 as an 'unacceptable risk to, or unacceptable interference with, human health and public safety', in light of the role of the businesses in supplying the National Health Service and wider medical sector? If not, why not?   |
| Q1.17.2               | The applicant   | <b>Baseline environment – agricultural economy</b>   |

| ExQ1    | Question to:  | Question:   |
|---------|---|---|
|         |   | <p>Section 14.5 of Environmental Statement (ES) Chapter 14 (Population) <a href="#">[APP-057]</a> provides some details of the number of people in employment on the Claydon Estate within the order limits.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Provide full details of the total number of people employed (full time equivalents), including seasonal workers, for each tenancy and the Claydon Estate itself.</li> <li>2. What impact would the proposed development have on the number of jobs?</li> <li>3. Would any of the proposed “land swaps” for tenants of the Claydon Estate impact employment numbers?</li> </ol>   |
| Q1.17.3 | The applicant   | <p><b>Embedded mitigation – offsets</b></p> <p>Offsets for public rights of way (PRoW) for fencing from solar photovoltaic (PV) development are specified in table 14.24 of ES Chapter 14 <a href="#">[APP-057]</a> and secured in the Design Commitments <a href="#">[REP1-020]</a>. Whilst some commentary on the rationale for the offsets is contained in the Design Approach Document <a href="#">[REP1-018]</a>, provide further justification for the offset distances specified. What analysis was undertaken to determine if the specified offsets would provide the necessary mitigation?</p>   |
| Q1.17.4 | The applicant<br>Preston Farms Limited<br>TCS Biosciences Limited | <p><b>Embedded mitigation - corridor for grazing animals in field E23</b></p> <p>To the applicant:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. How wide would the corridor be and what boundary treatments are proposed? If such details are currently unknown, when would they be determined and how would proposals be developed and agreed?</li> <li>2. What evidence can the applicant provide to demonstrate that the related issues identified in the written representation from Preston Farms Limited and TCS Biosciences Limited <a href="#">[REP1-133]</a>, including stress to animals, would be avoided or mitigated with the proposed corridor?</li> </ol> <p>To Preston Farms Limited TCS Biosciences Limited:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. The ExA notes the information provided in your written representation regarding the possible implications of moving livestock through the proposed corridor, including the supporting letter from a veterinary surgeon. Is any further scientific evidence or research available to support your conclusions?</li> </ol>   |
| Q1.17.5 | The applicant   | <p><b>Additional mitigation</b></p> <p>Paragraph 14.9.1 of ES Chapter 14 <a href="#">[APP-057]</a> refers to an “Outline Public Rights of Way and Permissive Paths Management Plan”. Should this refer to the Outline Rights of Way and Access Strategy?</p>  |
| Q1.17.6 | The applicant   | <p><b>Beneficial residual effects</b></p> <p>ES Chapter 14 <a href="#">[APP-057]</a> identifies that with embedded and additional mitigation measures in place, slight-beneficial socio-economic effects would be experienced during the construction and decommissioning phases on tourism and the tourist economy (tourist accommodation) due to the effect of non-local construction workforce on the tourism accommodation market. Provide further justification for this conclusion having regard to the potential for a reduction in visitor numbers and use of accommodation due to actual or perceived negative impacts and disruption due to construction or decommissioning activities.</p> <p>Permanent, slight beneficial effects are also identified for the operational phase for community access/walkers, cyclists and horse riders. Provide further justification for this conclusion having regard to the potential for usage of PRoW and permissive paths to be impacted by noise, landscape and visual and other effects that may reduce the attractiveness of such routes. Should the provision of permissive paths contribute towards a conclusion of permanent beneficial effects when the permissive paths might be removed upon decommissioning?</p> |
| Q1.17.7 | The applicant   | <p><b>Residual effects on the agricultural economy</b></p> <p>Paragraphs 14.10.6 and 14.10.38 of ES Chapter 14 <a href="#">[APP-057]</a> refer to the “...indicative likely change in employment and agricultural land” during the construction and operation phase respectively. Clarify what likely change in employment and agricultural land has been assessed.</p>   |
| Q1.17.8 | The applicant   | <p><b>Residual effects on agricultural businesses and landholdings</b></p> <p>The applicant’s assessment of residual effects in section 14.10 of the ES <a href="#">[APP-057]</a> identifies mitigation that has informed the assessment conclusions, including replacement land “...of at least the same level of provision, and in terms of severance of wider landholdings (where all replacement land is equally accessible from remaining landholdings and agricultural facilities; and for example, through the commitment to allowing for an grazing animal corridor through Field E23 to prevent severance)”.</p>   |

