



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

The Examining Authority's second written questions and requests for information (ExQ2): issued on 5 June 2026

Responses are due by deadline 4: 22 June 2026

The following table sets out the Examining Authority's (ExA) second written questions and requests for information – ExQ2.

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

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

Each question has a unique reference number which starts with 2 (indicating that it is from ExQ2) and then has an issue number and a question number. For example, the first question on general and cross-topic issues is identified as Q2.1.1. When you are answering a question, please start your answer by quoting the unique reference number.

Any references to the national policy statements below refer to those published in 2023 (last updated in 2025), unless otherwise stated.

You should respond to the questions by using the [Have your say](#) function on the [project page of the National Infrastructure website](#) and selecting 'Responses to Examining Authority's Second Written Questions (ExQ2)' when asked.

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

If you are responding to a small number of questions, you can submit your answers by choosing 'Make a comment' and entering your answers in the 'Your comments' box. If you are answering a larger number of questions you should download a copy of the Microsoft Word version of the document, enter your answers and save the document using an appropriate file name. You can then submit the completed document by selecting 'Upload files'.



Microsoft Word version: [https://nsip-documents.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/published-documents/EN010158-001100-Examining%20Authority's%20Written%20Questions%20\(ExQ2\)%20MS%20Word%20version.docx](https://nsip-documents.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/published-documents/EN010158-001100-Examining%20Authority's%20Written%20Questions%20(ExQ2)%20MS%20Word%20version.docx)



## Abbreviations used:

<b>AIL</b>	abnormal indivisible load	<b>LIR</b>	local impact report
<b>ALC</b>	agricultural land classification	<b>LVIA</b>	landscape and visual impact assessment
<b>ASI</b>	accompanied site inspection	<b>MW</b>	megawatts
<b>BESS</b>	battery energy storage system	<b>MWh</b>	megawatt hours
<b>BMV</b>	best and most versatile	<b>MWp</b>	megawatt peak
<b>BNG</b>	biodiversity net gain	<b>NGET</b>	National Grid Electricity Transmission Limited
<b>CA</b>	compulsory acquisition	<b>NHS</b>	National Health Service
<b>CAH</b>	compulsory acquisition hearing	<b>NPPF</b>	National Planning Policy Framework
<b>CEMP</b>	construction environmental management plan	<b>NPS</b>	national policy statement
<b>CNP</b>	critical national priority	<b>oCEMP</b>	outline Construction Environmental Management Plan
<b>CSAG</b>	Claydons Solar Action Group	<b>oLEMP</b>	outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan
<b>CTMP</b>	Construction Traffic Management Plan	<b>oOEMP</b>	outline Operational Environmental Management Plan
<b>dB</b>	decibel	<b>oRoWAS</b>	outline Rights of Way Access Strategy
<b>DCO</b>	Development Consent Order	<b>oSMP</b>	outline Soil Management Plan
<b>dDCO</b>	draft Development Consent Order	<b>PPs</b>	protective provisions
<b>EA</b>	Environment Agency	<b>PRoW</b>	public right of way
<b>EIA</b>	environmental impact assessment	<b>PV</b>	photovoltaic
<b>ES</b>	Environmental Statement	<b>RVAA</b>	Residential Visual Amenity Assessment
<b>ExA</b>	Examining Authority	<b>SoCG</b>	statement of common ground
<b>ExQ1</b>	Examining Authority's first written questions	<b>SSSI</b>	site of special scientific interest
<b>FRA</b>	flood risk assessment	<b>UKHSA</b>	UK Health Security Agency



<b>HS2</b>	High Speed Rail 2
<b>IP</b>	interested party
<b>LEMP</b>	landscape and ecological management plan

## **The Examination Library**

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

It will be updated as the examination progresses.

## **Citation of questions**

Questions in this table should be cited as follows:

Question reference: issue reference: question number, for example ExQ2.1.1 – refers to question 1 in this table.



<b>1. General and cross-topic questions</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>2. Need, site selection and alternatives</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>3. Air quality</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>4. Associated development</b>	<b>8</b>
4.1 Battery energy storage systems (BESS)	8
<b>5. Biodiversity and ecology</b>	<b>8</b>
5.1 Arboricultural impacts	10
5.2 Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)	10
<b>6. Compulsory acquisition, temporary possession and other land or rights considerations</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>7. Cultural heritage</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>8. Cumulative effects</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>9. The draft Development Consent Order (dDCO)</b>	<b>14</b>
9.1 Articles	14
9.2 Schedule 2 - Requirements	15
9.3 Protective Provisions (PPs)	16
<b>10. Health and wellbeing</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>11. Land and groundwater</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>12. Landscape and visual (including good design)</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>13. Noise and vibration</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>14. Population</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>15. Soils</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>16. Transport and access</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>17. Water environment</b>	<b>23</b>

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
<b>1. General and cross-topic questions</b>		
Q.2.1.1	Buckinghamshire Council	<p><b>Glint and glare</b></p> <p>Please provide comments on the applicant's consideration of glint and glare as set out in the Glint and Glare Assessment <a href="#">[APP-082]</a>. Does the Council concur with the applicant's conclusions in the assessment that the proposed development will only have low impact on identified sensitive receptors (including roads and public rights of way), and that all effects would not be significant? If not, why not? The Council is also invited to provide comments on concerns raised by the Claydon Solar Action Group regarding glint and glare, including in its deadline 3 submission <a href="#">[REP3-064]</a> as well as the applicant's response to issue specific hearing 1 (ISH1) action point 26 <a href="#">[REP3-049]</a> on this matter.</p>
Q2.1.2	The applicant	<p><b>National Policy Statement (NPS) EN-3 - glint and glare</b></p> <p>NPS EN-3 paragraph 2.10.136 states that applicants may consider adjusting the azimuth alignment of, or changing the elevation tilt angle of, a solar panel within the economically viable range, to alter the angle of incidence as part of a mitigation strategy. Has the applicant considered such methods to mitigate glint and glare effects? If so, signpost to where and how it has done so. If not, why not?</p>
Q2.1.3	UK Health Security Agency (UKHSA)	<p><b>Potential effects of the proposed development on medical supplies to the National Health Service (NHS)</b></p> <p>Preston Farms Limited and TCS Biosciences Limited has identified itself as the only manufacturer of donor animal blood for microbiology applications in England and Wales, supplying material critical for blood agar plates used in NHS diagnostics. The two companies have identified significant concerns regarding the potential effects of the proposed development on the operation of the businesses and associated livestock which may in turn have implications for their ability to supply the NHS and wider medical sector. Further details are provided in submissions provided by Preston Farms Limited and TCS Biosciences Limited, including their written representation <a href="#">[REP1-133]</a>, response to the Examining Authority's (ExA's) first written questions <a href="#">[REP2-107]</a> and submissions following discussion of the matter at ISH1 <a href="#">[REP3-067]</a>.</p> <p>Does the UKHSA have any concerns regarding the potential for the disruption of medical supplies from Preston Farms Limited and TCS Biosciences Limited to the NHS?</p>
<b>2. Need, site selection and alternatives</b>		
Q2.2.1	The applicant	<p><b>Overplanting</b></p> <p>The applicant's response to action point 2 of issue specific hearing 1 (ISH1) <a href="#">[REP3-049]</a> estimates that with a linear increase in panel efficiency of 13%, the increase in panel output would increase the current anticipated installed capacity of 334.1 megawatts (MW) to 377.8MW without any increase in number, size or location of panels installed. If the battery energy storage system (BESS) was not implemented by the applicant, and fields D8 and D9 were instead developed with solar photovoltaic (pv) arrays, what would the additional installed capacity be on top of any increase due to panel efficiency?</p>
Q2.2.2	The applicant  Buckinghamshire Council	<p><b>National Policy Statement (NPS) EN-1 (2025)</b></p> <p>At ISH1, the applicant <a href="#">[REP3-049]</a> drew attention to paragraph 4.11.12 of NPS EN-1 (2025) which states that "The Secretary of State should be satisfied that appropriate network connection arrangements are/ will be in place for a given project regardless of whether one or multiple (linked) applications are submitted." The applicant considers that this has been met in relation to both the solar and BESS as it currently benefits from a grid connection agreement for both the solar and BESS elements, albeit subject to ongoing industry-wide reform. The applicant also considers that the "relevant test is whether there is a realistic prospect of a grid connection, rather than certainty."</p> <p>To the applicant:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Provide further justification for your position that the "relevant test is whether there is a realistic prospect of a grid connection, rather than certainty."</li> </ol> <p>To Buckinghamshire Council:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Does the Council agree with the applicant's interpretation of paragraph 4.11.12 of NPS EN-1 (2025) that the test is one of demonstrating that there is a realistic prospect of a grid connection?</li> </ol>

