

# Rosefield Solar Farm

Draft Statement of Common Ground –  
Buckinghamshire Council (Clean)

EN010158/APP/5.22.2  
April 2026  
Revision 02  
Deadline 2  
Rosefield Energyfarm Limited



# Table of Contents

- Table of Contents ..... 1**
- 1. Introduction ..... 2**
  - 1.1. Overview .....2**
  - 1.2. Parties to this Statement of Common Ground .....2**
  - 1.3. Purpose of this Document.....2**
  - 1.4. Terminology .....3**
- 2. Proposed Development Description ..... 4**
- 3. Record of Engagement ..... 6**
  - 3.1. Record of Engagement.....6**
- 4. Current Position..... 15**
  - 4.1. Position of the Applicant and Buckinghamshire Council .....15**
- 5. Signatures ..... 73**

# 1. Introduction

## 1.1. Overview

- 1.1.1. Buckinghamshire Council maintains its formal objection to this development for the reasons set out in the Relevant Representations and the forthcoming Local Impact Report. Notwithstanding, there is acknowledgment that as Host Authority, the Council must engage on technical matters.
- 1.1.2. This Statement of Common Ground ('SoCG') has been prepared in respect of the application for the proposed Rosefield Solar Farm Development Consent Order ("the Application") made by Rosefield Energyfarm Ltd ("the Applicant") to the Secretary of State for Energy Security and Net Zero under section 37 of the Planning Act 2008 ("PA 2008").
- 1.1.3. The Proposed Development is a proposed new solar farm and battery storage facility located in Buckinghamshire. The proposals also include infrastructure to connect the Proposed Development to the National Grid East Claydon Substation, as well as any necessary supporting site infrastructure and environmental mitigation, including landscaping and ecological planting.
- 1.1.4. The SoCG is being submitted to the Examining Authority as an agreed draft between both parties. It will be amended as the examination progresses in order to enable a final version to be submitted to the Examining Authority.

## 1.2. Parties to this Statement of Common Ground

- 1.2.1. This SoCG has been prepared by the Applicant and Buckinghamshire Council (BC). BC is the host authority for the Proposed Development, as the Order Limits are located entirely within its administrative boundary.
- 1.2.2. Collectively, the Applicant and BC are referred to as 'the parties'.
- 1.2.3. The matters of interest discussed with BC are detailed in **Section 4** of this SoCG.

## 1.3. Purpose of this Document




- 1.3.1. This SoCG is a 'live' document and will be amended as the examination progresses in order to enable a final version to be submitted to the Examining Authority.
- 1.3.2. The SoCG has been prepared in accordance with the Ministry of Housing Communities and Local Government and Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities' Guidance on the examination stage for Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects ('DLUHC Guidance').
- 1.3.3. Paragraph 007 of the DLUHC Guidance comments that:

*“A Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) is a written statement prepared jointly by the applicant and another party or parties, setting out any matters on which they agree, or indeed disagree. A SoCG helps to ensure that the evidence at the examination focuses on the material differences between the main parties and therefore makes best use of the lines of questioning pursued by the Examining Authority”.*

- 1.3.4. The aim of this SoCG is, therefore, to provide a clear position of the progress and agreement met or not yet met between BC and the Applicant on matters relating to the Application.
- 1.3.5. The document will be updated as more information becomes available and as a result of ongoing discussions between the Applicant and BC.
- 1.3.6. The SoCG is intended to provide information for the examination process, facilitate a smooth and efficient examination, and manage the amount of material that needs to be submitted.
- 1.3.7. This SoCG does not seek to replicate information which is available elsewhere within the DCO Application documents. All documents are available in the deposit locations and/or the Planning Inspectorate’s website (<https://national-infrastructure-consenting.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/projects/EN010158/documents>).
- 1.3.8. Once finalised, the SoCG will be submitted to the Examining Authority that is examining the DCO Application under section 37 of the Planning Act 2008 for an order granting development consent for the Proposed Development.

## 1.4. Terminology

- 1.4.1. This SoCG summarises the main topics covered and the status of the matter. The colour coding system used within the table in **Section 4** has been outlined below.

| Cell  | Status  |
|---|---|
|  | Agreed - indicates where an issue has been resolved.  |
|  | Under Discussion - indicates where points continue to be the subject of on-going discussions between parties.                   |
|  | Not Agreed - indicates a position where both parties have reached a final position that a matter cannot be agreed between them. |

## 2. Proposed Development Description

- 2.1.1. The Proposed Development comprises the construction, operation (including, maintenance), and decommissioning of solar photovoltaic ('PV') development and energy storage, together with associated infrastructure and an underground cable connection to the National Grid East Claydon Substation.
- 2.1.2. The Proposed Development includes the installation, construction and decommissioning works, with the details to be defined at detailed design and subject to approval by the relevant Local Authority. The detailed design of the Proposed Development will be required to be undertaken within the parameters assessed in the Environmental Statement, which are secured through a range of control documents including the **Works Plans [EN010158/APP/2.3.3]**, the **Design Commitments [EN010158/APP/5.9.3]** and the requirements set out in the **Draft Development Consent Order (DCO) [EN010158/APP/3.1.3]**.
- 2.1.3. The design of the Proposed Development has evolved throughout the environmental assessment process to avoid or minimise environmental effects and in response to consultation and engagement feedback, where appropriate. The location of the Proposed Development is shown in Figure 1.1: Location Plan in **ES Volume 3, Background and Context Figures 1.1 - 1.2 [EN010158/APP/6.3] [APP-061]** and described in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 2: Location of the Proposed Development [EN010158/APP/6.1] [APP-045]**, with the consideration of alternatives and the evolution of the design of the Proposed Development presented in **ES Volume 1, Chapter 4: Reasonable Alternatives Considered [EN010158/APP/6.1] [APP-047]**.
- 2.1.4. The principal components of the Proposed Development include:
- Solar PV development consisting of:
    - Ground mounted Solar PV generating station. The generating station would include Solar PV modules and mounting structures; and
    - Balance of Solar System (BoSS) which comprises: Inverters; Transformers; Switchgear; Combiner Boxes; acoustic barriers and cabling.
  - A project substation (the 'Rosefield Substation') compound comprising: Transformers; Switchgear; reactive power compensation bays; disconnectors; circuit breakers; busbars; control equipment; lightning surge arrestors; building(s) including office, control, functions, material storage, material laydown areas and welfare facilities; firewalls; fencing and acoustic barriers; a security cabin; parking as well as wider monitoring, maintenance and emergency equipment;
  - A Main Collector Compound and two Satellite Collector Compounds comprising: Switchgear; Transformers; ancillary equipment; operation and

- maintenance and welfare facilities; material storage; material laydown areas; fencing and acoustic barriers; and security cabins;
- Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) compound comprising: batteries and associated Inverters; Transformers; Switchgear, ancillary equipment and their containers; office, control and welfare buildings; fencing and acoustic barriers; monitoring, maintenance and emergency systems; air conditioning; electrical cables; fire safety infrastructure; operation (including maintenance) security facilities; material storage; and material laydown areas;
  - Interconnecting Cabling Corridor(s) to connect the Solar PV modules and the BESS to the Satellite and Main Collector Compounds to the Rosefield Substation;
  - A Grid Connection Cable Corridor to connect the Rosefield Substation to the National Grid East Claydon Substation via 400kV cabling;
  - Ancillary infrastructure works comprising: boundary treatment; security equipment; lighting; fencing; landscaping; internal access tracks; works to facilitate vehicular access; earthing devices; earthworks; surface water management; utility connections and diversions; and any other works identified as necessary to enable the Proposed Development;
  - Green and blue infrastructure, recreation and amenity works comprising: landscaping; habitat management; biodiversity enhancement; the creation of three permissive footpaths; and works to divert PRoW Footpaths;
  - Site-wide operational monitoring and security equipment; and
  - Highways infrastructure improvements and safety works comprising: minor junction improvement works; road widening; passing places; and works to facilitate vehicular access to the Site.

### 3. Record of Engagement

#### 3.1. Record of Engagement

3.1.1. The parties have been engaged in consultation throughout the DCO application process. **Table 1** shows a summary of key engagement that has taken place between the Applicant and BC in relation to the Application.

**Table 1 - Record of Engagement**

| Date             | Chapter              | Form of correspondence | Key topics discussed and key outcomes   |
|------------------|----------------------|------------------------|---|
| 9 May 2023       | Cultural Heritage    | Email Correspondence   | Study area agreed for non-designated and designated assets  |
| 19 December 2023 | Transport            | Teams Meeting          | Impact review of transport scoping and potential impact on road network undertaken  |
| 26 February 2024 | Population           | Email Correspondence   | Approach to diversion of public rights of way (PRoW) and alignments of new permissive paths agreed  |
| 6 March 2024     | Cultural Heritage    | Teams Meeting          | Initial discussion around scope of archaeological fieldwork   |
| 04 April 2024    | Landscape and Visual | Email Correspondence   | ZTV Information provided and proposed maximum height parameters agreed  |
| 04 April 2024    | Landscape and Visual | Email Correspondence   | Discussion on the Zone of Theoretical Visibility  |
| 12 May 2024      | Landscape and Visual | Email Correspondence   | A viewpoint from the HS2 overbridge was deemed unnecessary after Parcel 1A was removed, with visual effects assessed via footpath users instead, as agreed with BC; an additional viewpoint from Addison Road bridge over East West Rail was included |
| 24 May 2024      | Air Quality          | Email Correspondence   | Agreed assessment methodology for air quality   |

|              |                      |                      |   |
|--------------|----------------------|----------------------|---|
| 29 May 2024  | Landscape and Visual | Teams meeting        | Discussion on the rationale for viewpoint selection   |
| 30 May 2024  | Transport            | Teams meeting        | Agreed access route assessed  |
| 10 June 2024 | Noise and Vibration  | Email Correspondence | The baseline survey results, including statistical analysis of background sound levels, were fully included and reflected BC's feedback   |
| 12 June 2024 | Landscape and Visual | Email Correspondence | Request for the experience of users on cycle route No. 51 to be considered. Experience of users of cycle route No. 51 has been considered in the assessment   |
| 12 June 2024 | Landscape and Visual | Email Correspondence | Request for additional views to be considered for HS2 close to Viewpoint 4  |
| 12 June 2024 | Landscape and Visual | Email Correspondence | Request for the consideration of the screening effect of hedgerows throughout the duration of the Proposed Development. The assessment includes effects as a result of plant growth rates and management strategy |
| 12 June 2024 | Landscape and Visual | Email Correspondence | Request for winter views to demonstrate a worst-case scenario for the photomontages. Winter photography has been used the basis for all photomontages   |
| 12 June 2024 | Landscape and Visual | Email Correspondence | Request for further viewpoints within the Proposed Development and for consideration towards the experience of horse riders on bridleways   |
| 26 June 2024 | Cultural Heritage    | Teams meeting        | Discussion around emerging geophysical results and approach to trial trenching  |

|  |                      |                      |  |
|--|----------------------|----------------------|--|
| 3 July 2024<br>(and recurring monthly) | Planning             | Teams Meeting        | Monthly online meetings to provide BC's Planning Officer with regular updates  |
| 07 August 2024                         | Biodiversity         | Email Correspondence | Council contact to discuss proposed survey works for protected species   |
| 06 September 2024                      | Cultural Heritage    | Email Correspondence | Update on geophysical survey results. Suggested trial trenching strategy shared  |
| 09 September 2024                      | Biodiversity         | Teams Meeting        | Design principles presented and secured  |
| 26 September 2024                      | Water                | Teams Meeting        | Meeting with the Lead Local Flood Authority to discuss principles of the development and implementation of SuDs and the drainage hierarchy               |
| 26 September 2024                      | Cultural Heritage    | Email Correspondence | Discussions on scope of pre-determination trial trenching  |
| 02 October 2024                        | Landscape and Visual | Email Correspondence | Itinerary of the proposed site visit shared with BC  |
| 09 November 2024                       | Noise and Vibration  | Email Correspondence | Agreed methodology for survey was undertaken   |
| 25 November 2024                       | Land and Groundwater | Email Correspondence | BC agreed that sufficient information in the PEIR justified scoping geological hazards out for assessment in the ES                                      |
| 25 November 2024                       | Land and Groundwater | Email Correspondence | Revised ES assessment methodology issued following comments on the PEIR. Agreement that methodology was acceptable was received from BC on 21 March 2025 |