| ExQ1             | Question to:  | Question:  |
|------------------|---------------|--|
|                  |               | <p>Paragraph 14.10.2 concludes that during the operation phase "...the value (sensitivity) of the agricultural land holdings as a receptor is very high and the magnitude of change expected at this operation is minor. Therefore, there is likely to be a temporary or permanent slight adverse residual effect on agricultural businesses and landholdings, which is considered to be not significant."</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Provide comments on the implications of conclusions on residual effects on agricultural businesses and landholdings in the event that replacement land is not agreed by tenants to be of the same level of provision or if the grazing corridor is not effective.</li> <li>2. Provide further justification for the conclusion of slight (not significant) effects in the context of table 14.23 (significance criteria) which indicates that a combination of very high sensitivity and minor magnitude of change can lead to either a slight or moderate effect. Paragraph 14.6.69 states that a moderate effect would be deemed as significant.</li> </ol> |
| Q1.17.9          | The applicant | <p><b>Magnitude of change for agricultural businesses and landholdings</b></p> <p>Provide further justification for the "minor" magnitude of change identified in the assessment of effects [APP-057] on agricultural businesses and landholdings in the context of the description of magnitude outlined in table 14.22 and related matters raised by interested parties.</p>   |
| Q1.17.10         | The applicant | <p><b>Residual effects on other (non-agricultural) businesses and development land</b></p> <p>Provide further justification for the conclusion of slight adverse residual effects during the construction and operational phase where the combination of high/very high sensitivity and minor magnitude can lead to a conclusion of slight or moderate (significant) effects as per table 14.23 of ES Chapter 14 [APP-057]. This is in the context of effects related to landscape and visual amenity which are acknowledged by the applicant as moderate adverse (significant) at Hogshaw Farm and Wildlife Park.</p>   |
| Q1.17.11         | The applicant | <p><b>Residual effects on tourism and the tourist economy</b></p> <p>In relation to the operational phase, paragraph 14.10.51 concludes that "Therefore, there is likely to be a temporary slight adverse residual effect on tourism, which is considered to be not significant.". Should this conclusion consider that the "temporary" effect would be for 40 years which is long-term?</p>   |
| Q1.17.12         | The applicant | <p><b>Outline Employment, Skills and Supply Chain Plan</b></p> <p>Buckinghamshire Council has made a request [REP1-112] for further consideration to be given to access to the site for construction workers from deprived areas of the county. The applicant's own assumption in its Transport Assessment [APP-131] is that 75% of construction staff would travel to and from the site by minibus. In this context, should the Outline Employment, Skills and Supply Chain Plan [REP1-100] provide a firmer commitment to providing such services for construction workers in deprived areas?</p>  |
| Q1.17.13         | The applicant | <p><b>Outline Employment, Skills and Supply Chain Plan</b></p> <p>The applicant's response [PDA-006] to Buckinghamshire Business First's relevant representation [RR-025] appears to make commitments that are not reflected in the Outline Employment, Skills and Supply Chain Plan [REP1-100], including the applicant's participation in the Construction Sector Employer Group. Does the plan need to be updated?</p>  |
| <b>18. Soils</b> |               |  |
| Q1.18.1          | The applicant | <p><b>Best and Most Versatile (BMV) agricultural land</b></p> <p>What are the economic and other benefits of BMV agricultural land in the order limits and how have they been considered by the applicant?</p>   |
| Q1.18.2          | The applicant | <p><b>BMV land – regional context</b></p> <p>Table 12.2 of Environmental Statement (ES) Chapter 12 (Soil) [APP-055] records that the Planning Inspectorate's scoping opinion requested that the loss of BMV land should be considered "within a regional context". The Examining Authority (ExA) notes that ES Chapter 17 (Cumulative Effects) [REP1-044] identifies a 1 kilometre zone of influence from the order limits whilst the study area for soils assessed in ES Chapter 12 is confined to the order limits only. Paragraph 12.10.9 states that "The temporary availability of this land is also not considered to be significant in the regional context". However, no regional context is provided. How has the applicant considered effects on BMV land in a regional context?</p>   |
| Q1.18.3          | The applicant | <p><b>Food production</b></p> <p>ES Chapter 12 [APP-055] and the Planning Statement [REP1-016] state that due to amendments in the National Planning Policy Framework, "there is no longer a need to consider the availability of agricultural land for food production in planning terms". Provide further commentary on this position in the context of National Policy Statement (NPS) EN-3 paragraph 2.10.11 and the 'Powering Up Britain: Energy Security Plan' which "encourages deployment of solar technology that delivers environmental benefits, with consideration for ongoing food production...".</p>  |