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
Q2.2.3	Buckinghamshire Council  Claydons Solar Action Group  Preston Farms Limited and TCS Biosciences Limited  National Grid Electricity Transmission (NGET)	<b>Location of the BESS</b>  To all parties: Please provide comments on the applicant's response to action point 7 from ISH1 <a href="#">[REP3-052]</a> that sets out its position on why fields E10 and E11 are an unsuitable location for the BESS. Has the applicant provided sufficient justification for not proposing the BESS in fields E10 and E11? If not, what further information should the applicant provide?  To NGET: Does NGET concur with the applicant's position in respect of the potential constraints of locating the BESS in fields E10 and E11 related to the offset requirements from overhead lines and pylons? If not, why not?
Q2.2.4	The applicant	<b>East Claydon BESS</b> At ISH1, the applicant confirmed <a href="#">[REP3-049]</a> that it was in discussion with the developer of the proposed East Claydon BESS regarding the potential coordination with the abnormal indivisible load (AIL) access route, identified as Work No. 2B within the application, that may lead to a shared access and reduced land take.  1. If possible, provide drawings of how the shared access arrangement may result in a reduced land take. 2. Has the applicant discussed the potential for the proposed development to connect to the East Claydon BESS to utilise its storage capacity and proposed substation to further reduce land take? If not, why not?
Q2.2.5	The applicant	<b>Site selection – topography</b> NPS EN-3 paragraph 2.10.19 identifies irradiance as a consideration in site selection which is in turn affected by topography “with an uncovered or exposed site of good elevation and favourable south-facing aspect more likely to increase year-round irradiance levels.” In addressing the policy requirement in the Planning Statement <a href="#">[REP1-016]</a> , the applicant states that “the general topography of the area surrounding the National Grid East Claydon Substation is land gently undulating, with much of the land sloping north to south, making it generally suitable for solar...”. Provide further information in support of this policy including details of the extent to which fields surrounding the substation are uncovered or exposed, of good elevation and with a south-facing aspect.
Q2.2.6	The applicant	<b>Site selection</b> With specific reference to Schedule 4 of The Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017, set out where the applicant has described the location, size and scale of reasonable alternative sites considered.
Q2.2.7	The applicant	<b>Site selection – alternatives</b> Provide further explanation for the drawing of the “site boundary” identified in the Wintering Bird Survey Report undertaken in 2022 <a href="#">[APP-089]</a> .
<b>3. Air quality</b>		
Q2.3.1	Preston Farms Limited and TCS Biosciences Limited	<b>Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) – Plume Assessment</b> Following discussions at issue specific hearing 1 (ISH1) on your critical review of the BESS Plume Assessment by a battery safety expert <a href="#">[REP2-107]</a> the applicant has updated its BESS Plume Assessment Summary <a href="#">[REP3-042]</a> and included commitment D25 in its Design Commitments <a href="#">[REP3-010]</a> “BESS containers and transformer units will be offset at least 50m from the southern boundaries of fields D8 and D9 and the eastern boundary of field D9  Has this addressed all your concerns? If not, what further action should the applicant take?
Q2.3.2	The applicant	<b>Aerosol particulates</b> In ISH1 Claydons Solar Action Group (CSAG) in the discussion on the BESS Plume Assessment raised concerns with respect to the contaminants and pollutants carried in the air in a “runaway event” and their potential effects on human and animal health. CSAG’s written summary of their oral submission at the hearing <a href="#">[REP3-066]</a> includes references to academic research on the topic of aerosol particulates emitted by lithium-ion battery fires and their distribution.

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		How has the applicant addressed the issues raised by the action group in its assessment?
Q2.3.3	Buckinghamshire Council	<p><b>Peak year of construction</b></p> <p>The latest statement of common ground <a href="#">[REP3-016]</a> between you and the applicant indicates that there is a single outstanding issue to be agreed – peak year of construction traffic with the air quality assessment stating 2029 and the traffic assessment March 2030. The Council indicated at ISH1 that this issue has been resolved.</p> <p>Please confirm that this is the case or otherwise. Does the Council have any outstanding air quality issues?</p>
<b>4. Associated development</b>		
<b>4.1 Battery energy storage systems (BESS)</b>		
Q2.4.1	The applicant	<p><b>BESS Capacity</b></p> <p>At issue specific hearing 1 <a href="#">[REP3-049]</a>, the applicant confirmed that the current indicative design for the BESS is approximately 1,000 megawatt hours (MWh) of storage capacity, equating to around 3 hours of storage at the proposed 335 megawatt (MW) connection capacity for the solar development.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Provide comparable details of BESS capacity in relation to solar generating capacity for other consented nationally significant infrastructure projects.</li> <li>2. In the context of the above, provide further commentary on how the BESS would meet the definition of associated development in the Planning Act 2008 and in accordance with <a href="#">guidance on associated development applications for major infrastructure projects April 2013</a>, including whether the BESS would be subordinate.</li> </ol>
<b>5. Biodiversity and ecology</b>		
Q2.5.1	Natural England (NE)	<p><b>Proposed Bernwood Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) – Mapping</b></p> <p>Please submit into the examination the draft mapping for the proposed Bernwood SSSI boundary.</p>
Q2.5.2	NE	<p><b>Proposed Bernwood SSSI – Mapping</b></p> <p>Given your comments in paragraph 1.11 of <a href="#">[REP3-061]</a> regarding the importance of fields B6, B7, B8 and likely also B3 as key foraging habitat for Bechstein's bats please explain why fields B3, B6, B7 and B8 are not included in the draft mapping for the proposed Bernwood SSSI boundary (as clarified in paragraph 4.1 of the same document)?</p>
Q2.5.3	The applicant	<p><b>Proposed Bernwood Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) – Ecological Impact Assessment (EclA)</b></p> <p>Explain what account you have taken of the proposed Bernwood SSSI and associated surveys and research reports in conducting the EclA in general and in particular with reference to Bechstein's bats.</p>
Q2.5.4	The applicant	<p><b>Bechstein's Bat – potential loss of foraging habitat</b></p> <p>In its deadline 3 submission <a href="#">[REP3-061]</a> at paragraphs 1.9 to 1.19 NE outlines its reasons for advocating that an avoidance approach is adopted with regard to the foraging habitat of Bechstein's bats, with all grazed fields, and in particular fields B3, B6, B7 and B8, protected from development throughout the order limits. Buckinghamshire Council has adopted a similar position throughout the examination with the latest statement of common ground between it and the applicant <a href="#">[REP3-016]</a> maintaining that proposed infrastructure should be removed from fields B6, B7, B10, B11, D28 and D29.</p> <p>Please provide a comprehensive response to both positions.</p>
Q2.5.5	The applicant	<p><b>Bechstein's Bat – potential loss of foraging habitat</b></p> <p>What would the potential impact on the proposed development be of omitting photovoltaic panels and associated infrastructure from each of the fields listed above individually and in combination?</p>
Q2.5.6	The applicant	<p><b>Bechstein's Bat – potential loss of foraging habitat</b></p> <p>How do you respond to Claydons Solar Action Group's (CSAG) concerns, set out in paragraph 4.12 of <a href="#">[REP3-065]</a> that temporary construction compounds are proposed on fields B6, B7 and B8 and this is inconsistent with a precautionary approach?</p>