|                  |                      |  |   |
|------------------|----------------------|--|---|
| 10 December 2024 | Cultural Heritage    | Email Correspondence   | Trench plan agreed and draft Written Scheme of Investigation issued for comment   |
| 08 January 2025  | Cultural Heritage    | Email Correspondence   | Written Scheme of Investigation for the Trial Trenching agreed  |
| 10 January 2025  | Cultural Heritage    | Email (archaeological advisor – jointly with Historic England) | Updates were made to the archaeological trial trenching written scheme of investigation and issued to the archaeological advisor for comment                      |
| 15 January 2025  | Land and Groundwater | Teams Meeting  | Agreed a mineral safeguarding assessment would be provided in advance of the DCO Application to determine whether mineral resources could be scoped out of the ES |
| 16 January 2025  | Cultural Heritage    | Email (archaeological advisor – jointly with Historic England) | Archaeological trial trenching written scheme of investigation finalised and approved   |
| 11 February 2025 | Landscape and Visual | Site walkover  | Site meeting with BC to review the viewpoints, offsets and proposed footpath diversions   |
| 19 February 2025 | Water                | Teams Meeting  | Meeting with the Lead Local Flood Authority to review comments in the Preliminary Environmental Information Report  |
| 26 February 2025 | Landscape and Visual | Site walkover  | Site meeting with BC to review proposed PRoW diversions and permissive routes and clarifications of High Speed 2 (HS2) changes                                    |
| 14 March 2025    | Land and Groundwater | Email Correspondence   | Mineral Safeguarding Assessment was issued and comments provided on the proposed structure of the assessment  |
| 2 April 2025     | Arboriculture        | Email Correspondence   | Email sets out the BC's comments on arboricultural matters and the Applicant's  |

response to these comments with a request for further discussion

|               |                   |                      |  |
|---------------|-------------------|----------------------|--|
| 11 April 2025 | Climate           | Teams Meeting        | Discussion related to the assessment methodology, baseline and mitigation measures. The Applicant has included an assessment of greenhouse gas emissions including a comparison with UK carbon budgets and grid carbon intensity, with expanded and specific mitigation measures and contextual methodology explanations |
| 15 April 2025 | Biodiversity      | Teams Meeting        | Update on the design, mitigation, surveys and enhancement proposals.<br><br>Queries raised have been addressed in the Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan, Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment, and Bat Preliminary Roost Assessment   |
| 16 April 2025 | Population        | Email Correspondence | Agreed the Population Assessment in the ES would exclude health and wellbeing effects  |
| 30 April 2025 | Water             | Teams meeting        | Agreed methodology included in Outline Drainage Strategy   |
| 12 May 2025   | Cultural Heritage | Teams Meeting        | Review of trial trenching results and discussion of archaeological management strategy for post-DCO submission   |
| 13 May 2025   | Arboriculture     | Email Correspondence | BC provided a contact for their Arboricultural lead  |
| 13 May 2025   | Water             | Teams meeting        | Discussion on the draft drainage strategy for the Proposed Development   |

|                   |                      |                                |  |
|-------------------|----------------------|--------------------------------|--|
| 06 June 2025      | Cumulative Effects   | Email Correspondence           | Shortlist agreed, request that Longbreach Solar Farm be included   |
| 12 August 2025    | Cultural Heritage    | Email (built heritage advisor) | Discussion of built heritage assets to be scoped into the detailed setting assessment in the ES  |
| 13 August 2025    | Cultural Heritage    | Email (built heritage advisor) | Confirmed that as Shepherd's Furze (NHLE 1214845) listed building had been demolished (with consent) in advance of HS2 and that it could be de-scoped from the assessment  |
| 14 August 2025    | Cultural Heritage    | Email (archaeological advisor) | List of archaeological assets proposed to be scoped into the ES was sent to the archaeological advisor   |
| 21 August 2025    | Cultural Heritage    | Email (archaeological advisor) | Archaeological advisor requested that the nearby scheduled moated site be included in the setting assessment   |
| 22 August 2025    | Cultural Heritage    | Email (archaeological advisor) | Archaeological advisor provided comments on draft archaeological management strategy (AMS). AMS updated  |
| 28 August 2025    | Cultural Heritage    | Email (archaeological advisor) | Archaeological advisor reiterated the request for 4% trenching of hard infrastructure and geophysical anomalies and 2% of remainder of development area to be undertaken pre-construction and form part of the AMS |
| 09 September 2025 | Land and Groundwater | Email Correspondence           | BC confirmed that it agrees that an assessment of mineral extraction and mineral safeguarding can be scoped out of the ES  |
| 12 September 2025 | Cultural Heritage    | Email (archaeological advisor) | Confirmed that the WWII ammunition dump could be scoped out of the ES  |

|                   |                   |  |  |
|-------------------|-------------------|--|--|
| 18 September      | Arboriculture     | Email Correspondence   | Arboriculturist lead from BC provided a response with a provisional date for a call to discuss the BC's comments   |
| 23 September 2025 | Cultural Heritage | Email (built heritage advisor)   | Confirmed that East Claydon is not designated as a conservation area but that the group of listed and non-designated assets should be considered within the ES |
| 28 November 2025  | Cultural Heritage | Teams meeting (BC archaeological advisor jointly with The National Trust and Historic England) | BC Archaeological Advisor confirmed that their relevant representation had been submitted requesting amendments to the Archaeological Management Strategy      |
| 13 January 2026   | Biodiversity      | Teams meeting  | Discussed the Relevant Representation received from BC and the Applicants initial response and amendments to documents that will be made at Deadline 1         |
| 15 January 2026   | Population        | Teams meeting  | Discussed the Relevant Representation received from BC and the Applicants initial response and amendments to documents that will be made at Deadline 1         |
| 5 February 2026   | Cultural Heritage | Teams meeting  | Discussed the Relevant Representation received from BC and the Applicants initial response and amendments to documents that will be made at Deadline 1         |
| 9 February 2026   | Arboriculture     | Teams meeting  | Discussed the Relevant Representation received from BC and the Applicants initial response and amendments to   |

|                  |                         |               |  |
|------------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
|                  |                         |               | documents that will be made at Deadline 1  |
| 13 February 2026 | Flood Risk and Drainage | Teams meeting | Discussed the Relevant Representation received from BC and the Applicants initial response and amendments to documents that will be made at Deadline 1 |
| 4 March 2026     | Land and Groundwater    | Teams meeting | Discussed the matters detailed within this Statement of Common Ground and amendments to documents that will be made at Deadline 1.                     |
| 26 March         | Land and Groundwater    | Teams meeting | Discussed remaining matters under discussion within this Statement of Common Ground.   |
| 30 March 2026    | Cultural Heritage       | Teams meeting | Discussed the matters detailed within this Statement of Common Ground and response to LIR  |
| 1 April 2026     | Waste                   | Teams meeting | Discussed comments raised by BC in their LIR and amendments to documents that will be made at Deadline 2.  |
| 8 April 2026     | Biodiversity            | Teams meeting | Discussed comments raised by BC in their LIR and remaining matters under discussion within this Statement of Common Ground.                            |
| 10 April 2026    | Cultural Heritage       | Teams meeting | Discussed remaining matters under discussion within this Statement of Common Ground.   |
| 15 April 2026    | Soil                    | Teams meeting | Discussed comments received in the LIR and remaining matters under discussion within this Statement of Common Ground.                                  |
| 17 April 2026    | Biodiversity            | Teams meeting | Discussed comments received in the LIR and remaining matters under discussion within this Statement of Common Ground.                                  |



## 4. Current Position

### 4.1. Position of the Applicant and Buckinghamshire Council

- 4.1.1. Buckinghamshire Council maintains its formal objection to this development for the reasons set out in the Relevant Representations and the forthcoming Local Impact Report. Notwithstanding, there is acknowledgment that as Host Authority, the Council must engage on technical matters.
- 4.1.2. The following tables set out the position of the Applicant and BC on technical matters, following a series of meetings and discussions with respect to the key areas of the Proposed Development. This includes matters where discussions are ongoing.
- 4.1.3. As noted above, this is a 'live' document, and some aspects have yet to be agreed upon between both parties. The intention is to provide a final position in subsequent versions of the SoCG, addressing and identifying where changes have been made, and ultimately, documenting agreement by both parties on relevant points.
- 4.1.4. The parties are in ongoing dialogue and the likelihood that disagreement will remain by the end of the examination for the matters that remain 'under discussion' will be detailed in the SoCG submitted at Deadline 2.
- 4.1.5. Where discussions are ongoing, the parties have included an indication of the likelihood that disagreement will remain by the end of the examination in accordance with the **Rule 6 letter [\[PD-008\]](#)**.

Table 1 - Air Quality

| Ref. | Source               | Description of Matter        | Stakeholder Comment   | Applicant's Response   | Status                  |
|------|----------------------|------------------------------|---|--|-------------------------|
| 1-1  | Email Correspondence | Air Quality Method Statement | BC agree with the Air Quality assessment methodology.   | <b>ES Volume 2, Chapter 6: Air Quality [EN010158/APP/6.2] [APP-049]</b> sets out the agreed methodology.   | Agreed                  |
| 1-2  | Email Correspondence | Air Quality Monitoring Data  | BC agree with the Air Quality Monitoring data.  | <b>ES Volume 2, Chapter 6: Air Quality [EN010158/APP/6.2] [APP-049]</b> sets out the agreed monitoring data.   | Agreed                  |
| 1-3  | Email Correspondence | Peak year of construction    | The air quality assessment states that the peak year for construction traffic is expected to be 2029. However, the Transport Assessment (TA) states that the peak traffic generation is expected in March 2030. It is requested that the applicant confirms when peak traffic generation is expected. It is also requested that the applicant confirms if this discrepancy will have an impact on the outcome of the air quality assessment. If so, | The Transport Assessment ( <b>ES Volume 4, Appendix 15.1: Transport Assessment [EN010158/APP/6.4] [APP-131]</b> ) has assumed a future year of 2029, in the event that the Proposed Development commences earlier and to avoid traffic impacts being diluted by a further year of traffic growth. All traffic assessment undertaken are on the basis of 2029 traffic flows. The figures used in both Transport Assessment ( <b>ES Volume 4, Appendix 15.1: Transport Assessment [EN010158/APP/6.4] [APP-131]</b> ) and the Air Quality | Under Discussion<br>Low |

there may be a requirement to update the air quality assessment.

Assessment (**ES Volume 4, Appendix 6.1: Air Quality Assessment [EN010158/APP/6.4] [APP-086]**) are the same.