| Q1.18.4          | The applicant | <p><b>Agricultural grazing</b></p>   |

| ExQ1     | Question to:  | Question:  |
|----------|---------------|--|
|          |               | ES Chapter 12 [APP-055] and the Planning Statement [REP1-016] refer to the potential for continued agricultural use during the operational lifetime of the proposed development beneath and around the solar photovoltaic modules “with potential for agricultural grazing”. Provide further commentary on who would manage any such grazing during the operational phase and how. Would the layout and design of the proposed development enable productive agricultural grazing? (also see questions Q1.4.2 and Q1.7.17)   |
| Q1.18.5  | The applicant | <p><b>Soil ecosystems</b></p> <p>The assessment of soil ecosystems during the operation phase in ES Chapter 12 [APP-055] identifies a slight beneficial effect. Paragraph 12.10.14 indicates that this is partially predicated on grazing of the land. Provide comments on any implications of this conclusion in light of response to the above question regarding agricultural grazing and the extent to which it is secured.</p>  |
| Q1.18.6  | The applicant | <p><b>Future baseline</b></p> <p>Paragraph 12.5.14 of ES Chapter 12 [APP-055] states that “While there may be potential changes in relation to climate change, including greater rainfall intensity and frequency of droughts, that could affect soil conditions, land grade, and farming practices, it is likely that these would only become apparent over longer time frames”. Provide further justification for this statement, including cross referencing with the applicant’s consideration of climate change in ES Chapter 16 (Water) [REP1-042].</p>  |
| Q1.18.7  | The applicant | <p><b>Worst case scenario</b></p> <p>Table 12.4 of ES Chapter 12 [APP-055] does not specify the maximum area of the Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) and Satellite Collector Compounds assessed as being a reasonable worst-case scenario. Confirm the maximum area assessed.</p>  |
| Q1.18.8  | The applicant | <p><b>Outline Soil Management Plan (oSMP) – Department for Environment, Food &amp; Rural Affairs (Defra) guidance</b></p> <p>Paragraphs 3.2.9 and 3.7.7 and of the oSMP [REP1-088] state that soil storage and handling will “normally be as specified” in the Defra guidance. When would soil handling and storage not be as specified in the Defra guidance and why? When the guidance is not applied, what alternative measures would be used? What is the process for determining and signing off deviations from the guidance?</p>  |
| Q1.18.9  | The applicant | <p><b>Green and blue infrastructure</b></p> <p>Paragraph 12.13 of ES Chapter 12 [APP-055] states that “The permanent land take for Green Infrastructure affects an assumed total area of 8.7 hectares (ha), none of which is classified as BMV land” and that a total of just over 10ha would be occupied by green and blue infrastructure, none of which would be classified as BMV. However, figure 12.1 of ES Chapter 12 [AS-022] appears to show grade 2 and 3a agricultural land in areas “proposed mitigation and/or enhancement” in the vicinity of Knoll Hill. Confirm whether any BMV land would be used for green and blue infrastructure and whether this would be permanently lost for agricultural use.</p> |
| Q1.18.10 | The applicant | <p><b>Residual effects on agricultural land quality during the operation phase</b></p> <p>Paragraph 12.10.13 of ES Chapter 12 [APP-055] states that “...the significance of the residual effect on agricultural land quality during operation (including maintenance) will be slight adverse/neutral or slight adverse and not significant.” Provide further clarification of when the residual effect would be slight adverse/ neutral or slight adverse.</p>   |
| Q1.18.11 | The applicant | <p><b>oSMP – Environmental Improvement Plan</b></p> <p>In the context of NPS EN-3 paragraph 2.10.34, provide further commentary on how the measures in oSMP [REP1-088] are in line with the ambition set out in the government’s Environmental Improvement Plan to bring at least 40% of England’s agricultural soils into sustainable management by 2028 and increase this up to 60% by 2030.</p>   |
| Q1.18.12 | The applicant | <p><b>oSMP – soil restoration</b></p> <p>Section 12 of the oSMP [REP1-088] states that “Following decommissioning, the land will be reinstated and returned to the same ALC Grade as prior to the installation of the Proposed Development.”</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Would the entirety of the order limits be reinstated to the same agricultural land classification (ALC) grade as prior to the installation of the proposed development? If not, clarify where and why not.</li> <li>2. Would pre-construction ALC surveys be carried out on land that has not been surveyed to provide an accurate baseline for soil restoration to the original ALC grade? If not, why not?</li> </ol>       |
| Q1.18.13 | The applicant | <p><b>oSMP – potential use of concrete blocks or gabions</b></p>   |

| ExQ1                            | Question to:  | Question:   |
|---------------------------------|---------------|---|