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
Q2.5.7	The applicant	<p><b>Bechstein's Bat – assessment methodology</b></p> <p>Section 3 of NE's post issue specific hearing 1 submission <a href="#">[REP3-061]</a> sets out a comprehensive critique of the applicant's assessment methodology for Bechstein's bats and its conclusion of a "potentially significant effect" at the district level. Provide a detailed response focusing in particular on NE's position that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The installation of Solar PV Modules should be considered as a loss of foraging habitat and as having an avoidance effect/impact on bats in the absence of mitigation (in line with a worst-case scenario assessment).</li> <li>• The loss of approximately 40ha of grazed grassland and foraging habitat would constitute a significant negative impact on a nationally important population of Bechstein's bat.</li> <li>• Significant impacts to this foraging habitat have the potential to negatively effect the conservation status of the species.</li> </ul> <p>and its conclusion that:</p> <p>"Ultimately, we disagree with the conclusion of the Environmental Statement. We advise there is a risk that the application in its current form has not mitigated potential impacts to an acceptable level and therefore a significant residual impact remains. We advise that the scheme is amended to address this risk given the national significance of the population and the uncertainty over the effectiveness of the mitigation".</p>
Q2.5.8	The applicant	<p><b>Bechstein's Bat – National Policy Statement (NPS) EN-1</b></p> <p>What is your response to Buckinghamshire Council's post ISH1 submission at paragraph 18 of <a href="#">[REP3-056]</a> regarding the application of paragraph 5.4.55 of NPS EN-1 to the potential "harm" that it considers would be caused to Bechstein's bats by the proposed development and its conclusions?</p>
Q2.5.9	The applicant	<p><b>Bechstein's Bat – NPS EN-1</b></p> <p>Provide a detailed response to Buckinghamshire Council's position set out in paragraph 16 of <a href="#">[REP3-056]</a> that harm to Bechstein's bat would be a reason to attribute substantial weight against the proposed development in the planning balance in accordance with paragraph 5.4.55 of NPS EN-1 rather than significant weight in accordance with paragraph 5.4.23 of NPS EN-1 which the applicant appears to be relying on.</p> <p>What would the implications be of such harm and the requirements for a proposed development to attract the critical national priority Infrastructure presumption?</p>
Q2.5.10	The applicant	<p><b>Bechstein's Bat – buffer widths</b></p> <p>In its deadline 3 submission <a href="#">[REP3-061]</a> at paragraphs 1.20 to 1.27 NE makes the case that to avoid fragmentation, buffers should not be measured from a centre line of existing hedgerows (as currently proposed by the applicant) but on a precautionary basis be based on an agreed width (10-15m either side of a field) on top of the existing ecological features representing the baseline conditions.</p> <p>Please provide a comprehensive response.</p>
Q2.5.11	The applicant	<p><b>Bechstein's Bat – effectiveness of proposed mitigation</b></p> <p>How do you respond to CSAG's concerns set out in paragraphs 4.15 and 4.16 of <a href="#">[REP3-065]</a> about what it considers to be inconsistencies on the part of the applicant with regard to the importance of grazing as a mitigation and the likelihood of its delivery?</p>
Q2.5.12	The applicant	<p><b>Bechstein's Bat – effectiveness of proposed mitigation</b></p> <p>In response to the ExA's written question 1.7.14(4) <a href="#">[REP2-087]</a> you maintain that in the absence of proposed grazing the mitigation would still be effective.</p> <p>This appears to have been based on an acoustic survey data obtained from High Speed 2 (HS2) which suggests field B7 does not show extensive use by Bechstein's bats and ignores the contrary findings of Natural England Commissioned Report 558 "The Bernwood population of Bechstein's Bats".</p> <p>Please confirm or otherwise that you still consider the proposed mitigation for Bechstein's bats would be effective without grazing, referencing the evidence in support of your position.</p>

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
Q2.5.13	The applicant	<p><b>Bechstein's Bat – management of habitat and grazing</b></p> <p>In its deadline 3 submission <a href="#">[REP3-061]</a> at paragraph 1.31 NE maintains that it is not just the presence of grazing which is important for foraging Bechstein bats, but also the frequency and timing of grazing, as well as stocking density. The latest outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) <a href="#">[REP2-067]</a> suggests the creation of species rich grassland in the mitigation areas with any grazing of this grassland to take place as aftermath grazing, in the autumn and winter and with a low stocking density, so as to create and maintain the floristic diversity that is required for achieving landscape and botanical objectives.</p> <p>Is there a conflict between achieving landscape and botanical objectives and mitigating the effects of the proposed development on Bechstein's bats?</p>
Q2.5.14	The applicant	<p><b>Bechstein's Bat – management of habitat and grazing</b></p> <p>In relation to grazing the current oLEMP <a href="#">[REP2-087]</a> (paragraph 5.2.3) states "Opportunities for grazing will be considered where practicable and is viable with details such as timings and stocking densities to be provided in the LEMP(s) at the detailed design stage".</p> <p>Given the cautious language used by the applicant, how likely is it that any significant level of grazing would be achieved on the proposed development? What discussions and with what parties have taken place to date and have any commitments been made or agreements signed?</p>
Q2.5.15	The applicant	<p><b>Bechstein's Bat – monitoring</b></p> <p>How do you respond to CSAG's concerns set out in paragraphs 4.17 and 4.18 of <a href="#">[REP3-065]</a> that monitoring is being used as mitigation?</p>
Q2.5.16	The applicant	<p><b>Bechstein's Bat – monitoring</b></p> <p>With regard to the monitoring strategy for effects of the proposed development on Bechstein's bats to be submitted at deadline 4 (ISH1 action 14 <a href="#">[EV7-018]</a>) please:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Clearly outline the methodology you propose for establishing the baseline.</li> <li>2. Set out the methods to be used and frequency of data collection.</li> <li>3. Confirm or otherwise, that you only propose that the monitoring regime would use adaptive measures to alter the ongoing management of habitats and not involve the removal of PV panels and associated infrastructure.</li> <li>4. If adaptive measures only would be used to alter the ongoing management of habitats explain what these would likely be.</li> </ol>
Q2.5.17	The applicant	<p><b>Ground nesting birds</b></p> <p>Provide a detailed response to the concerns raised by CSAG with regard to ground nesting birds set out in paragraphs 5.1 to 5.5 of <a href="#">[REP3-065]</a>.</p>
Q2.5.18	Buckinghamshire Council	<p><b>Ground nesting birds</b></p> <p>How do you respond to the applicant's case set out at 2-4 of <a href="#">[REP3-016]</a> that mitigation at a ratio of 2:1 for habitat loss is not required?</p>
<b>5.1 Arboricultural impacts</b>		
Q2.5.19	The applicant	<p><b>Cumulative assessment</b></p> <p>In the latest statement of common ground (SoCG) between you and Buckinghamshire Council <a href="#">[REP3-016]</a>, there is still no agreement on the Council's position that a cumulative assessment of the combined losses of arboricultural features across multiple schemes should be undertaken. Provide an update on the latest discussions and positions of the two parties.</p>
Q2.5.20	The applicant	<p><b>Hedgerow removal</b></p> <p>In the latest SoCG between you and Buckinghamshire Council <a href="#">[REP3-016]</a>, there is still no agreement on the Council's position that there would be fragmentation of ecological networks in the Bernwood Opportunity Area due to the loss of approx. 2,060m of hedgerow. Provide an update on the latest discussions and positions of the two parties.</p>
<b>5.2 Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)</b>		
Q2.5.21	Buckinghamshire Council Natural England	<p><b>Rosefield Solar Farm BNG Statutory Metric</b></p>