Table 2 – Biodiversity

| Ref. | Source                                       | Description of Matter                 | Stakeholder Comment   | Applicant's Response  | Status |
|------|--|---------------------------------------|---|---|--------|
| 2-1  | Section 42 response / ongoing correspondence | Survey effort and assessment approach | <p>BC agree with the precautionary approach to the survey efforts and assessment and consider that there is appropriate mitigation measures secured for the following species and habitats:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Great Crested Newt</li> <li>- Badger</li> <li>- Invertebrates ((lepidoptera, glow worm, aquatic invertebrates, black and brown hairstreak butterfly eggs)</li> <li>- Reptiles</li> <li>- Breeding Birds</li> <li>- Wintering Birds</li> <li>- Arable Plants</li> </ul> | <p><b>ES Volume 4, Appendix 7.5: Great Crested Newt Habitat Suitability Index and Environmental DNA Report (2023) [EN010158/APP/6.4] [APP-091], Appendix 7.6: Badger Survey Report (2022) (Confidential) [EN010158/APP/6.4] [APP-092] and Appendix 7.15: Badger Survey Report (2025) (Confidential) [EN010158/APP/6.4] [APP-101]</b> set out the survey findings.</p> | Agreed |

- Otter and Water Vole
- Trees (Arboriculture)

|                   |   |  |  |   |  |
|-------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| <p><b>2-2</b></p> | <p>Section 42 response / ongoing correspondence / Relevant Representation</p> | <p>Survey and Assessment Methodology</p> | <p>BC do not agree with the survey and assessment methodology for the following species and habitats:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Bats</li> </ul> | <p>The Applicant does not consider that further surveys and/or data are required. Full explanatory commentary is set out in <b>Consultation Report Appendices J-1 to J-2 [EN010158/APP/5.2] [APP-029]</b> and the <b>Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations [EN010158/APP/8.3] [PDA-006]</b> with the full assessment provided within <b>ES Volume 2, Chapter 7: Biodiversity [EN010158/APP/6.2.2]</b>.</p>                   | <p><b>Under Discussion</b><br/><b>Medium</b></p> |
| <p><b>2-3</b></p> | <p>Section 42 response / Relevant Representation</p>                          | <p>Embedded mitigation</p>               | <p>BC do not agree with the use of buffers which do not accord with the minimum specifications set out within local policy.</p>                                    | <p>The Applicant disagrees that buffers are generic. Bespoke offsets have been incorporated into the design of the Proposed Development which have been informed by both the results of surveys and through consultation with stakeholders. Full explanatory commentary is set out in <b>Consultation Report Appendices J-1 to J-2 [EN010158/APP/5.2] [APP-029]</b> and the <b>Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations</b></p> | <p><b>Under Discussion</b><br/><b>Medium</b></p> |

|     |   |                                  |   |   |  |  |  |
|-----|---|----------------------------------|---|---|--|--|--|
| 2-4 | Section 42<br>response /<br>Relevant<br>Representatio<br>n/ LIR | Offset to<br>ancient<br>woodland | BC consider the buffer from<br>ancient woodland should be at<br>least 50m, in accordance with<br>VALP Policy NE8. | [EN010158/APP/8.3] [PDA-006] and<br>ES Volume 2, Chapter 7:<br>Biodiversity [EN010158/APP/6.2.2]. | A minimum 30m buffer zone is<br>proposed around ancient woodland<br>to prevent root damage and support<br>habitat creation, exceeding the<br>standard 15m guidance from Natural<br>England and the Forestry<br>Commission. These buffers will<br>enhance ecological connectivity<br>between the site, nearby SSSIs, and<br>ancient woodland, benefiting local<br>wildlife such as bats. Additionally, a<br>10m buffer is now applied to ditches,<br>aligning with original watercourse<br>proposals. | Full explanatory commentary is set<br>out in <b>Consultation Report<br/>Appendices J-1 to J-2</b><br>[EN010158/APP/5.2] [APP-029] and<br>the <b>Applicant's Response to<br/>Relevant Representations</b><br>[EN010158/APP/8.3] [PDA-006],<br><b>Applicant's Response to<br/>Buckinghamshire Council's Local<br/>Impact Report</b><br>[EN010158/APP/8.11] and <b>ES</b> | <b>Under<br/>Discussion<br/>Medium</b> |
|-----|---|----------------------------------|---|---|--|--|--|

|            |  |              |  | Volume 2, Chapter 7: Biodiversity<br>[EN010158/APP/6.2.2].  |               |
|------------|--|--------------|--|---|---------------|
| <b>2-5</b> | Section 42<br>response /<br>Relevant<br>Representation | Black Poplar | <p>BC consider that an offset should be provided commensurate with their height plus 15m.</p> <p>BC request that there should be genetic testing for black poplar.</p> | <p>The group of trees with potential to be black poplar is entirely unaffected by the Proposed Development. A substantial buffer has been maintained around these trees, extending well beyond their calculated root protection areas, ensuring these trees are fully protected throughout the works as detailed in <b>ES Volume 4, Appendix 7.13: Arboricultural Impact Assessment [EN010158/APP/6.4] [APP-099]</b>.</p> | <b>Agreed</b> |

|     |                     |                  |   |  |  |
|-----|---------------------|------------------|---|--|--|
| 2-6 | Section 42 response | Bats             | <p>BC do not agree with the extent of solar panels as they consider that it is likely to cause harm to bats due to changes to the habitat management and reduction of foraging resources in key areas.</p> <p>BC request that panels and/or infrastructure is removed from fields B6,B7,B10 and B11 and fields D28 and D29.</p> | <p>Full explanatory commentary is set out in <b>Consultation Report Appendices J-1 to J-2 [EN010158/APP/5.2] [APP-029]</b>, the <b>Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations [EN010158/APP/8.3] [PDA-006]</b> and <b>ES Volume 2, Chapter 7: Biodiversity [EN010158/APP/6.2.2]</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant will be providing further detail on the change of habitat management and grazing on bats within the <b>Bat Technical Study [EN010158/APP/8.5]</b> that will be issued at Deadline 1 and will continue to discuss this matter with Buckinghamshire Council.</p> | <p><b>Under Discussion</b><br/><b>High</b></p> |
| 2-7 | Section 42 response | Management Plans | <p>Request that individual management plans for all veteran and ancient trees as well as non-ancient woodland and trees with potential to become veteran and ancient trees (inc. those within the hedgerows).</p>   | <p>The Applicant does not consider that individual management plans are necessary as no woodland habitat including ancient woodland, veteran or ancient trees would be removed, with mitigation measures to protect woodland and trees detailed and secured in the <b>Outline LEMP [EN010158/APP/7.6.2]</b>.</p>   | <p><b>Agreed</b></p>                           |

|     |                               |                                    |   |   |                            |
|-----|-------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|---|----------------------------|
| 2-8 | Section 42 response           | Ancient Woodland and Veteran Trees | BC consider that the proposed PRow diversions should be avoided due to intensification of usage within the buffer zone and increased vulnerability of the woodland. | <p>As detailed in <b>ES Volume 2: Chapter 7: Biodiversity [EN010158/APP/6.2.2]</b>, following the application of additional mitigation measures, no direct adverse impacts are predicted on ancient woodlands within and adjacent to the Order Limits through the lifetime of the Proposed Development.</p> <p>Proposed PRow diversions and new permissive routes in Parcel 1 would be unsurfaced tracks to avoid any physical impacts on the Root Protection Area. The new permissive path route would be 14.5m to the south of Shrubs Wood at the closest point and the closest diverted PRow (Ref. SCL/13/1) would be 10m to the west of Shrubs Wood. It has been assessed that the PRow diversions and permissive footpaths would not result in direct or indirect impacts to ancient woodland sites.</p> | Agreed                     |
| 2-9 | Relevant Representation / LIR | Proposed Bat Monitoring            | BC do not agree with the proposed bat monitoring and expect that it should include the monitoring of temporary flight lines.  | The <b>Outline LEMP [EN010158/APP/7.6.2]</b> outlines that monitoring of bat activity would be undertaken during the operation (including maintenance) phase to   | Under Discussion<br>Medium |

confirm the expected effectiveness of the embedded mitigation and the effect of the Solar PV modules and associated infrastructure on bats.

It is proposed that further detail will be added into the Outline LEMP at Deadline 1 of the examination to set out the methodology of the monitoring strategy. Further engagement is proposed with Natural England to discuss this in further detail. This would also confirm that the final bat monitoring within the detailed Landscape and Ecological Management Plan would be submitted to and approved in writing by the relevant local planning authority in consultation with Natural England prior to the operational phase of the Proposed Development.

The strategy will be developed in line with CIEEM's Bat Mitigation Guidelines **Error! Bookmark not defined.** (Chapter 9) to monitor the effectiveness of the mitigation proposed in relation to bats. Specific objectives will be set and tested, and remedial actions proposed where objectives are not met. Full

explanatory commentary is set out in **Consultation Report Appendices J-1 to J-2 [EN010158/APP/5.2] [APP-029]** and the **Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations [EN010158/APP/8.3] [PDA-006]** and **ES Volume 2, Chapter 7: Biodiversity [EN010158/APP/6.2.2]**.

|      |                         |                       |  |  |        |
|------|-------------------------|-----------------------|--|--|--------|
| 2-10 | Relevant Representation | Biodiversity Net Gain | BC consider that the BNG requirements have been met.   | This is set out in <b>ES Volume 4, Appendix 7.17: Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment [EN010158/APP/6.4.2]</b> .  | Agreed |
| 2-11 | Relevant Representation | DCO Requirement       | BC consider that the DCO should require a detailed Arboricultural Method Statement and Tree Protection Plan to be approved and implemented prior to the commencement of any works (including preliminary works) which could affect trees, hedgerows or woodland. | The <b>Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) [EN010158/APP/7.2.2]</b> secures the need for a site specific Arboricultural Method Statement ('AMS') and Tree Protection Plan (TPP) to be produced which will detail the exact location and nature of protective fencing, tree pruning, signage, methods of work and protection measures. The commitments in the <b>Outline CEMP [EN010158/APP/7.2.2]</b> are secured via Requirement 11 of the <b>Draft Development Consent</b> | Agreed |

|                    |                                |  |   |  |  |
|--------------------|--------------------------------|--|---|--|--|
|                    |                                |  |   | <p><b>Order [EN010158/APP/3.1.3].</b> Prior to commencement of construction, the Applicant will submit the detailed Construction Environmental Management Plan to BC for approval to discharge this requirement, which will include further detail on the AMS and TPP.</p>   |  |
| <p><b>2-12</b></p> | <p>Relevant Representation</p> | <p>Arboricultural cumulative impacts</p> | <p>BC consider that a cumulative assessment of the combined losses of arboricultural features across multiple schemes should be undertaken.</p> | <p>BS 5837 assessments are, by design, scheme-specific, and the quantification of cumulative effects across multiple developments is addressed at Environmental Statement level (for example, within the cumulative landscape, biodiversity and land-use assessments), rather than by attempting to merge disparate BS 5837 datasets from other projects.</p> <p>For the Proposed Development, arboricultural losses have been quantified and are clearly reported within <b>ES Volume 4, Appendix 7.13: Arboricultural Impact Assessment ('AIA') [EN010158/APP/6.4] [APP-099]</b>. For other schemes, compatible survey information (tree categories, RPAs, precise removals) is generally not available in a form that would</p> | <p><b>Under Discussion</b><br/><b>Medium</b></p> |

|             |     |                  |  |  |  |
|-------------|-----|------------------|--|--|--|
|             |     |                  |  | <p>allow a robust combined numerical total, and attempting one would risk being misleading. The Applicant therefore considers the current approach proportionate and consistent with EIA practice, while still allowing the Examining Authority to understand the contribution of the Proposed Development to any wider pattern of change in tree, hedgerow and woodland cover.</p>  |  |
| <b>2-13</b> | LIR | Hedgerow removal | BC are concerned that there would be fragmentation of ecological networks in the Bernwood Opportunity Area due to the loss of approx. 2,060m of hedgerow | <p>The Applicant acknowledges limited arboricultural impacts from the Proposed Development, mainly involving small sections of hedgerows and a limited number of trees, with no loss of veteran trees or ancient woodland. Most linear features will be retained, preserving landscape character. The ecological and historical importance of the hedgerow network is recognised, and losses are minimised. Replacement and new hedgerow planting will result in a net increase in hedgerows across the site, improving ecological connectivity. While new planting will take time to establish, this does not</p> | <p><b>Under Discussion</b><br/><b>Medium</b></p> |

|                    |            |                                       |   |   |  |
|--------------------|------------|---------------------------------------|---|---|--|
|                    |            |                                       |   | <p>represent permanent loss, and interim measures will maintain landscape connectivity until hedgerows are fully established</p>  |  |
| <p><b>2-14</b></p> | <p>LIR</p> | <p>Ground nesting bird mitigation</p> | <p>BC consider that the compensation land and strategy for ground nesting birds (required at a minimum 2:1 ratio) has not yet been identified or secured.</p> | <p>Breeding bird surveys have been undertaken over two years within the Solar PV panel areas, covering a substantial area. As the cable route and other areas support the same habitats, the Applicant is confident this survey data can reliably predict breeding bird use, including by ground-nesting species. Cabling works are temporary, with land reinstated to agricultural use, so no significant effects on breeding birds are anticipated. The Outline LEMP commits to carrying out works outside the breeding season where possible, or undertaking nesting bird checks to ensure legal compliance. Additional mitigation and monitoring measures to support ground-nesting birds are secured through the <b>Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan</b> [EN010158/APP/7.6.2] [REP1-086] and Requirement 7 of the <b>Draft Development Consent Order</b></p> | <p><b>Under Discussion</b><br/><b>Medium</b></p> |

(DCO) [EN010158/APP/3.1.3]  
[\[REP1-008\]](#).