|                                 |               | Paragraph 4.2.5 of the oSMP <a href="#">[REP1-088]</a> states that “The option to install pre-cast concrete blocks or gabions (filled with local stone) known as "shoes" may also be considered, avoiding the need for driven and screw anchored installation, therefore minimising ground disturbance.” Who would consider the use of such methods and in what circumstances would they be applied?  |
| Q1.18.14                        | The applicant | <b>oSMP – grass sward</b><br>Elaborate on commentary in paragraph 4.3.1 of the oSMP <a href="#">[REP1-088]</a> regarding the decision about where grass seeding will occur prior to construction. Who would make this decision? What would happen in instances when grass swards have not established 6 months prior to construction? What alternative methods would be applied in such circumstances?  |
| Q1.18.15                        | The applicant | <b>oSMP – drainage</b><br>The ExA notes the applicant’s amendments to the oSMP <a href="#">[REP1-088]</a> regarding remedial works to agricultural drainage. What assessment has the applicant undertaken to determine the suitability of the existing drainage system to support the operational phase? For the decommissioning phase, paragraph 5.4.8 states that if required due to damage, new drains should be installed into the subsoil, prior to topsoil reinstatement. How quickly would drains be repaired or replaced due to any damage during the construction phase?   |
| Q1.18.16                        | The applicant | <b>oSMP – monitoring and compliance</b><br>Who would be responsible for the monitoring and compliance of measures in the oSMP <a href="#">[REP1-088]</a> ? Would monitoring and compliance information be shared with any relevant stakeholders?  |
| Q1.18.17                        | The applicant | <b>ALC Report – extent of unsurveyed areas</b><br>Table 4.2 of the ALC Report <a href="#">[APP-126]</a> indicates that that 42.45ha was not surveyed. However, paragraph 12.6.3 of ES Chapter 12 <a href="#">[APP-055]</a> states that 53ha was not surveyed, with paragraph 12.13.1 indicating that that 54.45ha was not surveyed. How much land (in ha) within the order limits has not been surveyed?  |
| Q1.18.18                        | The applicant | <b>ALC Report – assumed grade 3b land</b><br>Paragraph 3.1.5 of the ALC Report <a href="#">[APP-126]</a> states that “As the soil type is homogeneous throughout the Site it is therefore reasonable to assume the unsurveyed area will also be Grade 3b.” Annex 3 of the ALC Report indicates that land in the vicinity of Knoll Hill Farm was not surveyed. This area is also in close proximity to the only BMV land identified in the ALC survey. As highlighted in the Claydons Solar Action Group’s written representation <a href="#">[REP1-127]</a> , grade 3a agricultural land was also identified close to Parcel 1 of the order limits in surveys undertaken for High Speed Rail 2. Provide further justification for the assumption that land not subject to survey can be considered to be grade 3b land as a reasonable worst-case scenario. |
| <b>19. Transport and access</b> |               |   |
| Q1.19.1                         | The applicant | <b>National Policy Statement (NPS) EN-1</b><br>In relation to the applicant’s assessment of traffic and transport matters, NPS EN-1 paragraph 5.14.8 states that “The assessment should also consider any possible disruption to services and infrastructure (such as road, rail and airports).”<br>How has the applicant met this policy requirement?  |
| Q1.19.2                         | The applicant | <b>NPS EN-1</b><br>How has the applicant had regard to the need to provide appropriate facilities for heavy goods vehicle (HGV) drivers as appropriate as stated in NPS EN-1 paragraph 5.14.13?   |
| Q1.19.3                         | The applicant | <b>NPS EN-1</b><br>Paragraph 2.10.125 of NPS EN-1 states that “Applicants should ensure all sections of roads and bridges on the proposed delivery route can accommodate the weight and volume of the loads and width of vehicles. Although unlikely, where modifications to roads and/or bridges are required, these should be identified, and potential effects addressed in the ES.”<br><br>The ExA notes the applicant’s consideration of weight on the Abnormal Indivisible Load (AIL) route in the AIL Route Survey <a href="#">[APP-131]</a> , but it is not clear whether weight has been considered on the construction traffic route or in Environmental Statement (ES) Chapter 15 (Transport and Access) <a href="#">[APP-058]</a> . Provide further clarification and update documents if appropriate.  |

| ExQ1     | Question to:                                 | Question:   |
|----------|--|---|
|          |  | The ExA is also mindful of Buckinghamshire Council's request <a href="#">[REP1-112]</a> for a complete swept path analysis from the A41 to the access points for the proposed development. The applicant is invited to consider this request in the context of this policy requirement.   |