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		Please provide your comments on the applicant's BNG metric <a href="#">[REP3-025]</a> and confirm whether you consider the methodology and calculations to be accurate.
Q2.5.22	Claydons Solar Action Group	<p><b>Rosefield Solar Farm BNG Statutory Metric</b></p> <p>The applicant has summarised its understanding of the discussion at ISH1 (under item 3) on the methodology used in the biodiversity net gain metric and its accuracy in <a href="#">[REP3-049]</a>. The applicant has also referenced its response to CSAG's deadline 2 submission <a href="#">[REP3-051]</a> which in table 5 (ref. 5.9.3) provides further information on its own position. Are there any further points you wish to make on this issue?</p>
<b>6. Compulsory acquisition, temporary possession and other land or rights considerations</b>		
Q2.6.1	The applicant	<p><b>Alternatives to Compulsory Acquisition</b></p> <p>With reference to The Planning Act 2008 guidance related to procedures for the compulsory acquisition (CA) of land, including paragraph 8, how can the Examining Authority (ExA) be assured that all reasonable alternatives to CA (including modifications to the scheme) have been explored? Set out what assessment/ comparison has been made of the alternatives to the proposed acquisition of land or interests for each affected person identified in the Book of Reference <a href="#">[REP3-008]</a>.</p>
Q2.6.2	The applicant  Buckinghamshire Council  Preston Farms Limited and TCS Biosciences Limited	<p><b>Compelling case in the public interest test</b></p> <p>Section 122 of The Planning Act 2008 requires the Secretary of State to be satisfied that there is a compelling case in the public interest for land to be acquired compulsorily. Paragraph 14 of The Planning Act 2008 guidance related to procedures for the CA of land states that "In determining where the balance of public interest lies, the Secretary of State will weigh up the public benefits that a scheme will bring against any private loss to those affected by compulsory acquisition."</p> <p>If it is demonstrated that the proposed development may impact medical supplies to the National Health Service (NHS), should the Secretary of State also take account of any related public disbenefit as well as private loss when weighing against public benefits in determining if there is a compelling case in the public interest for the CA of Preston Farms Limited's interests?</p>
Q2.6.3	The applicant  Affected persons	<p><b>Update on negotiations</b></p> <p>To the applicant:</p> <p>Provide an updated Land Rights and Negotiations Tracker ("the tracker") <a href="#">[REP2-081]</a> on negotiations with all affected persons. Ensure that the update addresses the following in relation to the latest version of the tracker:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. With the reference to AEJ and FJ Claridge, the tracker states that there "are agreed heads of terms and the legal agreement is currently being progressed." It later states that the "parties are working towards conclusion of the legal documentation." However, matters do not appear to be agreed <a href="#">[REP2-123]</a>. Please update accordingly.</li> <li>2. The tracker indicates that discussions are ongoing with Preston Farms Limited and the applicant is "seeking voluntary agreement by the end of the examination." The latest submission from Preston Farms Limited and TCS Biosciences Limited suggests an agreement is not close at present. They also argue <a href="#">[REP3-067]</a> that the private loss resulting from the impact on their business will be very considerable. Please comment on this.</li> <li>3. Update on the latest position in relation to replacement land for tenants. The tracker states that heads of terms for the replacement land are agreed with Preston Farms Limited and AEJ and FJ Claridge but based on evidence before the examination, this does not appear to be accurate.</li> <li>4. What is the latest position with the negotiations with Terence Ives <a href="#">[REP1-126]</a>? The tracker suggests that little progress has been made to date.</li> <li>5. The position as reported in the tracker concerning resolution of the landholding owned by Jeremy Fennemore is more hopeful that agreement can be reached during the examination. Again, please provide an update on the negotiations.</li> <li>6. The applicant confirms that it has concluded negotiations with the Claydon Estate and that a legal agreement has been secured. Can this be confirmed by the Claydon Estate?</li> </ol> <p>To affected persons:</p>

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		Affected persons are also invited to provide an update to negotiations regarding the compulsory acquisition of land and/or rights from their perspective and to outline any outstanding concerns.
Q2.6.4	The applicant	<p><b>Voluntary agreements</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. If voluntary agreements with affected persons are not forthcoming, how should the ExA and the Secretary of State address this position in our considerations?</li> <li>2. In light of the current status of negotiations and extent of outstanding issues with affected persons, provide further commentary to demonstrate that reasonable efforts have been made by the acquiring authority to negotiate the purchase of land by agreement.</li> </ol>
Q2.6.5	The applicant	<p><b>Statement of Reasons</b></p> <p>Paragraph 5.8.2 of the Statement of Reasons <a href="#">[REP1-010]</a> states “There are three tenants on the Claydon Estate to which detailed heads of terms for relocation or vacation agreements are agreed.” It appears from submissions from Preston Farms Limited and AEJ and FJ Claridge that this may not be the case. Please update the Statement of Reasons as appropriate.</p>
Q2.6.6	The applicant  A.E.J. & F.J. Claridge	<p><b>Removal of plot 2/6</b></p> <p>The ExA notes that the Land Plans <a href="#">[REP3-004]</a>, Works Plans <a href="#">[REP3-005]</a> and Book of Reference <a href="#">[REP3-008]</a>, were updated at deadline 3 to remove plot 2/6. The latter states that “following discussion with the landowner we no longer need rights in this area”</p> <p>To the applicant:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Please elaborate on the reasons for the removal of plot 2/6.</li> <li>2. Update the Land and Rights Negotiations Tracker to reflect the removal of plot 2/6</li> </ol> <p>To A.E.J. &amp; F.J. Claridge:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Does the removal of plot 2/6 address any of your concerns set out to date, including in relation to the operation of your farm?</li> </ol>
Q2.6.7	The applicant	<p><b>Private loss</b></p> <p>The applicant’s response to action point 4 from compulsory acquisition hearing 1 <a href="#">[REP1-107]</a> provided further information on its approach to minimising private loss. Whilst paragraph 1.1.4 of the response references Mr Fenemore, Mr Bullman, Mr Ives and National Grid Electricity Transmission, it primarily focusses on providing details relating to the respective interests of Mr Fowler, Preston Farms Limited and A E J and FJ Claridge. Please provide corresponding details for other affected persons, expanding on how the applicant has sought to minimise private loss.</p>
Q2.6.8	The applicant	<p><b>Preston Farms Limited tenancy</b></p> <p>Action point 28 from issue specific hearing 1 <a href="#">[EV7-018]</a> asked the applicant to “To provide submissions on the Preston Farms Limited’s tenancy position and its relevance to the Secretary of State’s decision making.” For deadline 4. The applicant is asked to provide precise detail of how long the land has been occupied by the tenant, and when the Notice to Quit was served and on which parties?</p>
<b>7. Cultural heritage</b>		
Q2.7.1	The applicant	<p><b>Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment and Setting Assessment</b></p> <p>Did the applicant undertake site visits to each of the listed buildings included in the detailed settings assessment <a href="#">[REP2-046]</a> in order to inform its conclusions? If not, why not?</p>
Q2.7.2	The applicant  Historic England	<p><b>Claydon House</b></p> <p>The statement of common ground (SoCG) between the applicant and Historic England <a href="#">[REP2-018]</a> at reference 2.1 in table 2 states that Historic England concurs with the assessment of heritage assets including that the impact on Claydon House is at “the lower end of substantial.” Is this the position agreed between the two parties or a typographical error? Update the SoCG, if appropriate.</p>
Q2.7.3	The applicant	<p><b>Bernwood Farm</b></p>