Table 3 – Climate

| Ref. | Source                         | Description of Matter      | Stakeholder Comment   | Applicant's Response  | Status |
|------|--------------------------------|----------------------------|---|---|--------|
| 3-1  | Meeting / email correspondence | GHG Assessment Methodology | BC agree with the assessment methodology (including inclusion of a comparison with UK carbon budgets and grid intensity) and conclusions. | <p><b>ES Volume 2, Chapter 8: Climate [EN010158/APP/6.2] [APP-051]</b> presents a comparison against national and sectoral carbon budgets and against the UK grid carbon intensity.</p> <p>Additional justification on the methodology of the assessment which uses CCGT as a comparison baseline is outlined in <b>ES Volume 2, Chapter 8: Climate [EN010158/APP/6.2] [APP-051]</b> considering potential alternative methodologies, as well as a section comparing the Proposed Development against different energy generation technologies.</p> | Agreed |

Table 4 – Cultural Heritage

| Ref. | Source   | Description of Matter  | Stakeholder Comment  | Applicant's Response  | Status   |
|------|--|--|--|---|--|
| 4-1  | Section 42 Response / Email correspondence / Relevant Representation / LIR | Assessment methodology including how the contribution of setting to significance has been identified | <p>BC do not agree with the way the cultural heritage methodology has been followed and consider that the assessments of setting do not adequately consider the contribution of setting to significance and thus the effects of changes to the setting of the designated heritage assets.</p> <p>BC consider that the contribution to significance should be assessed in more detail including how different views including two way views, views that take in both the receptor and scheme, parkland views and views and relationships that historically relate to heritage sites and contribute to their significance.</p> | <p><b>ES Volume 2, Chapter 9: Cultural Heritage [EN010158/APP/6.2] [APP-052]</b> includes all the assets that have been requested to be scoped in and sets out the assessment methodology which follows industry standards and guidance. and conclusions.</p> <p><b>ES Volume 4, Appendix 9.1: Archaeological Desk-based Assessment and Setting Assessment, Annex C and Annex D [EN010158/APP/6.4] [APP-106]</b> has considered the contribution made by setting to the significance of heritage assets in turn, including the contribution made by designed views. Detailed assessment has been provided for those assets expected to experience significant effects. This has included consideration of any designed views, particularly with</p> | <p><b>Under Discussion</b><br/><b>High</b></p> |

|     |  |                                 |   |   |        |
|-----|--|---------------------------------|---|---|--------|
|     |  |                                 |   | reference to Claydon House. The list of assets scoped into the assessment has been agreed with Historic England through ongoing engagement as set out in the <b>Draft SoCG with Historic England [EN010158/APP/5.16]</b> .  |        |
| 4-2 | Section 42 response / ongoing correspondence | Trial Trenching                 | BC agree with the trial trenching survey scope and methodology.                               | <p>The Applicant undertook pre-determination archaeological investigations in consultation with the host authority at a 4% sample rate of the targeted areas.</p> <p>Results of these surveys and how this has informed the design of the Proposed Development (including approach to mitigation) is included within <b>ES Volume 2, Chapter 9: Cultural Heritage [EN010158/APP/6.2] [APP-052]</b>, <b>ES Volume 4, Appendix 9.2: Geophysical Survey Report [EN010158/APP/6.4.2]</b> and <b>Appendix 9.3: Archaeological Trial Trenching Report [EN010158/APP/6.4] [APP-108]</b>.</p> | Agreed |
| 4-3 | Section 42 response                          | Written Scheme of Investigation | BC request that a detailed Written Scheme of Investigation submitted to detail an appropriate | The <b>Draft Archaeological Management Strategy [EN010158/APP/7.10.2]</b> includes  | Agreed |

evaluation and mitigation strategy prior to construction and decommissioning works.

provision for detailed Written Scheme(s) of Investigation for further evaluation and archaeological mitigation to be agreed with BC prior to construction works commencing. Potential impacts to archaeological remains during operation (including maintenance) and decommissioning works are considered within **ES Volume 2, Chapter 9: Cultural Heritage [EN010158/APP/6.2] [APP-052]**.

|                     |               |   |   |   |
|---------------------|---------------|---|---|---|
| Section 42 response | Bernwood Farm | BC consider that Farm although of low significance would benefit from some screening or other mitigation, as it would be significantly harmed through changes to its setting. | Bernwood Farm has been considered as part of the Residential Visual Amenity Assessment ( <b>ES Volume 4, Appendix 10.5: Residential Visual Amenity Assessment [EN010158/APP/6.4] [APP-114]</b> ) which confirms that the offset of above ground infrastructure from the property is a minimum of 180 metres. Therefore, the setting of Bernwood Farm would be preserved, as would the relationship between the buildings within the farmyard. | <p style="background-color: #92d050; padding: 5px;">Under Discussion</p> <p style="background-color: #ffc107; padding: 5px;">Medium</p> |
|---------------------|---------------|---|---|---|

|             |  |   |  |  |  |
|-------------|--|---|--|--|--|
|             |  |   |  | Bernwood Farm is not a listed building and assessment of effects on this asset were not requested by BC's built heritage advisor.  |  |
| <b>4-6a</b> | LIR  | Harm to the significance of heritage assets   | BC agree that the harm to the significance of the designated built heritage assets will be less than substantial and with the exception of those detailed in the rows below (which BC consider would experience a greater level of harm than assessed by the Applicant) BC agree that the harm would be at the lower end of that scale.  | The Applicant welcomes agreement that the harm would be less than substantial and the agreement regarding the scale of harm to those heritage assets not specified below.  | <b>Agreed</b>                            |
| <b>4-6b</b> | Section 42 Response, Relevant Representation and LIR | Harm to significance of Claydon House and Park and Middle Claydon Conservation Area | BC consider that there would be less than substantial harm to the significance of Claydon House and its associated park as a result of changes to views out from the upper floors of the house towards Knowl Hill and through changes to the character of the wider estate surroundings including the relationship between Claydon House and its estate farms and the overall change to the agricultural | The Applicant considers that the harm to the significance of Claydon House and its associated park as a result of changes to the views out from the upper floors of the house towards Knowl Hill and through changes to the character of the wider estate surroundings including the relationship between Claydon House and its estate farms and the overall change to the agricultural character of the | <b>Under Discussion</b><br><b>Medium</b> |

|                    |   |  |  |   |  |
|--------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
|                    |   |  | <p>character of the estate. BC consider this harm to be in the middle of the scale of less than substantial. This relationship would also be affected by the cumulative effects of other developments, especially infrastructure.</p>      | <p>estate would be less than substantial and towards the lower end of this scale.</p>   |  |
| <p><b>4-6c</b></p> | <p>Section 42 Response, Relevant Representation and LIR</p> | <p>Harm to the significance of All Saint’s Church and East Claydon village, Blackmoorhill Farmhouse, Rosehill Farmhouse, Botolph House, Dry Leys Farmhouse, Botolph Claydon Conservation Area,</p> | <p>BC consider that the harm to the significance of these heritage assets would be less than substantial and towards the middle of this scale.</p> <p>BC consider that there would also be cumulative impacts on these heritage assets</p> | <p>The Applicant considers that the harm to the significance of these heritage assets through changes within their setting resulting from the Proposed Development would be at the lower end of the scale of less than substantial.</p> | <p><b>Under Discussion</b><br/><b>Medium</b></p> |

|                    |                                     |   |  |  |  |
|--------------------|-------------------------------------|---|--|--|--|
| <p><b>4-6e</b></p> | <p>LIR</p>                          | <p>Harm to the significance of Pond Farmhouse</p> | <p>BC consider that there would be harm to the significance of Pond Farmhouse through disruption to its relationship with Claydon House (which has already been damaged by HS2, East West Rail and other infrastructure projects), and the harm would be at the upper end of less than substantial harm.</p> | <p>The Applicant considers that the harm to the significance of Pond Farmhouse through changes within its setting resulting from the Proposed Development would be at the middle of the scale of less than substantial. The Applicant further considers that the cumulative effect of the Proposed Development in combination with HS2 and East West Rail would remain within the middle of the scale of less than substantial harm.</p> | <p><b>Under Discussion</b><br/><b>Medium</b></p> |
| <p><b>4-7a</b></p> | <p>Relevant Representation, LIR</p> | <p>Draft AMS</p>                                  | <p>BC considered that the amendments to the Draft AMS at Deadline 1 are acceptable</p>   | <p>Amendments have been made to the <b>Draft Archaeological Management Strategy [EN010158/APP/7.10.2]</b> at Deadline 1 to provide clarification on the timing of the archaeological fieldwork, and address the requests for provision for BC’s Historic Environment Record to be supplied with copies of all of the trial trenching reports which have been approved by BC and</p>  |  |

|      |                         |           |  |  |   |        |
|------|-------------------------|-----------|--|--|---|--------|
| 4-7b | Relevant Representation | Draft AMS | BC is in agreement with the proposed approach to pre-construction evaluation as detailed in the Draft AMS. | Historic England in hard and digital format. | The Applicant is concerned by the request for blanket percentage coverages which does not accord with the emerging best practice guidance published by CIFA, FAME, ALGAO and Historic England in 2025. The Applicant considers that an approach whereby site-specific research questions would determine the scope of further evaluation to inform the detailed design would be more appropriate. This approach is aligned with what was agreed with Historic England and Lincolnshire Council for Springwell Solar Farm. | Agreed |
|------|-------------------------|-----------|--|--|---|--------|