| Q1.19.4  | The applicant<br><br>Buckinghamshire Council | <b>Operational (including maintenance) phase of the proposed development</b><br>ES Chapter 15 <a href="#">[APP-58]</a> scopes out the operational (including maintenance) phase from the assessment due to the low-level of traffic expected to be generated. Section 2.11 of the Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan (oOEMP) <a href="#">[REP1-080]</a> commits the applicant to submit a planned maintenance schedule every 12 months from the date of final commissioning to the relevant local planning authority. Paragraph 2.11.7 lists details that must be included in the statement including "Confirmation that the environmental effects that are likely to arise as a result of such maintenance and the environmental controls to be implemented are not materially worse than those reported in the ES."<br>Should the applicant's conclusions on this matter be subject to approval by the relevant local planning authority? If not, why not? |
| Q1.19.5  | The applicant                                | <b>Study area</b><br>Confirm why the AIL route is not within the study area considered in ES Chapter 15 <a href="#">[APP-058]</a> .   |
| Q1.19.6  | The applicant                                | <b>Transport Assessment (TA) – minibus usage</b><br>In the context of ExQ 1.17.12 above regarding the extent to which 75% of construction staff would use a minibus is secured, confirm if there are any related implications for the assumptions made in the TA <a href="#">[APP-131]</a> and its conclusions. This should include confirmation or otherwise that 10% of construction staff would arrive by car and 15% by light goods vehicle (LGV). Provide amendments to the TA and Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP) <a href="#">[REP1-084]</a> if necessary.   |
| Q1.19.7  | The applicant                                | <b>TA – traffic count locations</b><br>Were traffic count locations as referenced in section 4.7 of the TA <a href="#">[APP-131]</a> agreed with Oxfordshire County Council as well as Buckinghamshire Council? If not, why not?  |
| Q1.19.8  | The applicant<br><br>National Highways       | <b>TA – junction modelling</b><br><br><b>To the applicant:</b><br>Buckinghamshire Council's Local Impact Report <a href="#">[REP1-112]</a> indicates that that applicant will provide junction modelling but that this information has not been forthcoming. When will the applicant provide this information?<br><br><b>To National Highways:</b><br>The Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) <a href="#">[REP1-032]</a> between National Highways and the applicant states that National Highways' request for junction impact assessment is "under discussion". Please provide comments on the applicant's stated position in the SoCG that no additional modelling is required.  |
| Q1.19.9  | The applicant                                | <b>Residual effects during construction</b><br>Table 15.16 of ES Chapter 15 <a href="#">[APP-058]</a> summarises the applicant's assessment of residual effects. Recognising that the applicant may have applied "professional judgement", further justification is required from the applicant for conclusions of minor residual effects (not significant) where the sensitivity of receptor is high and magnitude of impact is minor. Table 15.11 of the ES (significance of effects matrix) suggests that "moderate" should be the conclusion in such instances which would be "significant" as per para 15.6.19.<br><br>The above applies to the following receptors: users of Snake Lane/Fidlers Field, users of Granborough Road and public rights of way (PRoW), bridleway and path users within the development areas.  |
| Q1.19.10 | The applicant                                | <b>TA - trip generation average</b><br>Provide further justification for the approach of the TA in averaging trip generation out over a 12-hour day in the context of paragraph 3.15.18 of the Proposed Development Description <a href="#">[REP1-034]</a> which states that employees would travel "...to and from Site an hour on either side of these times (i.e. between 6am - 7am and 7pm - 8pm)". Construction deliveries are also restricted to a 10-hour day Monday to Friday (08:00 to 18:00) as identified in the oCTMP <a href="#">[REP1-084]</a> . Confirm where restrictions on these delivery times are secured in the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan <a href="#">[REP1-078]</a> as stated in the oCTMP at paragraph 3.2.1.   |
| Q1.19.11 | The applicant                                | <b>oCTMP – Traffic Management Group</b>   |

| ExQ1     | Question to:  | Question:   |
|----------|---|---|
|          |   | Should the membership of the proposed Traffic Management Group as identified in section 4 of the oCTMP <a href="#">[REP1-084]</a> also include representatives from neighbouring local authorities along the entirety of the construction traffic route and AIL routes, including Oxfordshire County Council and Milton Keynes City Council? If not, why not?   |
| Q1.19.12 | Buckinghamshire Council   | <p><b>oCTMP amendments</b></p> <p>Please confirm if the suite of amendments made by the applicant at deadline 1 to the oCTMP <a href="#">[REP1-084]</a> address any outstanding concerns of Buckinghamshire Council. If not, confirm what further changes may be necessary.</p>   |