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p>Buckinghamshire Council has requested that the applicant provide a cultural heritage assessment of Bernwood Farm which it considers to be a non-designated heritage asset. In addition, the applicant's response to Buckinghamshire Council's request for further mitigation for Bernwood Farm as summarised in the SoCG <a href="#">[REP2-024]</a> refers to its consideration in the Residential Visual Amenity Assessment (RVAA) which confirms an offset of 180 metres from the property.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Does the applicant intend to provide an assessment of Bernwood Farm? If not, why not? If so, when will it be submitted into the examination?</li> <li>2. The applicant is invited to comment further on the extent to which findings of the RVAA have informed its conclusions on the suitability of cultural heritage mitigation.</li> </ol>
Q2.7.4	The applicant	<p><b>Botolph House</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Should the multiple references to "Grade II" Botolph House in Environmental Statement (ES) Chapter 9 <a href="#">[REP2-027]</a> refer to Grade II* as per the Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment and Settings Assessment <a href="#">[REP2-046]</a>? If so, update ES Chapter 9 accordingly.</li> <li>2. Provide a detailed response to Buckinghamshire Council's response to action point 20 from issue specific hearing 1 <a href="#">[REP3-055]</a> regarding the applicant's assessment of Botolph House. The Council considers that its architecture has not been considered in sufficient detail, to identify the contribution of setting to its significance.</li> </ol>
Q2.7.5	Buckinghamshire Council	<p><b>ES Chapter 9 – operation phase</b></p> <p>Elaborate on the apparent concern identified in your comments on deadline 2 submission <a href="#">[REP3-053]</a> regarding the applicant's consideration of effects during the operation stage in ES Chapter 9 <a href="#">[REP2-027]</a> in which you state "In Table 9.15 "Summary of heritage assessment" construction and decommissioning activity is mentioned. Operation is not, although it is assessed for individual heritage assets in paragraphs 9.10.55 to 9.10.108."</p>
Q2.7.6	The applicant Buckinghamshire Council	<p><b>Interpretation boards</b></p> <p>Provide an update on any discussions that have taken place regarding the provision of interpretation boards for built heritage and the historic landscape.</p>
<b>8. Cumulative effects</b>		
Q2.8.1	The applicant	<p><b>Environmental Statement (ES) Chapter 17 (Cumulative effects) – assessment methodology</b></p> <p>Explain your approach to keeping tier 3 projects under review throughout the examination and including them in the assessment if sufficient information becomes available publicly.</p> <p>Provide a list of all tier 3 projects identified up to this point in the examination and highlight those that you have progressed to assessment.</p>
Q2.8.2	Buckinghamshire Council	<p><b>ES Chapter 17 (Cumulative effects) – assessment methodology</b></p> <p>In response to the Examining Authority's (ExA) written question 1.11.2 <a href="#">[REP2-090]</a> regarding the acceptability of the applicant's assessment of cumulative effects on the highway network, you indicated that the methodology was generally acceptable but there were locations across the highway network where significant constraints mean that relying on a percentage increase in traffic was not always appropriate.</p> <p>Please explain your concerns.</p> <p>Has the applicant since addressed this issue? If not, what further action would you recommend the applicant takes to satisfy you on this point?</p>
Q2.8.3	The applicant	<p><b>ES Chapter 17 (Cumulative effects) – assessment methodology</b></p> <p>In response to the ExA's written question 1.11.9 <a href="#">[REP2-087]</a> you provided an explanation of how significant intra-project effects were considered alongside significant effects already identified from individual ES topic areas.</p> <p>Please provide a step by step explanation of the approach illustrated by an actual example.</p>
Q2.8.4	Buckinghamshire Council	<p><b>ES Chapter 17 (Cumulative effects) – assessment methodology</b></p>

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p>In your response to the ExA's written question 1.11.30 <a href="#">[REP2-090]</a> you maintained your concern at the way cumulative effects are discounted on the basis that other existing or approved developments are assumed to be fully mitigated with residual effects treated as not significant before combined assessment is undertaken and that this places reliance on anticipated mitigated outcomes rather than robustly testing whether the combined presence of multiple developments gives rise to cumulative harm.</p> <p>Has the applicant since addressed this issue? If not, what further action would you recommend the applicant takes to satisfy you on this point?</p>
Q2.8.5	Buckinghamshire Council	<p><b>ES Chapter 17 (Cumulative effects) – assessment methodology</b></p> <p>In the latest draft statement of common ground between you and the applicant <a href="#">[REP3-016]</a> there is still an outstanding area of disagreement with respect to the classification of effects as temporary or permanent over the 40 years of the operational life of the proposed development.</p> <p>Would you please explain your concerns? What do you consider to be the potential consequences of this difference in approach? What more could the applicant do to satisfy you on this point?</p>
Q2.8.6	Buckinghamshire Council	<p><b>ES Chapter 17 (Cumulative effects) – assessment methodology</b></p> <p>In the latest draft statement of common ground between you and the applicant <a href="#">[REP3-016]</a> there is still an outstanding area of disagreement with respect to the need for a cumulative assessment of the combined losses of arboriculture features across multiple schemes.</p> <p>Has this now been resolved? What is the latest position?</p>
Q2.8.7	Buckinghamshire Council	<p><b>ES Chapter 17 (Cumulative effects) – assessment methodology</b></p> <p>In your response to the ExA's written question 1.11.31 <a href="#">[REP2-090]</a>, you maintain that the applicant has not provided sufficient project design detail to inform the direct and cumulative impact assessment for agricultural land classification and soils.</p> <p>Has this now been resolved? What is the latest position?</p>
Q2.8.8	National Grid Electricity Transmission Limited (NGET)	<p><b>ES Chapter 17 (Cumulative effects) – inter-project effects with the proposed replacement National Grid East Claydon substation</b></p> <p>In response to the ExA's written question 1.11.12 <a href="#">[REP2-105]</a> requesting NGET's view on the assumptions the applicant had made with respect to the proposed replacement of National Grid East Claydon substation, you explained that the project was evolving and there was insufficient detail to comment.</p> <p>What is the latest position with respect to the substation project? Are you now able to comment on the applicant's assumptions?</p>
Q2.8.9	Buckinghamshire Council	<p><b>ES Chapter 17 (Cumulative effects) – construction of the proposed development</b></p> <p>Is it still the Council's view that the cumulative effects of construction would be significant and construction programmes should be staggered to mitigate them?</p>
<b>9. The draft Development Consent Order (dDCO)</b>		
Note: questions/ comments below relate to dDCO Rev 5 <a href="#">[REP3-006]</a> (clean)/ <a href="#">[REP3-007]</a> (tracked)		
<b>9.1 Articles</b>		
Q2.9.10	Buckinghamshire Council	<p><b>Article 5. Power to maintain the authorised development</b></p> <p>Is the Council content that the wording of article 5(3) means that the power to maintain the authorised development is limited so as not to authorise "the carrying out of any works which are likely to give rise to any materially new or materially different effects that have not been assessed in the environmental statement"?</p>
Q2.9.11	Buckinghamshire Council	<p><b>Articles 8. Street works, 9. Application of the permit scheme, 10. Power to alter layout, etc., of streets</b></p> <p>Is the Council content with the applicant's revised wording of article 9, which applies the permit scheme to street works and the power to alter layout, etc., of streets (articles 8 and 10 respectively) and these works as a result would have adequate notice periods?</p>
Q2.9.12	Buckinghamshire Council	<p><b>Article 12. Temporary prohibition or restriction on use of streets and public rights of way</b></p>