Table 5 – Cumulative Effects

| Ref | Source               | Description of Matter                    | Stakeholder Comment   | Applicant's Response   | Status |
|-----|----------------------|--|---|--|--------|
| 5-1 | Email correspondence | Short-list of other existing development | BC agree with methodology and with the long and short-list of | <b>ES Volume 2, Chapter 17: Cumulative Effects [EN010158/APP/6.2.2]</b> sets out | Agreed |

|            |                              |  |   |  |  |
|------------|------------------------------|--|---|--|--|
|            | and/or approved developments | other existing development and/or approved developments. | the cumulative effects based on the short list of developments.<br><br>The Applicant remains committed to updating the cumulative long and short list as new developments come into the public domain, ensuring that the assessment remains as accurate and comprehensive as possible throughout the examination process. |  |  |
| <b>5-2</b> | Relevant Representation      | 'Temporary' effects                                      | BC note that 40 years should not be considered as temporary and could lead to permanent consequential effects.  | The Applicant considers that operational impacts would be temporary as the Proposed Development would be decommissioned after the 40 year operational lifespan and the land would be reinstated. This approach is consistent with the approach taken on other Solar DCO projects. The Applicant acknowledges that there would be a number of likely significant inter-project residual cumulative effects on landscape and visual and biodiversity as concluded in <b>ES Volume 2, Chapter 17:</b> | <b>Under Discussion</b><br><b>High</b> |

|            |                         |                      |   | <b>Cumulative Effects<br/>[EN010158/APP/6.2.2].</b>  |                                  |
|------------|-------------------------|----------------------|---|--|----------------------------------|
| <b>5-3</b> | Relevant Representation | Construction effects | BC consider that cumulative effects during construction would be significant and they consider that consideration should be given to the staggering of construction programmes. | This comment is noted and we welcome further discussion with BC on this matter.  | <b>Under Discussion<br/>High</b> |
| <b>5-4</b> | LIR                     | Cumulative effects   | BC disagree with the approach and outcome of the cumulative effects assessment particularly related to ecology, landscape and cultural heritage.                                | <b>ES Volume 2, Chapter 17: Cumulative Effects [EN010158/APP/6.2.2] [REP1-044]</b> considers all environmental topics, including biodiversity, landscape and cultural heritage. Relevant mitigation is secured through the <b>Outline CEMP [EN010158/APP/7.2.2] [REP1-078]</b> and <b>Design Commitments [EN010158/APP/5.9.3] [REP1-020]</b> . In addition, embedded design measures have been incorporated to avoid or reduce potential cumulative effects through the placement of infrastructure. |                                  |

Table 6 – Landscape and Visual Impact

| Ref. | Source               | Description of Matter | Stakeholder Comment   | Applicant's Response   | Status |
|------|----------------------|-----------------------|---|--|--------|
| 6-1  | Section 42 response  | Study area            | Study area to be increased from 5km to 6km to include sensitive receptors at Waddesdon Manor and Wotton Underwood RPGs. | Study area extended to include all potentially sensitive receptors up to a 6km radius. This is illustrated on <b>ES Volume 3, Figure 10.1: Landscape Study Area, Context and Designations</b> [EN010158/APP/6.3] <a href="#">[APP-069]</a> .       | Agreed |
| 6-2  | Section 42 response  | ZTV                   | Heights of screening elements used for ZTVs should be reduced.  | ZTVs were updated using reduced screening heights of 6m for buildings and 10m for woodland. The ZTVs are illustrated within <b>ES Volume 3, Figures 10.7a to 10.9a and Figures 10.10a to 10.12b</b> [EN010158/APP/6.3] <a href="#">[APP-069]</a> . | Agreed |
| 6-3  | Email correspondence | Photography           | BC requested for photomontages to illustrate the worst-case scenario using winter photography.                          | Winter photography has been used to illustrate the worst-case scenario for views and photomontage with the exception of one additional view requested in the summer of 2025.   | Agreed |
| 6-4  | Email correspondence | Viewpoints            | Viewpoints have been selected and agreed in discussion with BC.   | All viewpoints have been agreed and have informed the assessment set out in <b>ES Volume 2, Chapter</b>  | Agreed |

|            |                     |                           |   |   | <b>10: Landscape and Visual [EN010158/APP/6.2] [APP-053].</b> |                                    |
|------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---|---|---|------------------------------------|
| <b>6-5</b> | Section 42 response | Hedgerows                 | BC consider that 4m high hedgerows would require periodic reduction in height over the 40-year life of the Proposed Development thereby affecting magnitude of visual effect. | Woodland trees have been proposed in locations where taller screening elements are required. Hedgerows will be managed to 3-3.5m to screen the Proposed Development which is considered sustainable in the long-term.   |   | <b>Agreed</b>                      |
| <b>6-6</b> | Section 42 response | Cumulative visualisations | BC consider that visualisations are required to illustrate the visibility of cumulative schemes from more open/elevated viewpoints  | Cumulative visualisations for three viewpoints have been included in <b>ES Volume 4, Appendix 17.3: Cumulative Visualisations [EN010158/APP/6.4] [APP-136].</b>   |   | <b>Under Discussion<br/>Medium</b> |
| <b>6-7</b> | Section 42 response | Visual effects            | BC consider that several villages are likely to experience permanent significant adverse visual effects, including Steeple Claydon, Botolph Claydon and Granborough.          | The assessment in <b>ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010158/APP/6.2] [APP-053]</b> reports no significant adverse effect on the visual amenity of residents in any of villages surrounding the Site.<br><br>Residents of Botolph Claydon and Granborough would experience up to moderate (not significant) effects, those of Steeple Claydon up to moderate/minor adverse (not significant) effects, whilst no other |   | <b>Under Discussion<br/>High</b>   |

|             |                              |  |   |   |  |
|-------------|------------------------------|--|---|---|--|
|             |                              |  |   | settlements would experience more than minor adverse (not significant) effects.   |  |
| <b>6-8</b>  | Ongoing correspondence / LIR | Assessment methodology and conclusions | BC do not agree with the assessment conclusions, particularly related to public rights of way and landscape characters across the Claydon Bowl, Hogshaw Claylands, Twyford Value and areas within the Aylesbury Vale AAL. | The assessment methodology and conclusions are set out in <b>ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010158/APP/6.2] [APP-053]</b> .   | <b>Under Discussion</b><br><b>High</b>   |
| <b>6-9</b>  | LIR                          | BESS                                   | BC are concerned about the location of the BESS in fields D8 and D9   | As set out in the response to LIR Para. Ref. 4.4.68, the Applicant respectfully disagrees that relocating the BESS would result in overall reduced impacts. <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 4: Reasonable Alternatives Considered [EN010158/APP/6.1] [APP-047]</b> and the <b>Design Approach Document [EN010158/APP/5.8.2] [REP1-018]</b> explain the reasons why the proposed BESS has been located in Fields D8 and D9 | <b>Under Discussion</b><br><b>High</b>   |
| <b>6-10</b> | LIR                          | Mitigation                             | BC consider that mitigation is insufficient and in some cases   | As noted on page 54, the taller elements of the Proposed Development, which include the   | <b>Under Discussion</b><br><b>Medium</b> |

|  |  |   |  |
|--|--|---|--|
|  | worsens impacts by enclosing former open rural views | noise barrier and BESS, are located in low lying areas of the Order Limits with proposed mitigation hedgerow planting to minimise and soften views. The solar PV development and BESS have been set back from the Bernwood Jubilee Way, given its elevated position, to allow views to continue over the top of the built elements of the Proposed Development, as described in the <b>Design Approach Document [EN010158/APP/5.8.2] [REP1-018]</b> . |  |
|--|--|---|--|

Table 7 – Land and Groundwater

| Ref. | Source                                     | Description of Matter              | Stakeholder Comment  | Applicant's Response   | Status                                |
|------|--|------------------------------------|--|--|---------------------------------------|
| 7-1  | Section 42 response / Email Correspondence | Geological hazards methodology     | BC agreed that geological hazards can be scoped out of the assessment.     | <b>Table 11.1 in ES Volume 2, Chapter 11: Land and Groundwater [EN010158/APP/6.2.2]</b> sets out the justification for this matter being scoped out of the assessment. | <b>Agreed</b>                         |
| 7-2  | Section 42 response                        | Groundwater assessment methodology | BC consider that the assessment in relation to groundwater levels and flow | The Applicant has detailed this issue more fully in <b>ES Volume 2 Chapter 11: Land and Groundwater</b>  | <b>Under Discussion</b><br><b>Low</b> |

lacks detail, and specific information on groundwater depth and flow direction is not provided. In particular, the potential for shallow groundwater impacts on the BESS is not discussed. BC considers that the detail of this assessment should be provided.

**[EN010158/APP/6.2.2]**, to bring that document in line with the management plans that provide details of mitigation measures in relation to this issue.

The assessment provided in **ES Volume 2 Chapter 11: Land and Groundwater**

**[EN010158/APP/6.2.2]** was informed by the information provided in the preliminary risk assessment in **ES Volume 4, Appendix 11.1: Preliminary Risk Assessment [EN010158/APP/6.4.2]** and intrusive survey information available in **ES Volume 4, Appendix 11.3: Ground Investigation Report [EN010158/APP/6.4] [APP-125]**.

The Applicant will complete further ground investigation (the scope of which will be designed based on the findings of **ES Volume 4, Appendix 11.1: Preliminary Risk Assessment [EN010158/APP/6.4.2]** and the information from **ES Volume 4, Appendix 11.3: Ground Investigation Report [EN010158/APP/6.4] [APP-125]**, and agreed with BC, and the

Environment Agency, where appropriate) prior to any works commencing. This is secured in the **Outline CEMP [EN010158/APP/7.2.2]**.

It is noted that there is currently little data on the site-specific groundwater conditions. However, this does not change the fact that the groundwater importance is categorised on the basis of the aquifer designations (according to Table 11.6 of **ES Volume 2 Chapter 11: Land and Groundwater [EN010158/APP/6.2.2]**), which are applied by the Environment Agency based on national mapping. Although more information on site-specific groundwater conditions will be collected during ground investigation work that is still to be completed (as secured within **Outline CEMP [EN010158/APP/7.2.2]**), this will allow a better understanding of the specific groundwater regime, but will not fundamentally change the assessment in terms of the groundwater importance, or the magnitudes of impact that are applied for considering groundwater

|     |                      |                                  |   |  |        |
|-----|----------------------|----------------------------------|---|--|--------|
|     |                      |                                  |   | receptors (Table 11.8 of <b>ES Volume 2 Chapter 11: Land and Groundwater [EN010158/APP/6.2.2]</b> ).   |        |
| 7-3 | Email correspondence | Approach to Mineral safeguarding | BC agreed that mineral safeguarding can be scoped out of the ES.  | <p>Mineral resources are covered in the Mineral Safeguarding Assessment which is provided in Appendix 2 to the <b>Planning Statement [EN010158/APP/5.7.3]</b>.</p> <p>The Applicant has agreed to update the Mineral Safeguarding Assessment after results of intrusive ground investigation work are available.</p>   | Agreed |
| 7-4 | Section 42 response  | Contamination risks              | BC agree with the level of ground investigation data and are happy with the Applicant's proposed approach to verifying contamination risks. | <p>A site investigation has been undertaken of some areas within the Site. However, it has not been possible to undertake intrusive works of the entire Site in advance of the DCO submission. An interpretive report and further site investigations would be undertaken post-consent as set out and secured in the <b>Outline CEMP [EN010158/APP/7.2.2]</b>. The scope of the further works would be subject to approval by the local planning authority as secured in the</p> | Agreed |

|     |                         |                      |   |   |        |
|-----|-------------------------|----------------------|---|---|--------|
|     |                         |                      |   | <p><b>Outline CEMP [EN010158/APP/7.2.2].</b></p> <p>The scope of the surveys, which includes the targeting of potential sources of contamination identified within the Preliminary Risk Assessment is secured in the <b>Outline CEMP [EN010158/APP/7.2.2].</b></p>  |        |
| 7-5 | Relevant Representation | Ground Investigation | BC agree with the proposed approach and welcome the addition of ground gas and groundwater monitoring as part of the further Ground Investigation works proposed at pre-construction. | <p>Section 11.5.25 of <b>ES Volume 2 Chapter 11: Land and Groundwater [EN010158/APP/6.2]</b> <a href="#">[APP-054]</a> indicates that, in accordance with <b>ES Volume 4, Appendix 11.1: Preliminary Risk Assessment [EN010158/APP/6.4.2]</b>, the identified potential contaminant linkages should be assessed further through appropriate pre-construction ground investigation. This investigation is secured by the <b>Outline CEMP [EN010158/APP/7.2.2]</b> to target the identified sources of potential contamination and assess the feasibility of identified pathways.</p> | Agreed |

As detailed in and secured by the **Outline CEMP [EN010158/APP/7.2.2]**, the further required phases of ground investigation work will be completed (including groundwater and ground gas monitoring, where appropriate) prior to construction works commencing. The scope will be agreed in advance with BC (and the Environment Agency, where appropriate) and the findings will be issued to BC (and the Environment Agency, where appropriate). Any remedial action required as a result of any findings from the further phases of ground investigation work will be agreed in advance with BC and the Environment Agency, where appropriate, in terms of scope of work for remediation, validation and verification.

|     |                         |                  |  |  |
|-----|-------------------------|------------------|--|--|
| 7-6 | Relevant Representation | Residual effects | BC notes that the assessment of residual effects assumes no significant existing contamination present but states that it is unclear what this is based on, as the findings from the initial | The ‘assumption of no significant contamination’ can be made on the basis that ground investigation work is required to identify and provide details on any existing contamination (as secured within <b>Outline CEMP [EN010158/APP/7.2.2]</b> (the scope of |
|-----|-------------------------|------------------|--|--|

**Agreed**

ground investigation is not discussed.