| Q1.19.13 | <p>The applicant</p> <p>National Trust</p> <p>Preston Farms Limited</p> <p>Hogshaw Farm and Wildlife Park</p> | <p><b>oCTMP – co-ordination with local business and visitor attractions</b></p> <p>A new section 4.4 (information to other parties) is provided in the oCTMP at deadline 1 <a href="#">[REP1-084]</a> which outlines the applicant’s approach to sharing information with other parties regarding construction traffic, including the National Trust, Buckinghamshire Railway Centre and Hogshaw Farm and Wildlife Park.</p> <p>The updated oCTMP <a href="#">[REP1-084]</a> also includes additional commitments to work with agricultural business interests to facilitate the safe crossing of livestock and to avoid road reconstruction works to Snake Lane/ Fiddlers Field during the school summer holiday period, if possible. In addition, no construction traffic will be permitted to travel east on Granborough Road to minimise interactions with local agricultural traffic and livestock crossings on the public road.</p> <p><b>To the applicant:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Should business and tourism stakeholders be represented on the Traffic Management Group? If not, why not?</li> <li>2. Should Preston Farms Limited and any other relevant local agricultural interests also be referenced in section 4.4 of the oCTMP and/ or the Traffic Management Group? If not, why not?</li> </ol> <p><b>To other interested parties:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. To what extent do the amendments made by the applicant in the oCTMP <a href="#">[REP1-084]</a> address concerns raised in your respective relevant representations and written representations regarding construction traffic management?</li> </ol> |
| Q1.19.14 | The applicant   | <p><b>oCTMP – onsite access management</b></p> <p>Paragraph 7.1.2 of the TA <a href="#">[APP-131]</a> states that the “CTMP will also include an Onsite Access Management Plan (OAMP) to safely manage the interactions between PRow, bridleway and path users and construction traffic/activities.”</p> <p>The outline CTMP <a href="#">[REP1-084]</a> does not make reference to an OAMP, although related details are provided in section 6. Does the applicant intend to produce an OAMP? If so, would this form part of the outline or detailed CTMP?</p>  |
| Q1.19.15 | <p>The applicant</p> <p>Buckinghamshire Council</p>   | <p><b>Outline CTMP – wear and tear agreement</b></p> <p><b>To the applicant and Buckinghamshire Council:</b></p> <p>What form of legal agreement would the wear and tear agreement as referenced in section 4.7 of the oCTMP <a href="#">[REP1-084]</a> take? Has any progress been made on this to date?</p> <p><b>To the applicant:</b></p> <p>Is a corresponding agreement being sought with other local authorities on the construction traffic route? If not, why not?</p>   |
| Q1.19.16 | The applicant   | <p><b>oCTMP – on-site parking</b></p> <p>How many on-site car parking spaces would be provided at the primary and secondary construction compounds for staff during the construction phase? If available, how has this data informed the TA <a href="#">[APP-131]</a> and ES Chapter 15 <a href="#">[APP-058]</a>?</p> <p>How would the commitment made at paragraph 4.9.2 of the oCTMP <a href="#">[REP1-084]</a> that no parking will be permitted on the public road verges be managed and enforced?</p>   |

| ExQ1                         | Question to:   | Question:  |
|------------------------------|--|--|
| Q1.19.17                     | The applicant  | <b>oCTMP - controls</b><br>What measures are secured to ensure that vehicles movements identified in the TA <a href="#">[APP-131]</a> would not be exceeded?   |
| Q1.19.18                     | The applicant<br>Buckinghamshire Council                   | <b>Outline CTMP – AIL traffic management measures</b><br>Paragraph 2.2.3 of the oCTMP <a href="#">[REP1-084]</a> appears to indicate that the AIL Route Survey <a href="#">[APP-131]</a> was prepared following the production of the oCTMP. Should section 5 of the outline CTMP (AIL Traffic Management Measures) be updated to include relevant details of the AIL Route Survey? If not, why not?   |
| Q1.19.19                     | The applicant  | <b>High Speed Rail 2 (HS2)</b><br>What is the role and function of the Traffic Liaison Group referenced in the draft Statement of Common Ground with HS2 Limited <a href="#">[REP1-030]</a> ?<br>Provide a clear plan that identifies the construction traffic route for HS2 in relation to the construction traffic route for the proposed development.   |
| Q1.19.20                     | The applicant  | <b>Outline Rights of Way Access Strategy (oRoWAS) – permanent diversions</b><br>What constraints would prohibit the applicant from defining the minimum width of 2 metres for newly created footpaths in the oRoWAS <a href="#">[REP1-090]</a> as requested by Buckinghamshire Council?  |
| Q1.19.21                     | Buckinghamshire Council                                    | <b>oRoWAS – replacement of stiles</b><br>The applicant's response <a href="#">[PDA-006]</a> to Buckinghamshire Council's request for the removal of stiles within the order limits and replacement with British Standards: 5709 compliant gates or gaps states that "...any new or diverted routes to be designed in accordance or with regard to design standards adopted by Buckinghamshire Council, which would include in relation to stiles and gates...".<br>Do Buckinghamshire Council's adopted design standards require replacements with British Standards: 5709 compliant gates or gaps?  |