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		Is the Council content with the applicant's explanation in <a href="#">[REP3-050]</a> of how existing provisions within the outline Rights of Way Strategy <a href="#">[REP2-071]</a> , and outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCMTP) <a href="#">[REP2-065]</a> combined with a proposed update of the oCMTP at deadline 4 to include a new broader commitment specifically referencing article 12, would ensure streets and public rights of way used in the construction of the proposed development would be restored to their original condition?
Q2.9.13	The applicant	<b>Article 14. Use of private streets</b> At issue specific hearing 2 (ISH2), the Examining Authority noted that article 14 would confer wide powers over private roads within the Order limits. The ExA queried whether this power should instead be restricted to those roads specifically identified in the application documents. In relation to this the applicant agreed action point 6, <a href="#">[EV8-004]</a> "to update streets, access and rights of way plans to show existing private roads" now confirmed to be actioned at deadline 4, 22 June. Please update the streets, access and rights of way plans to show only those private roads that it is proposed would be used for the project.
Q2.9.14	Buckinghamshire Council	<b>Article 16. Agreements with street authorities</b> In response to the ExA's written question 1.12.9 <a href="#">[REP2-090]</a> you suggested amended wording for article 16. Agreements with street authorities, which would provide safeguards against works that did not meet adoptable standards. At ISH2, it was noted that the applicant had sought to address this issue by providing amended wording in the outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP) <a href="#">[REP2-065]</a> and discussions between the parties would continue. Are you content with the proposed wording in the oCTMP? If not, what wording do you propose for either article 16 or the oCTMP?
Q2.9.15	The applicant	<b>Article 20. Authority to survey and investigate the land</b> A 28 day rather than 14 day notice period (article 20(2)) for entry onto land is considered to be more reasonable by the Examining Authority (ExA), particularly for access to land subject to complex and often time critical farming or business operations which may well need to be re-arranged to accommodate survey/ investigation activities. In addition, the ExA considers it would be helpful to the landowner if at the same time as notice was served approximate timings and a location plan for the proposed activities were provided.  Is the applicant content to amend the article? If not provide your reasons.
Q2.9.16	Buckinghamshire Council	<b>Article 22. Compulsory acquisition of land</b> Are you content that article 22 does not explicitly confirm that compulsory acquisition powers do not extend to mines and minerals as article 48. Compulsory acquisition of land – incorporation of the mineral code, already achieves this?
<b>9.2 Schedule 2 - Requirements</b>		
Q2.9.17	Environment Agency (EA)	<b>General</b> A number of the proposed requirements require the submission of detailed management plans which must be 'substantially' in accordance with outline plans which have been submitted with the application. The ExA notes the Environment Agency's has maintained its position in the latest statement of common ground between it and the applicant <a href="#">[REP3-014]</a> that the use of 'substantially' in the dDCO requirements undermines the enforceability of proposals and/ or may erode the environmental protections put in place and should be removed. The applicant's position on this matter was discussed at ISH2 a summary of which is provided in <a href="#">[REP3-050]</a> . Does this information change the EA's position?
Q2.9.18	The applicant	<b>General</b> The proposed development is intended to connect to the proposed National Grid East Claydon substation. Is a further requirement preventing any authorised development including any preliminary works commencing until planning permission has been granted for the proposed substation?
Q2.9.19	Buckinghamshire Council	<b>8. Fencing and other means of enclosure</b> Is the Council content with the amended wording of requirement (R) 8(6) and 8(7) of the draft Development Consent Order (dDCO) <a href="#">[REP3-006]</a> submitted at deadline 3?
Q2.9.20	Buckinghamshire Council	<b>14. Operational noise</b> Are you content that R14, the outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) <a href="#">[REP3-030]</a> and the oCTMP <a href="#">[REP2-065]</a> would provide adequate control of operational noise in general and in particular noise associated with activities that would be undertaken in the hour

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		either side of the proposed core working hours of 7:00am to 7:00pm Monday to Friday and 7:00am to 12:00pm on Saturdays and abnormal or emergency construction traffic movements, construction activities such as trenchless techniques (including horizontal directional drilling) and abnormal indivisible load deliveries, which may need to take place during evenings, Sundays, bank holidays or at night?
<b>9.3 Protective Provisions (PPs)</b>		
Q2.9.21	Anglian Water Services Limited	<p><b>Progress reaching agreement</b></p> <p>At deadline 3 the applicant submitted Status of Negotiations with Statutory Undertakers <a href="#">[REP3-046]</a> which indicates that progress has been made between you and the applicant agreeing PPs and that you are currently considering the latest draft.</p> <p>Please provide an update on progress. Are you confident that agreement will be reached with the applicant before the end of the examination? If not, what are the issues you have concerns about?</p>
Q2.9.22	The applicant	<p><b>Progress reaching agreement</b></p> <p>At deadline 3 you submitted Status of Negotiations with Statutory Undertakers <a href="#">[REP3-046]</a> which indicates that draft PPs and the associated draft commercial agreement with National Grid Electricity Transmission Limited are close to agreement.</p> <p>Please outline the outstanding issues to be agreed in both documents.</p>
Q2.9.23	Openreach Limited	<p><b>Progress reaching agreement</b></p> <p>At deadline 3 the applicant submitted Status of Negotiations with Statutory Undertakers <a href="#">[REP3-046]</a> which indicates that progress has been made between you and the applicant agreeing PPs and that you are currently considering the latest draft.</p> <p>Please provide an update on progress. Are you confident that agreement will be reached with the applicant before the end of the examination? If not, what are the issues you have concerns about?</p>
Q2.9.24	The applicant	<p><b>Progress reaching agreement</b></p> <p>At deadline 3 you submitted Status of Negotiations with Statutory Undertakers <a href="#">[REP3-046]</a> which indicates that a draft interface agreement with Statkraft UK Limited is close to agreement.</p> <p>Please outline the outstanding issues to be agreed and why you are confident the interface agreement can be agreed before the end of the examination.</p>
Q2.9.25	The applicant	<p><b>Progress reaching agreement</b></p> <p>At deadline 3 you submitted Status of Negotiations with Statutory Undertakers <a href="#">[REP3-046]</a> which indicates that draft PPs with Thames Water Utilities Limited are close to agreement.</p> <p>Please outline the outstanding issues to be agreed.</p>
Q2.9.26	UK Power Networks Limited	<p><b>Progress reaching agreement</b></p> <p>At deadline 3 the applicant submitted Status of Negotiations with Statutory Undertakers <a href="#">[REP3-046]</a> which indicates that progress has been made between you and the applicant agreeing a commercial agreement and that you are currently considering the latest draft.</p> <p>Please provide an update on progress. Are you confident that agreement will be reached with the applicant before the end of the examination? If not, what are the issues you have concerns about? Will PPs also be required?</p>
<b>10. Health and wellbeing</b>		
Q2.10.1	The applicant	<p><b>Health Effects Report</b></p> <p>How do you respond to Buckinghamshire Council's concern, expressed in its response to the Examining Authority's (ExA) written question 1.13.1 <a href="#">[REP2-090]</a>, that while Annex A of Environmental Statement (ES) Appendix 5.5: Health and Well Being Summary Statement <a href="#">[REP2-</a></p>