Following further engagement, BC no longer see this as an issue and agree with this matter.

which will be designed based on the findings of **ES Volume 4, Appendix 11.1: Preliminary Risk Assessment [EN010158/APP/6.4.2]** and the information from **ES Volume 4, Appendix 11.3: Ground Investigation Report [EN010158/APP/6.4] [APP-125]** and agreed with BC and the Environment Agency, where appropriate) prior to any works commencing. Any identified contamination would then be required to be remediated, in accordance with a scope of work to be agreed with BC (and the Environment Agency, where appropriate), prior to any construction works commencing. This applies to the potential for existing contamination to be present. There are also measures within the **Outline CEMP [EN010158/APP/7.2.2], Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan (OEMP) [EN010158/APP/7.3.2]** and **Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (DEMP) [EN010158/APP/7.4.2]** to ensure

that if unexpected existing contamination is encountered once construction works commence (or during the operation or decommissioning phases), that works are stopped until an agreed method of remediation and validation is confirmed with BC (and the Environment Agency, where appropriate). It is therefore possible to determine that, after resolution of any issues relating to contamination via these mechanisms, there will be no residual contamination that could result in a significant effect on the groundwater receptor.

Table 8 – Soils

| Ref. | Source              | Description of Matter | Stakeholder Comment   | Applicant's Response  | Status                  |
|------|---------------------|-----------------------|---|---|-------------------------|
| 8-1  | Section 42 response | Long-term impacts     | BC consider that long-term impacts on agricultural land are not adequately addressed, and | The Applicant considers that long-term impacts on agricultural land have been addressed. The Proposed | <b>Under Discussion</b> |

|            |                     |                    |   |   |                                       |
|------------|---------------------|--------------------|---|---|---------------------------------------|
|            |                     |                    | appropriate mitigation has not been provided.   | Development considers the impacts on agricultural land for a 40-year period which considers the entire duration of the operational phase of the scheme. The land will be returned to its original use following decommissioning. Details of the mitigation to prevent any long-term damage are outlined within <b>ES Volume 2, Chapter 12: Soil [EN010158/APP/6.2] [APP-055]</b> and secured in the <b>Outline Soil Management Plan (SMP) [EN010158/APP/7.7.2]</b> . Following the execution of the mitigation measures there will be no long-term impacts. | <b>Medium</b>                         |
| <b>8-2</b> | Section 42 response | Survey methodology | BC agree that methodology used for the ALC survey was appropriate.  | <b>ES Volume 4, Appendix 12.1: Agricultural Land Classification Report [EN010158/APP/6.4] [APP-126]</b> sets out the survey methodology and ALC survey results.   | <b>Agreed</b>                         |
| <b>8-3</b> | Section 42 response | Agricultural land  | BC consider that climate change impacts, including consideration of ecosystem services have not been addressed. | <b>ES Volume 2, Chapter 12: Soils [EN010158/APP/6.2] [APP-055]</b> addresses impacts related to soil quality and agricultural land quality. Climate has been assessed as part of the agricultural land classification survey to determine any limitations on  | <b>Under Discussion</b><br><b>Low</b> |

agricultural land quality. Wider climate change related matters have been addressed within **ES Volume 2, Chapter 8: Climate [EN010158/APP/6.2] [APP-051]**, and the Climate Change Resilience Assessment (**ES Volume 4, Appendix 8.2: Climate Change Resilience Assessment [EN010158/APP/6.4] [APP-105]**).

|     |                         |                     |  |  |
|-----|-------------------------|---------------------|--|--|
| 8-4 | Relevant Representation | Soil classification | BC do not agree with the topsoil classification conclusions and consider that the entire site should be Unit C (Red) - low tolerance to structural damage (see Table 2 of the Outline Soil Management Plan (SMP)). They consider that the Outline SMP fails to identify that the soil across the Site is clay. | The Applicant does not agree and has undertaken the ALC survey in line with the Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food (1988) Agricultural Land Classification for England and Wales: Revised Criteria for Grading the Quality of Agricultural Land (ALC011) as set out in <b>ES Volume 2, Chapter 12: Soil [EN010158/APP/6.2] [APP-055]</b> and <b>ES Volume 4, Appendix 12.1: Agricultural Land Classification Report [EN010158/APP/6.4] [APP-126]</b> . The topsoil texture across the site are all heavy textures but the field capacity days across the site are 136-142 therefore as the FCD are below 150 the topsoil classification is Unit B (Orange). |
|-----|-------------------------|---------------------|--|--|

**Under Discussion  
Medium**

|     |                         |                    |   |   |
|-----|-------------------------|--------------------|---|---|
| 8-4 | Relevant Representation | Cumulative effects | BC would like to see the cumulative assessment updated to include impacts on the local ALC land quality resource. | The cumulative assessment for soils and agriculture is located in <b>ES Volume 2 Chapter 17: Cumulative Effects [EN010158/APP/6.2.2]</b> . No significant cumulative effect on agricultural land was found and as only 1.51% of the site was BMV land and as such, further assessment was not needed. |
|-----|-------------------------|--------------------|---|---|

**Under Discussion**  
**Low**

Table 9 – Noise

| Ref. | Source                     | Description of Matter               | Stakeholder Comment   | Applicant's Response   | Status                                |
|------|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|--|---------------------------------------|
| 9-1  | Email Correspondence       | Baseline methodology                | BC consider that the methodology and approach to establishing baseline measurements (including the baseline noise measurement locations, report, and results) is appropriate. | The methodology is set out in <b>ES Volume 2, Chapter 13: Noise and Vibration [EN010158/APP/6.2.2]</b> .                                       | <b>Agreed</b>                         |
| 9-2  | Email Correspondence / LIR | Assessment approach and methodology | BC disagree with the, magnitude of impact, and likely significant effect.   | The assessment approach, methodology and conclusions are set out in <b>ES Volume 2, Chapter 13: Noise and Vibration [EN010158/APP/6.2.2]</b> . | <b>Under Discussion</b><br><b>Low</b> |

|                   |                                |                                 |  |  |                      |
|-------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|--|--|----------------------|
| <p><b>9-3</b></p> | <p>Section 42<br/>Response</p> | <p>Public Rights<br/>of Way</p> | <p>BC consider that Public Rights of Way users should be considered as a receptor for noise.</p>                           | <p>Consideration has been given to the noise impacts on PRoW within/adjacent to the Order Limits as detailed in <b>ES Volume 2, Chapter 13: Noise and Vibration [EN010158/APP/6.2.2] Paragraphs 13.8.6 to 13.8.8</b>). Cumulative effects from other developments on users of PRoW are not anticipated to be any greater than that presented for the Proposed Development in isolation (see Section 13.8 of <b>ES Volume 2, Chapter 13: Noise and Vibration [EN010158/APP/6.2.2]</b>).</p> | <p><b>Agreed</b></p> |
| <p><b>9-4</b></p> | <p>Section 42<br/>response</p> | <p>Working<br/>hours</p>        | <p>BC request for noisy activities to be constrained to 08:00 – 18:00 Monday to Friday and 08:00 – 13:00) on Saturday.</p> | <p>Construction works would be undertaken during the hours of 07:00 to 19:00 Monday to Friday, and 07:00 to 12:00 on Saturday. Between 07:00 to 08:00 and 18:00 to 19:00 Monday to Friday and 07:00 to 08:00 on Saturdays, noisier activities (such as piling) would be restricted depending on the construction activity proposed to take place and its proximity to sensitive receptors. No construction works would be carried out on Sundays or Bank or</p>                            | <p><b>Agreed</b></p> |

|  |                               |                          |   |  |                                       |
|--|-------------------------------|--------------------------|---|--|---------------------------------------|
| Public Holidays without prior agreement with the host authority. This is secured in the <b>Outline CEMP [EN010158/APP/7.2.2]</b> . |                               |                          |   |  |                                       |
| <b>9-5</b>   | Relevant Representation / LIR | Cumulative Noise Impacts | BC are concerned that there will be cumulative noise impacts and consider that that a mechanism should be secured to compel developers to collaborate with other developers to remedy noise complaints. | The potential for cumulative noise impacts has been presented in <b>ES Volume 2, Chapter 17: Cumulative Effects [EN010158/APP/6.2.2]</b> . Inter-project cumulative noise effects during construction and operational phases are assessed as being not significant.<br><br>In relation to the origin of construction noise that could be generated by different development sites in the area, it would be expected that noise levels at or above the adopted British Standard significance thresholds would generally be attributable to works taking place in the vicinity of the affected receptor and therefore readily identifiable in terms of their origin. The mechanism for addressing construction phase complaints is | <b>Under Discussion</b><br><b>Low</b> |

|                   |                                |                   |  |  |   |
|-------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------|--|--|---|
| <p><b>9-6</b></p> | <p>Relevant Representation</p> | <p>BESS Noise</p> | <p>BC has queried whether reliance on timber acoustic fencing as the primary acoustic barrier is sufficient, with request for the specification, installation, and maintenance of the barrier to be robustly secured through DCO requirements or consideration of supplementary mitigation.</p> <p>BC also comment that ongoing noise monitoring and a clear complaints procedure must be established, with adaptive</p> | <p>set out in the <b>Outline CEMP [EN010158/APP/7.2.2]</b>.</p> <p>The requirement and specification of acoustic barriers and/or other appropriate mitigation measures (including refinement of the engineering requirements to adopt lower noise emitting plant, where possible) will ensure that the acoustic mitigation strategy is sufficient to reduce noise to within the adopted criteria.</p> <p>There are various material options that can be adopted for the acoustic barriers. Any timber acoustic fencing to be used as a barrier will have suitable material properties such that the level of noise attenuation required to meet the adopted criteria can be achieved. The specification, installation, and maintenance requirements of any acoustic mitigation scheme will be provided prior to operation and is secured by a requirement of the <b>Outline OEMP [EN010158/APP/7.3.2]</b>, (Section 2.8 refers).</p> | <p style="background-color: #FFD700; text-align: center; padding: 5px;"><b>Agreed</b></p> |
|-------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------|--|--|---|

It is proposed that further detail will be added into the **Outline OEMP [EN010158/APP/7.3.2]** at Deadline 1 of the examination to set out the commitment for a clear complaints procedure, including compliance noise monitoring and adaptive control measures, where deemed necessary.