| Q1.19.22                     | The applicant  | <b>oRoWAS – operational phase effects</b><br>Why does section 5 of the oRoWAS <a href="#">[REP1-090]</a> cross refer to ES Chapter 6 (Air Quality) <a href="#">[APP-049]</a> , but not to other chapters that may be of relevance, including Chapters 10 (Landscape and Visual) <a href="#">[APP-053]</a> and 13 (Noise and Vibration) <a href="#">[REP1-040]</a> ?  |
| Q1.19.23                     | The applicant  | <b>oRoWAS and Design Commitments – offsets for permissive paths</b><br>Whilst offset distances from solar photovoltaic development are specified for PRoWs, neither the oRoWAS <a href="#">[REP1-090]</a> nor the Design Commitments <a href="#">[REP1-020]</a> provide corresponding details for offsets for existing or proposed permissive paths. Please provide clarification and update documents as appropriate.   |
| <b>20. Water environment</b> |  |  |
| Q1.20.1                      | Environment Agency (EA),<br>Anglian Water Services Limited | <b>Review of deadline 1 documents</b><br>Review the updates to the application documents (see table 1 of the applicant's cover letter <a href="#">[REP1-001]</a> for an overview of the updated documents) and the additional documents (see table 2 of the applicant's cover letter) submitted at deadline 1, the applicant's responses to the relevant representations <a href="#">[PDA-006]</a> and confirm whether the applicant's responses or amendments have addressed your concerns regarding the impacts on the water environment. If the changes have not sufficiently addressed your concerns, set out how the documents could be further updated to overcome them. |
| Q1.20.2                      | The applicant  | <b>Update to the Outline Battery Safety Management Plan (oBSMP)</b><br>In your responses to the relevant representations <a href="#">[PDA-006]</a> you stated that the oBSMP <a href="#">[REP1-092]</a> would be amended at deadline 1 to provide further detail on the maintenance schedule in place for the automatic or manual penstocks, to respond to comments from the EA. However, this does not appear to have been actioned. Update the document accordingly or explain why you no longer intend to make this amendment.  |
| Q1.20.3                      | The applicant  | <b>Update to the Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (oDEMP)</b><br>In your responses to the relevant representations <a href="#">[PDA-006]</a> you stated that the oDEMP <a href="#">[REP1-082]</a> would be amended at deadline 1 to include the requirement for a 12-month post-construction monitoring regime, to respond to comments from the EA. However, this does not appear to have been actioned. Update the document accordingly or explain why you no longer intend to make this amendment.  |
| Q1.20.4                      | The applicant  | <b>Update to the Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan (oOEMP)</b><br>In your responses to the relevant representations <a href="#">[PDA-006]</a> you stated that the oOEMP <a href="#">[REP1-080]</a> would be amended at deadline 1 to clarify that the mitigation measures proposed will also protect surface water quality, to respond to comments from the EA. However, this does not appear to have been actioned. Update the document accordingly or explain why you no longer intend to make this amendment.   |
| Q1.20.5                      | The applicant  | <b>Provision of pre-planning enquiry water supply assessment</b>   |

| ExQ1     | Question to:  | Question:   |
|----------|---|---|
|          |   | In your response <a href="#">[AS-035]</a> to the Examining Authority's (ExA) section 89 letter dated 9 <sup>th</sup> January 2026 <a href="#">[PD-006]</a> , you stated that a pre-planning enquiry water supply assessment had been undertaken with Anglian Water Serviced Limited and this would be submitted to the examination at deadline 1. Direct the ExA to where this is located in the application documents or explain why this has not been provided.   |
| Q1.20.6  | EA, Buckinghamshire Council Local Lead Flood Authority (LLFA) | <b>National Policy Statement (NPS) EN-1</b><br>Are you satisfied that sufficient information on flood risk management regarding safe access and escape routes as part of an agreed emergency plan has been provided by the applicant, and that any residual risk could be safely managed over the lifetime of the development?  |
| Q1.20.7  | EA, Buckinghamshire Council LLFA                              | <b>NPS EN-1</b><br>Are you satisfied that the proposed drainage system complies with any National Standards published by Ministers under paragraph 5(1) of schedule 3 of the Flood and Water Management Act 2010, including during the construction period?   |
| Q1.20.8  | The applicant   | <b>NPS EN-1</b><br><ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NPS EN-1 paragraph 5.8.41 states that energy projects should not normally be consented within Flood Zone 3b. However, parts of the proposed development would be located in Flood Zone 3b. Is there a material reason why the proposed development located in Flood Zone 3b <b>must</b> be located in these areas?</li> <li>The ExA notes that the Sequential Test <a href="#">[REP1-016]</a> states that whilst the edges of the fields in Flood Zones 2 and 3 could be excluded from the proposed development, this would reduce the megawatt capacity and would fail to make the best use of land to deliver renewable energy. If development was excluded from Flood Zones 2 and 3, set out how much the megawatt capacity would be reduced by, for each Flood Zone.</li> </ol> |