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<a href="#">050</a> improves clarity of health assessment reporting, the presentation of the assessment as an Annex to an Appendix within the ES fails to afford the assessment equivalent prominence within the ES as other topics that also feature as named topics in the relevant Environmental Impact Assessment legislation?
Q2.10.2	The applicant	<p><b>Health assessment - landscape related and cumulative wellbeing effects and geographically sensitive sub-populations</b></p> <p>In its response to the ExA's written question 1.13.1 <a href="#">[REP2-050]</a> Buckinghamshire Council highlighted three inter-related matters that it considers persist as significant adverse residual effects (i.e. after mitigation), which it wishes the applicant to explore further through robust assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Landscape and visual change, including cumulatively</li> <li>• Effects on public rights of way</li> <li>• Insufficient focus on high-exposure geographical sub-populations as specific receptor groups for health and well-being effects</li> </ul> <p>Do you intend assessing these effects further? If not, why not?</p>
Q2.10.3	Buckinghamshire Council	<p><b>Health assessment – local businesses, local employment, agricultural displacement and tourism</b></p> <p>In the latest statement of common ground between you and the applicant <a href="#">[REP3-016]</a> you maintain that further assessment is required on the cumulative effects of the proposed development on local businesses, local employment, agricultural displacement and tourism.</p> <p>What is your response to the applicant's assertion that sufficient assessment has already been undertaken in ES (Chapter 14) – Population <a href="#">[REP2-033]</a>?</p>
<b>11. Land and groundwater</b>		
Q2.11.1	Buckinghamshire Council	<p><b>Groundwater assessment methodology</b></p> <p>The latest statement of common ground between you and the applicant <a href="#">[REP3-016]</a> still shows there is a disagreement between the parties on the lack of assessment at this stage of the project of groundwater levels and flow direction particularly with respect to the battery energy storage system.</p> <p>Are you satisfied that provisions within Environmental Statement Chapter 11: Land and groundwater <a href="#">[REP1-038]</a> and the outline Construction Environmental Management Plan <a href="#">[REP3-030]</a> mean that groundwater would be investigated and any mitigation required implemented prior to construction?</p>
<b>12. Landscape and visual (including good design)</b>		
Q2.12.1	Buckinghamshire Council	<p><b>Design Commitments</b></p> <p>The applicant's response to the Examining Authority's (ExA) first written questions (ExQ1) Q1.15.3 <a href="#">[REP2-087]</a> states that it does not consider that there is a need to reference any specific guidance, such as colour studies or studies of local buildings, to confirm colour choices at the detailed design stage. This is due to the relatively simple built forms of the proposed development and the provisions already included in the Design Commitments <a href="#">[REP2-010]</a>. Is the Council satisfied that the Design Commitments provide sufficient detail and guidance to inform its approval of the choice of colours for the development at the detailed design stage?</p>
Q2.12.2	The applicant	<p><b>Moderate (not significant) effects</b></p> <p>At issue specific hearing 1 (ISH1) <a href="#">[REP3-049]</a>, the applicant stated that only a limited number of receptors (two settlements and 12 residential receptors) were identified as moderate, but not significant. Provide a summary table that identifies all receptors where a conclusion of moderate adverse effects has been reached by the applicant. This should clearly identify whether the effects are deemed to be significant or not significant by the applicant.</p>
Q2.12.3	The applicant	<p><b>Assessment of effects</b></p> <p>Provide examples of other Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects that have been approved by the Secretary of State that adopted the same or similar approach to arrive at conclusions on the significance of effects as the applicant, including the use of a three-point scale to determine sensitivity and a four-point scale for magnitude. Explain why any such cases are applicable to the Rosefield Solar Farm project.</p>

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
Q2.12.4	The applicant  Buckinghamshire Council	<b>Fields D28 and D29</b> To the applicant: 1. Confirm which landscape and visual viewpoints the applicant considers that there would be intervisibility with the proposed development in fields D28 and D29 in years 1 and 10. To Buckinghamshire Council: 2. The Council is invited to elaborate on its position as stated in ISH1 <a href="#">[REP3-056]</a> that there were medium or medium-to-long distance views of fields D28 and D29 when traversing the area by public rights of way and that the development would be noticeable even with mitigation.
Q2.12.5	Buckinghamshire Council	<b>Potential mitigation in the outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP)</b> Is the use of the word “potential” mitigation appropriate in the oLEMP <a href="#">[REP2-067]</a> to avoid any ambiguity around the certainty that mitigation would be provided? If not, provide an alternative description.
Q2.12.6	Claydons Solar Action Group	<b>Non-visual effects</b> Elaborate on concerns raised in your written representation and at ISH1 that screen planting would reduce levels of adverse landscape and visual effects as much as the landscape and visual impact assessment assumes, partly “because screening cannot mitigate non-visual experiential landscape and visual effects for example sound, smell, awareness, security / safety, memories, associations...”. In doing so, please comment on the suitability of the applicant’s response to your written representation on this matter <a href="#">[REP2-086]</a> at reference 7.1.18 that considers noise and odour.
<b>13. Noise and vibration</b>		
Q2.13.1	The applicant  Buckinghamshire Council	<b>Background noise</b> The Examining Authority (ExA) notes the continued concern of Buckinghamshire Council regarding the relative increase in noise levels to some receptors due to low background noise levels. The applicant explained at issue specific hearing 1 (ISH1) <a href="#">[REP3-049]</a> that its approach in considering absolute noise levels is appropriate and consistent with other nationally significant infrastructure projects (NSIPs). The applicant also stated that it was not reliant only on the 35 decibel (dB) threshold specified in requirement 14 (operational noise) of the draft Development Consent Order (dDCO) <a href="#">[REP3-006]</a> but that other measures in the outline Operational Environmental Management Plan (oOEMP) <a href="#">[REP3-032]</a> would also manage noise. The oOEMP would be subject to approval by Buckinghamshire Council under requirement 12 of the dDCO.  To the applicant: 1. Provide examples of other consented NSIPs that have applied a similar approach in low background noise areas. 2. Provide comments on how the applicant’s approach complies with National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) paragraph 198 which requires applicants to “mitigate and reduce to a minimum potential adverse impacts resulting from noise from new development...”  To Buckinghamshire Council: 3. To what extent would the wider control measures in oOEMP that would be subject to approval by the Council provide assurance that the relative increase in noise from low background levels could be adequately addressed?
Q2.13.2	The applicant	<b>Embedded mitigation - offset</b> In relation to the proposed 50m offset embedded noise mitigation, the applicant’s response to Examining Authority’s first written questions (ExQ1) Q1.16.8 <a href="#">[REP2-087]</a> states that “due to the quantity of noise sources and mitigation measures applied, combined with the complexity of noise propagation pathways from multiple sources operating simultaneously, it is not appropriate to specify a fixed offset distance at which components must be sited to ensure adverse impacts would be avoided.” If so, why has the applicant specifically identified an offset of 50m between specific components and residential properties as well as from the southern boundaries of fields D8 and D9 and the eastern boundary of field D9 in the Design Commitments <a href="#">[REP3-010]</a> ?
Q2.13.3	The applicant	<b>Embedded mitigation - use of equipment with low noise emissions</b>