Table 10 – Population and Human Health

| Ref. | Source                  | Description of Matter                | Stakeholder Comment  | Applicant's Response  | Status   |
|------|-------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|---|--|
| 10-1 | Relevant Representation | Approach to Health Impact Assessment | BC consider that a formal HIA or Heath ES Chapter should have been undertaken, adhering to IEMA guidance with a full and detailed health baseline, engagement and consultation, and an assessment of the potential for impacts for determinants of and pathways to health and wellbeing. | <p>Following feedback from Phase Two consultation <b>ES Volume 4, Appendix 5.5: Health and Wellbeing Summary Statement [EN010158/APP/6.4.2]</b> has been produced to support the ES and sets out how a compliant assessment has been undertaken in line with IEMA guidance and taking into account BC's advice during the pre-application period.</p> <p>A Health Effects Report which is provided in Annex A of <b>ES Volume 4, Appendix 5.5: Health and</b></p> | <p><b>Under Discussion</b><br/><b>Medium</b></p> |

**Wellbeing Summary Statement [EN010158/APP/6.4.2]** will be submitted at Deadline 1.

**Under Discussion  
Medium**

|             |     |                            |  |   |
|-------------|-----|----------------------------|--|---|
| <b>10-2</b> | LIR | Approach to the assessment | BC disagree with the level of assessment and consider that further assessment is required to consider local businesses, local employment, agricultural displacement and tourism. | The Applicant has undertaken a detailed assessment which considers local businesses, land use and employment capacity change and tourism as outlined in <b>ES Volume 2, Chapter 14: Population [EN010158/APP/6.2] [APP-057]</b> . |
|-------------|-----|----------------------------|--|---|

Table 11 – Waste

| Ref.        | Source | Description of Matter | Stakeholder Comment   | Applicant's Response   | Status                          |
|-------------|--------|-----------------------|---|--|---------------------------------|
| <b>11-1</b> | LIR    | Assessment of waste   | The Council has concerns that full consideration of material use, and waste generation has not been provided including levels of plastic and cardboard waste during construction and operation and waste from demobilisation of the construction compounds. | <b>Appendix 5.7: Indicative Construction, Operation and Decommissioning Waste [EN010158/APP/6.4]</b> has been amended at Deadline 2 to address the concerns raised in the Local Impact Report, including consideration of demobilisation waste, construction worker, office and packaging waste. | <b>Under Discussion<br/>Low</b> |

**Appendix 5.7: Indicative Construction, Operation and Decommissioning Waste [EN010158/APP/6.4]** has additionally been updated to provide justification of the recycling rates applied.

|             |     |                     |  |
|-------------|-----|---------------------|--|
| <b>11-2</b> | LIR | Assessment of waste | These concerns undermine confidence that the Applicant has fully reported on the traffic impacts (also covering air and noise) of the Proposed Development, where full material and waste volumes are not known. |
|-------------|-----|---------------------|--|

The traffic numbers that have been considered in **Appendix 5.7: Indicative Construction, Operation and Decommissioning Waste [EN010158/APP/6.4]** and within the Environmental Statement incorporates a reasonable assumption that includes waste movements.

**Under Discussion  
Low**

Table 12 – Water Environment, Surface Water, Flooding, Drainage

| Ref  | Source              | Description of Matter     | Stakeholder Comment  | Applicant's Response  | Status |
|------|---------------------|---------------------------|--|---|--------|
| 12-1 | Section 42 response | Hydraulic modelling       | BC agree with the level of surveys and hydraulic modelling that has been undertaken. | Detailed modelling of Claydon Brook presented in <b>ES Volume 4, Appendix 16.1: Flood Risk Assessment [EN010158/APP/6.4.2] [PDA-004]</b> has informed the baseline data. The modelling has been revised to incorporate the 30% climate chance allowance and will be submitted at Deadline 1.  | Agreed |
| 12-2 | Section 42 response | Offsets from watercourses | BC consider that the offsets to Main Rivers Ordinary Watercourses are acceptable.    | Perimeter fencing surrounding the Solar PV development will be offset at least 10m either side from all existing ditches and ordinary watercourses, except where access tracks and/or cable routes are required to cross an existing feature. This is in line with the guidance from the Internal Drainage Board and is secured in the <b>Design Commitments [EN010158/APP/5.9.3]</b> . | Agreed |

|      |                         |  |   |   |        |
|------|-------------------------|--|---|---|--------|
| 12-3 | Ongoing correspondence  | Assessment methodology and conclusions | BC agree with the assessment methodology and conclusions.   | The assessment methodology and conclusions are set out in <b>ES Volume 2, Chapter 16: Water [EN010158/APP/6.2.2]</b> .  | Agreed |
| 12-5 | Relevant Representation | Flood Risk Assessment                  | BC consider that the flood risk assessment is sufficient.   | <p><b>ES Volume 4, Appendix 16.1: Flood Risk Assessment [EN010158/APP/6.4.2] [PDA-004]</b> has been updated to incorporate the latest climate change allowances in consultation with the Environment Agency and re-issued to examination on 10 February</p> <p>Mitigation has been carried out in accordance with the requirements of the Environment Agency. The Applicant considers that flood risk to the Proposed Development has been suitably assessed and the proposed surface water drainage strategy has been developed to ensure run off from the Proposed Development does not increase flood risk off site.</p> | Agreed |
| 12-6 | Relevant Representation | Surface water drainage strategy        | BC considers the surface water drainage strategy sufficient | The <b>Outline Drainage Strategy [EN010158/APP/7.11.2]</b> provides preliminary calculations for Parcels 1, 2 and 3 based on the guidance provided by the LLFA and IDB and  | Agreed |

limiting the flow to 4l/s/ha and sizing of attenuation features for the 1% AEP + 25% climate change event. Provision of detailed drainage design including hydraulic modelling of the networks is anticipated at detailed design when development layouts are finalised. The drainage network will be designed to contain the 1 in 30 year event storm and to safely manage exceedance flows for events up to the 1 in 100 year + CC.

|             |                                |                      |  |  |
|-------------|--------------------------------|----------------------|--|--|
| <p>12-7</p> | <p>Relevant Representation</p> | <p>Water Quality</p> | <p>BC (as the LLFA) does not support discharging potentially contaminated runoff from tanks directly into watercourses. They consider that water quality should be managed through SuDS features such as swales, ponds, and bioretention areas.</p> <p>Following further engagement, BC no longer see this as an issue and agree with this matter.</p> | <p>An assessment using the Simple Index Approach in accordance with SuDS Manual Ciria C753 has been undertaken and results for all 3 Parcels are provided in the <b>Outline Drainage Strategy [EN010158/APP/7.11.2]</b>. This provided information on the level of treatment provided by the proposed SuDS features. Where required, additional measures were proposed to mitigate pollution risk from the high pollution hazard areas. This is presented in <b>Section 8: Water Quality</b> of the <b>Outline Drainage Strategy [EN010158/APP/7.11.2]</b></p> |
|-------------|--------------------------------|----------------------|--|--|

**Agreed**

and proposed to be implemented as part of the detail drainage design.

Should contaminated water be identified, it would either be appropriately treated and discharged or contained and tankered off site using an appropriate waste carrier. For example, in the unlikely event of a fire at the BESS, retained water would be tested by the Operator. If contaminated (polluted), the water would be removed from site by tanker for treatment at an appropriately licensed offsite facility. If testing confirms that the water is suitable for discharge or reuse, it would be released to the local drainage network under controlled conditions, in consultation with the relevant regulators or reused as a potential source of firefighting water by re-filling the water tanks. This approach ensures that environmental protection is maintained under both normal and emergency conditions.

|      |                         |          |   |  |                      |
|------|-------------------------|----------|---|--|----------------------|
| 12-8 | Relevant Representation | Drainage | <p>Comment that two soakaway tests were undertaken (TP002 and TP014) which is insufficient for a site of this scale.</p> <p>Following further engagement, BC no longer see this as an issue and agree with this matter.</p> | <p>The <b>Outline Drainage Strategy [EN010158/APP/7.11.2]</b> demonstrates that a conservative approach has been taken assuming that infiltration is not considered a viable primary surface water disposal method for the proposed development. Patrial infiltration has been assumed for the conveyance SuDS, which is subject to further ground investigation and infiltration potential from underlying geology.</p> | <p><b>Agreed</b></p> |
|------|-------------------------|----------|---|--|----------------------|

Table 13 – Traffic and Transport

| Ref. | Source                                       | Description of Matter | Stakeholder Comment  | Applicant's Response   | Status               |
|------|--|-----------------------|--|--|----------------------|
| 13-1 | Section 42 response / ongoing correspondence | Baseline methodology  | BC agree with the methodology and approach to establishing baseline traffic conditions (survey locations, report and results). | <p>The methodology is set out in <b>ES Volume 2, Chapter 15: Transport and Access [EN010158/APP/6.2]</b> <a href="#">[APP-058]</a> and <b>ES Volume 4, Appendix 15.1: Transport Assessment [EN010158/APP/6.4]</b> <a href="#">[APP-131]</a>.</p> | <p><b>Agreed</b></p> |

|      |  |                                    |   |   |        |
|------|--|------------------------------------|---|---|--------|
| 13-2 | Section 42 response / ongoing correspondence | Assessment of construction, Impact | BC consider that the assessment should be undertaken at the peak of construction traffic on all routes within the agreed study area.      | Agreed and included in the <b>ES Volume 2, Chapter 15: Transport and Access [EN010158/APP/6.2]</b> <a href="#">[APP-058]</a> and <b>ES Volume 4, Appendix 15.1: Transport Assessment [EN010158/APP/6.4]</b> <a href="#">[APP-131]</a> . | Agreed |
| 13-3 | Section 42 response / ongoing correspondence | Traffic Impact                     | BC consider that the impact of construction traffic does not lead to significant effects and is short term in nature.                     | Agreed and included in the <b>ES Volume 2, Chapter 15: Transport and Access [EN010158/APP/6.2]</b> <a href="#">[APP-058]</a> and <b>ES Volume 4, Appendix 15.1: Transport Assessment [EN010158/APP/6.4]</b> <a href="#">[APP-131]</a> . | Agreed |
| 13-4 | Section 42 response / ongoing correspondence | Mitigation Measures                | BC consider that mitigation measures are required to ensure the safe and efficient use of the study area road network for all road users. | Mitigation measures are detailed in <b>Volume 2, Chapter 15: Transport and Access [EN010158/APP/6.2]</b> <a href="#">[APP-058]</a> and <b>Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) [EN010158/APP/7.5.2]</b> .                | Agreed |
| 13-5 | Section 42 response / ongoing correspondence | Abnormal Load Access               | BC request for access of abnormal loads to be fully considered and assessed.  | <b>ES Volume 4, Appendix 15.1: Transport Assessment [EN010158/APP/6.4]</b> <a href="#">[APP-131]</a> contains an AIL Route Survey. The <b>Outline CTMP [EN010158/APP/7.5.2]</b> considers   | Agreed |

|      |                         |                       |   |   |                         |
|------|-------------------------|-----------------------|---|---|-------------------------|
|      |                         |                       |   | abnormal load traffic management measures.  |                         |
| 13-6 | Relevant Representation | Access route          | BC agrees with the Applicant's proposed access route, but requests that ongoing discussions with HS2 should continue. | The support of BC on the access route is noted and agreed. The Applicant will continue to engage with HS2 and will use the Stakeholder liaison measures set out in the <b>Outline CTMP [EN010158/APP/7.5.2]</b> to ensure that full engagement is undertaken.                       | Agreed                  |
| 13-7 | Relevant Representation | Provision of drawings | BC requests further drawing details relating to the site access junctions.  | Full junction drawing details are provided in the <b>Outline CTMP [EN010158/APP/7.5.2]</b> . These provide junction layout, road marking, cross section and dimension details and are of a standard accepted for DCO scale projects. Further engagement with BC will be undertaken. | Under Discussion<br>Low |
| 13-8 | Relevant Representation | Staff Travel Plan     | BC request further information on staff travel and how the mode share targets will be guaranteed.                     | Staff travel will be controlled by a Staff Travel Plan, as outlined in the <b>Outline CTMP [EN010158/APP/7.5.2]</b> .<br><br>The mode targets in the <b>Outline CTMP [EN010158/APP/7.5.2]</b> will be enforced via two regimes. Firstly, the contractor is bound to accept the      | Under Discussion<br>Low |