| Q1.20.9  | The applicant   | <b>NPS EN-1</b><br>NPS EN-1 paragraph 5.18.15 states that flood risk assessments (FRA) should identify and secure opportunities to reduce the causes and impacts of flooding overall during the period of construction. Demonstrate how you have complied with this requirement, noting that the FRA <a href="#">[PDA-004]</a> does not identify which construction compounds would be located in Flood Zones 2 and 3.  |
| Q1.20.10 | The applicant   | <b>NPS EN-3</b><br>The Outline Drainage Strategy <a href="#">[REP1-096]</a> paragraph 5.5.1 refers to the provision of approximately 3.67 hectares of impermeable areas which constitute access tracks. However, paragraph 2.10.85 of NPS EN-3 states that "Where access tracks need to be provided, permeable tracks should be used..." Why have you not committed to the use of permeable tracks in accordance with NPS EN-3?   |
| Q1.20.11 | The applicant   | <b>NPS EN-3</b><br>The Outline Drainage Strategy <a href="#">[REP1-096]</a> paragraph 5.9.3 states that limited culverting may be required to cut off ditches. However, paragraph 2.10.87 of NPS EN-3 states that culverting existing watercourses/ drainage ditches should be avoided. Why can culverting not be avoided?  |
| Q1.20.12 | The applicant   | <b>NPS EN-3</b><br>NPS EN-3 paragraph 2.10.88 states that where culverting for access is unavoidable, applicants should demonstrate that no reasonable alternatives exist and where necessary, it will only be in place temporarily for the construction period. Confirm if there would be culverting for access, and if so, demonstrate that no reasonable alternatives exist and where necessary it would only be in place temporarily for the construction period.   |
| Q1.20.13 | EA  | <b>Flood Risk Assessment</b><br>Provide a view on the updated FRA <a href="#">[PDA-004]</a> and whether you have any outstanding concerns regarding the assessment or flood risk as a result of the proposed development.   |
| Q1.20.14 | EA, Buckinghamshire Council LLFA                              | <b>Sequential test</b><br>Do you consider that the applicant has been able to demonstrate that the sequential test has been applied and satisfied as part of the site selection process? Explain your answer.   |
| Q1.20.15 | The applicant   | <b>Sequential test</b><br>Provide an explanation of how you applied the sequential test to all elements of the proposed development. The ExA notes that information has been provided on how the sequential test was applied to the location of the proposed photovoltaic panels <a href="#">[REP1-016]</a> . However, more detailed information should be provided on the sequential approach to the location of all elements of the proposed development, considering each phase of the proposed development.   |
| Q1.20.16 | The applicant   | <b>Environmental Statement (ES) Chapter 16 (Water)</b>  |

| ExQ1     | Question to:                    | Question:  |
|----------|---------------------------------|--|
|          |                                 | Table 16.9 in ES Chapter 16 <a href="#">[REP1-042]</a> shows the criteria matrix for determining significance of effect. Explain why the matrix is set out such that there would be 4 instances which would constitute a significant effect, which is different to matrices used in other ES chapters. For example, why would a minor magnitude of impact on a high sensitivity receptor, or a major magnitude of impact on a low sensitivity not have a moderate effect, which would be significant?  |
| Q1.20.17 | Buckinghamshire Council<br>LLFA | <p><b>Outline drainage strategy</b></p> <p>In your Local Impact Report <a href="#">[REP1-112]</a> you confirm that principles set out in the Outline Drainage Strategy <a href="#">[REP1-096]</a> to manage surface water flood risk arising from the proposed development are satisfactory. However, in your relevant representation <a href="#">[RR-026]</a> you identified a number of concerns regarding surface water drainage, including infiltration testing and groundwater risk, use of underground tanks, lack of hydraulic calculations and exceedance flows, use of pumping, water quality management and missing information. Confirm if the any of these matters remain outstanding and if so, explain how the applicant could address them.</p>   |
| Q1.20.18 | The applicant                   | <p><b>ES Chapter 16 (Water)</b></p> <p>ES Chapter 16 <a href="#">[REP1-042]</a> states that there would be opportunities for enhancement to the water environment, through biodiversity enhancements within Parcel 1a where Finemere Wood Site of Special Scientific Interest and the Muxwell Brook are located and that vegetation cover below the solar panels would slow the rate of surface water runoff during high intensity rainfall events, promoting the interception of surface water runoff, thus overall reducing flood risk in the order limits and downstream of the proposed development. The ExA however notes that no beneficial effects are identified as a result of the proposed development in table 16.11 of ES Chapter 16 for example. Can you quantify the extent of any enhancements stated in the ES? If so, should these be considered as temporary benefits?</p> |