

**National Grid Electricity Transmission Plc response to Examining Authority's  
First Written Questions and Requests for Information (ExQ1) in relation to  
Rosefield Solar Farm Consent Order**

**Deadline 2**

**Statutory Undertaker Registration Number** [REDACTED]

**1. Q 1.9.6 RESPONSE**

- 1.1 This response is submitted following the Examination Authority's first written questions and requests for information issued on 2 April 2026. This response is submitted on behalf of National Grid Electricity Transmission ("NGET") in respect of the application by Rosefield Energyfarm Limited ("**the Applicant**") for the Rosefield Solar Farm Development Consent Order ("**the Order**") to authorise the Rosefield Solar Farm Project ("**the Project**").
- 1.2 Both NGET and the Applicant acknowledge that the proposed Order Limits overlap with land required for the siting of future NGET infrastructure which includes the following:-
- works to East Claydon 400 kV and 132 kV substations (the "Existing Substation") with a new 400 kV and 132 kV substation (the "New Substation"); and
  - Reconfiguration of the existing overhead line (OHL Works).
- together the "**East Claydon Project**".
- 1.3 The affected plots are set out in detail in NGET's written representation.
- 1.4 The Applicant has made clear in discussions with NGET and through its responses to the ExA that it has no intention of acquiring all of the land within the Order limits, applying the "Rochdale Envelope Principle" in order to allow for flexibility, taking into account design development.
- 1.5 The New Substation is in detailed engineering design stage and as NGET has advised previously, the time required to complete FEED design is ongoing. NGET have taken great care in both its optioneering and land acquisition strategy to be proportionate in identifying land plots for the delivery of the East Claydon Project and understands that the Applicant will similarly take NGET's considerations into account. It is noted in Table 2.2.1 of the Applicant's response to the Section 89(3) Document that "the Applicant is confident that the Proposed Development would not detrimentally impact upon NGET's ability to deliver the East Claydon Project and the reconfiguration of existing overhead lines. Ongoing collaborative engagements between the parties is seeking a designed resolution that works for both projects".
- 1.6 In Table 2.2.1, the Applicant has also stated that the DCO Application (as submitted) "contains sufficient flexibility for the final siting of works to construct and maintain NGET's infrastructure to ensure that, regardless of the final design for the East Claydon Project, the Proposed Development would not prejudice the delivery of NGET's works and would also itself remain deliverable".

- 1.7 It is also noted by the Applicant in Table 2.2.1 that "The Proposed Development would be designed to take account of NGET's statutory obligations to both construct and maintain their assets and that doing so would remove any perceived or actual conflicts across all phases of the development of the two projects. The Applicant is working this through with NGET through the tailoring of protective provisions alongside any cooperation agreement required." NGET continues to work with the Applicant on the Protective Provisions. NGET has already identified in its representation and response to the RFI that it will require Protective Provisions to be included within the Order for the Project, which will include the following protections:-
- 1.7.1 the Applicant will not exercise its compulsory powers over NGET operational land without the consent of NGET; and
  - 1.7.2 the Applicant will not exercise its compulsory powers over land identified for the delivery of the East Claydon Project without the consent of NGET.
  - 1.7.3 that all NGET assets, both existing and any anticipated future assets, are adequately protected and that all works comply with relevant safety standards.
- 1.8 NGET also identified in its written representation the relevant clearances including access clearances, statutory electricity clearance from overhead lines, and project specific clearances for the East Claydon Project. NGET will also require relevant easements in place to reflect technical guidance requirements.
- 1.9 Therefore, on the basis that the Applicant has confirmed in writing and through meetings with NGET, that that the DCO Application contains sufficient flexibility for the final siting of the infrastructure to ensure that, regardless of NGET's final design for the East Claydon Project, the Proposed Development would be designed and deliverable around NGET's infrastructure work, NGET it satisfied that there is no need for applicant to seek alternatives sites, but notes that this is of course subject to successful resolution of design discussions and agreement of the Protective Provisions and any related agreements.

#### **Q 1.11.12 RESPONSE**

2. As acknowledged by the Applicant, the assumptions set out by the Applicant regarding the proposed replacement National Grid East Claydon in paragraphs 17.6.2, 17.6.6 and 17.6.8 of the Environmental Statement Chapter 17, Cumulative Effects, Vol 2, are informed by comparable applications and are presented to provide an indicative assessment of the likely effects. NGET has been consistent in its position that the design of the East Claydon Project is an evolving and ongoing exercise and at this stage, the design for the East Claydon Project has not progressed to a sufficient level of detail to enable NGET to advance its procurement strategy nor its emission strategy. The relevant information will come forward as the design for the East Claydon Project evolves, and NGET will continue to keep the Applicant and the Examination Authority informed throughout this process, as previously stated in its representations.