|                    |                                |   |   |   |   |
|--------------------|--------------------------------|---|---|---|---|
|                    |                                |   |   | <p>mode share targets under the contractual arrangements with the Applicant, ensuring compliance, monitoring and the full introduction of the travel plan.</p> <p>Secondly, as staff travel is part of the <b>Outline CTMP [EN010158/APP/7.5.2]</b>, its implementation under the DCO is a legal requirement, ensuring that the Applicant and their contractor must ensure compliance with staff mode share targets.</p> <p>These two elements ensure full compliance and as such, no further assessment is required.</p> | <p><b>Under Discussion</b><br/><b>Low</b></p> |
| <p><b>13-9</b></p> | <p>Relevant Representation</p> | <p>Trip generation and traffic impact</p> | <p>BC has requested peak hour traffic flow information, details on how staff mode share will be achieved and enforced and a junction assessment at the A41 / Station Road Junction.</p> | <p>Peak hour flow data can be provided, however the assessment provided is consistent with energy project assessments undertaken for DCO scale projects across the UK and provides sufficient impact details for BC to consider, noting that the traffic impact indicates that there are no significant traffic effects in <b>ES Volume 2, Chapter 15: Transport and Access [EN010158/APP/6.2] [APP-058]</b>.</p>   |   |

With regards to staff travel mode share, this will be controlled by a Staff Travel Plan, as outlined in the **Outline CTMP [EN010158/APP/7.5.2]**.

The mode targets in the detailed Construction Traffic Management Plan will be enforced via two regimes. Firstly, the contractor is bound to accept the mode share targets under the contractual arrangements with the Applicant, ensuring compliance, monitoring and the full introduction of the travel plan.

Secondly, as staff travel is part of the detailed Construction Traffic Management Plan, its implementation under the DCO is a legal requirement, ensuring that the Applicant and their contractor must ensure compliance with staff mode share targets.

These two elements ensure full compliance and as such, no further assessment is required.

Junction assessments at the A41 / Station Road junction will be

discussed with BC in further detail. The majority of traffic will not be using the junction at network peak hours and as such, the potential for significant effects is considered minor. The construction traffic effects are also temporary in nature and the assessment provided covers the peak month, which is a defined peak. In these situations, it is not normally a requirement to undertake a junction assessment and engagement with BC on data collection did not require the collection of manually classified turning count information at this junction, required for the undertaking of a LINSIG assessment of the junction.



Table 14 – Public Rights and Way and Amenity

| Ref. | Source                            | Description of Matter                    | Stakeholder Comment  | Applicant's Response   | Status        |
|------|-----------------------------------|--|--|--|---------------|
| 14-1 | Relevant Representation/<br>Local | Reinstatement of temporary PRow closures | BC welcomes the commitment to limit temporary closures to a maximum of six months per route. The Council welcomes the Applicant's confirmation | It is the intention that temporarily diverted PRow would be reinstated to at least their original condition post construction. Details such as surfacing of routes would be discussed with and | <b>Agreed</b> |

| Impact Report |  |                      |   |  |                             |
|---------------|--|----------------------|---|--|-----------------------------|
| <b>14-2</b>   | Relevant Representation/ Local Impact Report | Permanent diversions | <p>that the surface of PROWs will be reinstated post construction following cable laying, at least to the pre-construction condition.</p> <p>Diversion of Footpaths ECL/4/2 within Parcel 3 and ECL/7/2 within Parcel 2 - the proposals are acceptable in principle. It is not considered that the minor inconvenience as a result of the diversions amounts to a layout of the scheme which would discourage recreational use.</p> | <p>approved by BC to create an appropriate high-quality network. This secured in the <b>Outline Rights of Way and Access Strategy (RoWAS) [EN010158/APP/7.8.2] [REP1-090]</b>.</p> <p>The diversions are secured by the <b>Streets, Rights of Way and Access Plans [EN010158/APP/2.4.3] [REP1-006]</b> and the <b>Outline RoWAS [EN010158/APP/7.8.2] [REP1-090]</b>.</p>   | <b>Agreed</b>               |
| <b>14-3</b>   | Relevant Representation/ Local Impact Report | Permanent diversions | <p>Diversion of Footpath SCL/13/2 and SCL/13/1 within Parcel 1 - the application proposal creates a dead-end at Ponds Farm which BC considers to be unacceptable. A revised alignment is required to maintain connectivity. BC also requests the applicant considers an alternative which creates a desire line that eliminates the right-angle bend at Calvert Road.</p>   | <p>The Applicant has reduced the length of PRoW SCL/12/2 that is stopped up, connecting the stretch of SCL/12/2 that runs through the Ponds Farm complex to the permanently diverted route to the west. This maintains connectivity and prevents a dead end. This was updated in the <b>Outline RoWAS [EN010158/APP/7.8.2] [REP1-090]</b> at Deadline 1.</p> <p>The right-angle bend was not highlighted by BC in their Relevant Representation and the Applicant is not aware of the alternative solution that has been proposed by the</p> | <b>Under Discussion Low</b> |

|      |   |                              |   |  |                         |
|------|---|------------------------------|---|--|-------------------------|
| 14-4 | Relevant Representation/<br>Local Impact Report | Recorded width of diversions | BC request a 2m width is recorded in the definitive statement for newly created public footpaths resulting from the proposed diversions. BC would welcome an undertaking in the Outline RoWAS to address this at the detailed design stage.   | Council. The Applicant will liaise with BC on this point.<br>The <b>Outline RoWAS [EN010158/APP/7.8.2] [REP1-090]</b> requires any new or diverted routes to be designed in accordance or with regard to design standards adopted by BC, and be approved by BC before they are implemented. Details such as route width and surfacing would be further assessed at the detailed design stage as a result and would be discussed with and approved by BC at that stage.   | Under Discussion<br>Low |
| 14-5 | Relevant Representation/<br>Local Impact Report | Permissive footpaths         | A permissive path network is provided for in the Application and welcomed. However, an additional permissive path linking Knowl Hill and Knowlhill Farm is recommended to mitigate impacts of additional traffic along Calvert Road and until wider connections can be made when the permissive path network is opened. | Creating an additional link to the proposed permissive route from the south and south east, to link to MCL/17/1 and/or MCL/18/1 at Knowlhill Farm, would require the route to cross land outside the main developable area which is only required to be used by Applicant for cabling and/or construction and maintenance access. This area would be returned to agricultural use following construction, and the additional link is not considered necessary to mitigate the effects of the Proposed Development. It is not anticipated that traffic would increase |                         |

|      |  |                   |  |  |        |
|------|--|-------------------|--|--|--------|
| 14-6 | Relevant Representation/ Local Impact Report | Three Points Lane | <p>BC requested segregation of non-motorised users along Three Points Lane to avoid conflict with construction traffic. BC would welcome clarity on where in the application documents smaller areas for construction compounds than the maximum parameters shown on <b>ES Volume 3, Figure 3.8: Indicative Location of Primary and Secondary Construction Compounds</b> [EN010158/APP/6.3.2] [AS-021] is provided for but, on the basis that traffic would only be crossing Three Points Lane, BC consider that not providing</p> | <p>on Calvert Road during construction, as it is not part of the primary construction route for construction traffic or the Abnormal Indivisible Load (AIL) access route. The permissive paths are intended to be implemented during the construction phase, as secured in the <b>Outline RoWAS</b> [EN010158/APP/7.8.2] [REP1-090]. It is therefore not considered appropriate to provide this link.</p> <p>A single construction compound is proposed on Three Points Lane. <b>ES Volume 1, Chapter 3: Proposed Development Description</b> [EN010158/APP/6.1.2] [REP1-034], sets out that each Primary Construction Compound would be no greater than 25,000m<sup>2</sup> in plan. The maximum plan area is secured through the <b>Outline CEMP</b> [EN010158/APP/7.2.2] [REP1-078]. Construction traffic would not travel along Three Points Lane. It would cross Three Points Lane between Fields SA12 and B23 (South) only, as indicated in <b>ES Volume 3, Figure 3.11: Indicative Location of Internal Access Tracks</b> [EN010158/APP/6.3] [APP-063]. The access point shown in</p> | Agreed |
|------|--|-------------------|--|--|--------|

|   |   |  |   |
|---|---|--|---|
|   | <p>a segregated route would be acceptable.</p>  | <p><b>ES Volume 3, Figure 3.9: Indicative Construction and Operational Access [EN010158/APP/6.3] [APP-063]</b> into Field B20 would only be used during operation. It is therefore not considered necessary to provide a segregated route behind the highway boundary hedge.</p> |   |
| <p><b>14-7</b> Relevant Representation/ Local Impact Report</p> | <p>PRoW network improvements</p> <p>An opportunity exists to upgrade Footpaths SCL/8/2 and QUA/41/1 to bridleway status, closing a gap in the network and deleting the dead-end bridleway to Coppice Lowhill Farm. It is an opportunity to maximise opportunities to facilitate enhancements within NPS EN-3 para 2.10.44. A variety of permissive paths are provided to improve the walking connectivity during the lifetime of the development and enhance the recreational options. While BC accepts there is no direct mitigation in diverting the bridleway in this part of the site, it could form part of the Proposed Development's wider package</p> | <p>The Applicant is not proposing to upgrade these footpaths to bridleways as it is not necessary to mitigate the effects of the Proposed Development and does not reflect discussions with the landowner.</p>   | <p><b>Under Discussion</b><br/><b>Low</b></p> |

of local access improvements, at no additional cost. This supports ROWIP objectives, NPPF para 105 and Policy C4 of VALP.

|                    |   |                                       |  |  |
|--------------------|---|---------------------------------------|--|--|
| <p><b>14-8</b></p> | <p>Relevant Representation/ Local Impact Report</p> | <p>Upgrades to existing footpaths</p> | <p>The removal of stiles within the application boundary and replacement with mobility gates or gaps would support local policy and legislation aiming to improve access for the mobility impaired. This would be in accordance with NPS EN-3 para 2.10.44 and is something BC would welcome being secured in the Outline Rights of Way and Access Strategy.</p> | <p>This would be further assessed at the detailed design stage and at that time would be discussed with and approved by BC. The <b>Outline RoWAS [EN010158/APP/7.8.2] [REP1-090]</b> requires any new or diverted routes to be designed in accordance or with regard to design standards adopted by BC, which would include in relation to stiles and gates, and be approved by BC in that regard before they are implemented. The <b>Outline LEMP [EN010158/APP/7.6.2] [REP1-086]</b> also requires stiles and gates to be checked to ensure they are safe and operationally effective, which would include consideration of accessibility. However, the <b>Outline RoWAS [EN010158/APP/7.8.2] [REP1-090]</b> will be updated at Deadline 2 to secure review of the location of stiles across the Site and consideration of their accessibility during the detailed design.</p> |
|--------------------|---|---------------------------------------|--|--|

**Under Discussion**  
Low

## 5. Signatures

This Statement of Common Ground is agreed upon:

On behalf of Buckinghamshire Council

Name:

Signature:

Date:

On behalf of the Applicant

Name:

Signature:

Date:



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