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p>The applicant's response to ExQ1 Q1.16.9 <a href="#">[REP2-087]</a> states that "The selection of equipment will be subject to the design team/contractor responsible for the detailed design of the proposed development. This decision can be balanced with other factors such as equipment size, efficiency, availability and cost..."</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Would Buckinghamshire Council have any input into the decision not to use equipment with low noise emissions? If not, why not?</li> <li>2. Can the use of equipment with low noise emissions be considered as embedded mitigation if a contractor can discount it based on cost at a later date?</li> </ol>
Q2.13.4	The applicant	<p><b>Public Rights of Way (PRoW) users</b></p> <p>Provide a further assessment of noise effects on PRoW users as advocated by Buckinghamshire Council at paragraph 81 of its post ISH1 note <a href="#">[REP3-056]</a> or provide further justification for not doing so.</p>
Q2.13.5	<p>The applicant</p> <p>Buckinghamshire Council</p> <p>Preston Farms Limited and TCS Biosciences Limited</p>	<p><b>Noise and vibration effects on livestock and related mitigation</b></p> <p>In the absence of the consideration of horses, sheep and cattle as receptors in the noise assessment detailed in Environmental Statement Chapter 13 <a href="#">[REP1-040]</a> how can the Secretary of State have confidence that the full range of likely significant effects have been identified and that outline mitigation measures identified by the applicant would be effective?</p>
<b>14. Population</b>		
Q2.14.1	The applicant	<p><b>Primary construction compound in field E21, E22 or E23</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. At what stage would the applicant determine whether the primary construction compound in parcel 3 as identified in the Works Plans <a href="#">[REP3-005]</a> and figure 3.8 of Environmental Statement (ES) Chapter 3 Proposed Development Description <a href="#">[REP1-049]</a> would be located in either field E21, E22 or E23?</li> <li>2. What factors would inform the decision regarding the location of the primary construction compound and would it be subject to consultation with relevant landowners and tenants?</li> <li>3. Aside from the grazing corridor proposed for Field E23 in the Design Commitments <a href="#">[REP3-010]</a>, what other mitigation measures are proposed to address the potential effects of the compound on the use of field E23 by Preston Farms Limited? In answering this question, have regard to the additional information provided at deadline 3 by Preston Farms Limited regarding its use of field E23 <a href="#">[REP3-067]</a>.</li> </ol>
Q2.14.2	The applicant	<p><b>Knowl Hill Farm – layout of the proposed development</b></p> <p>Provide further explanation and justification of the proposed layout of the proposed development in the vicinity of Knowl Hill Farm having regard to matters raised in Mr Claridge's deadline 3 submission <a href="#">[REP3-069]</a>. The Examining Authority (ExA) notes that the applicant's response to issue specific hearing 1 (ISH1) action point 31 on this matter <a href="#">[REP3-049]</a> reiterates its position that the layout and use of fields B18 and B19 was informed by the Residential Visual Amenity Assessment <a href="#">[APP-114]</a>. Did the applicant also consider the implications for farming operations in determining the layout? If so, identify where this is referenced in the examination library. If not, why not?</p>
Q2.14.3	The applicant	<p><b>Knowl Hill Farm - water supply</b></p> <p>Provide a plan that identifies the spring and well referenced in Mr Claridge's deadline 3 submission <a href="#">[REP3-069]</a> as well how access to them would be maintained as indicated in the updated Design Commitments <a href="#">[REP3-010]</a>.</p>
Q2.14.4	The applicant	<p><b>Biosecurity measures during construction</b></p> <p>The applicant's response to ISH1 action point 30 <a href="#">[REP3-049]</a> clarifies that there would be a maximum of 200 construction workers at any one time in parcel 3 for a period of around 16 weeks. In comparison, a maximum number of 15 were present during trial trenching works. Provide further details to explain how the necessary biosecurity measures will be effectively communicated and adhered to given the number of unescorted construction workers and period of time that they would be on site. In doing so, have regard to the additional biosecurity details provided by Preston Farms Limited and TCS Biosciences Limited at deadline 3 <a href="#">[REP3-067]</a></p>
Q2.14.5	Preston Farms Limited and TCS Biosciences Limited	<p><b>National Health Service (NHS) supply chain</b></p>

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		Provide comments on the applicant's post hearing note <a href="#">[REP3-049]</a> which refers to the Parliamentary Under-Secretary for Health and Social Care, Mr Zubir Ahmed's, comments in Parliament in which it was stated that "There are a number of suppliers on NHS Supply Chain's current framework which offer donor animal blood supply for diagnostic use which support a level of resilience across England."
Q2.14.6	Preston Farms Limited and TCS Biosciences Limited	<b>Minimum corridor width</b> The ExA notes concerns regarding the corridor width for livestock with 90m stated as being the minimum <a href="#">[REP3-067]</a> . Provide comments on how Preston Farms Limited and TCS Biosciences Limited manage associated risks in more confined spaces. For example, the ExA noted on the accompanied site inspection (ASI) that whilst barns and linked farmyards facilitated the free movement of animals, there were instances where a 90m corridor width was not in place.
Q2.14.7	The applicant  Buckinghamshire Council  Preston Farms Limited and TCS Biosciences Limited	<b>Field E23</b> To the applicant: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Provide further details to demonstrate that a grazing corridor (or corridors) would be a workable solution to concerns raised by Preston Farms Limited and TCS Biosciences Limited regarding the safe movement of livestock in the context of details provided in their deadline 3 submission <a href="#">[REP3-067]</a>. In particular, provide indicative drawings to show how the minimum corridor width requested by Preston Farms Limited and TCS Biosciences Limited could be accommodated to connect all gateways in field E23 during both the construction/decommissioning phase with a potential primary construction/decommissioning compound (Works No. 8A) in situ and during the operational phase with solar photovoltaic (PV) development (Works No. 1 and Works No. 2).</li> </ol> To the applicant, Buckinghamshire Council, Preston Farms Limited and TCS Biosciences Limited: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Do the potential benefits including of field E23 in Work No. 1 and Work No. 2 <a href="#">[REP3-005]</a> such as the estimated 12.25 megawatt peak (MWp) generating capacity as cited by the applicant in response to ISH1 action point 32 <a href="#">[REP3-049]</a> outweigh potential adverse effects? Provide reasoning having regard to relevant policy.</li> </ol>
Q2.14.8	The applicant	<b>Assessment of residual effects on agricultural businesses and landholdings and other non-agricultural businesses</b> Environmental Statement (ES) Chapter 14 Population <a href="#">[REP2-033]</a> states that the value (sensitivity) of non-agricultural business and development land as a receptor is high or very high. The magnitude of change is given as minor (except for one topic area for one receptor - Hogshaw Farm and Wildlife Park) during construction and slight/negligible or minor (except for moderate effects experienced by two receptors/receptor groups for visual amenity only) during operation. The sensitivity and magnitude for all receptors is not specified. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Identify the sensitivity and magnitude of change for each individual receptor considered within the assessment of other non-agricultural businesses.</li> <li>2. In the context of concerns raised by TCS Biosciences Limited regarding the potential effects on their operation, provide further justification for the applicant's identification of a minor magnitude of change during the construction phase and slight/negligible or minor during operation and overall conclusions. In doing so, have regard to any related potential implications for the NHS that may arise for conclusions in the ES.</li> <li>3. In the context of concerns raised by Preston Farms Limited and A.E.J. &amp; F.J. Claridge, provide further justification for the minor magnitude of change and overall conclusions identified for agricultural businesses and landholdings during both construction and operation.</li> </ol>
Q2.14.9	Buckinghamshire Council	<b>Outline Employment, Skills and Supply Chain Plan</b> The Council is invited to provide comments on the Outline Employment, Skills and Supply Chain Plan as updated by the applicant at deadline 2 <a href="#">[REP2-077]</a> .
<b>15. Soils</b>		
Q2.15.1	The applicant  Buckinghamshire Council	<b>Green and blue infrastructure</b> The applicant updated the worst-case scenario considered in Environmental Statement (ES) Chapter 12 Soil <a href="#">[REP2-031]</a> at deadline 2 to include the maximum areas that have been assessed, including the Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) and satellite collector compounds. Should the worst-case scenario also reference the land take for the green and blue infrastructure (10 hectares) assumed to be permanent in the assessment? If not, why not?
Q2.15.2	The applicant	<b>Green and blue infrastructure</b>

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		<p>In response to the Examining Authority's (ExA) first written question (ExQ1) Q1.18.9, the applicant <a href="#">[REP2-087]</a> stated that there would be an area of best and most versatile (BMV) agricultural land located within field B9 (adjacent to Knowl Hill) in Parcel 1 that is proposed as green and blue infrastructure but that none of this area is considered to be permanent for the purposes of the assessment as it would be reinstated to the same agricultural land classification (ALC) grade at the end of decommissioning.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Clarify this position in relation to the statement at paragraph 12.8.13 in the ES <a href="#">[REP2-087]</a> that "For the purposes of this assessment, it has been assumed that Green Infrastructure has the potential to be permanent."</li> <li>2. Identify on a plan all areas of green and blue infrastructure that have been assumed to be permanent for the purposes of the ES and confirm the ALC grade of this land.</li> </ol>
Q2.15.3	<p>The applicant  Buckinghamshire Council</p>	<p><b>Soil ecosystems</b></p> <p>The applicant's response to the Local Impact Report (LIR) <a href="#">[REP2-085]</a> states that soil ecosystem services have not been assessed in Chapter 12 of the ES <a href="#">[REP2-031]</a> as it pre-dates the updated Institute of Sustainability and Environmental Professionals guidance - A New Perspective on Land and Soil in Environmental Impact Assessment published in January 2026. The applicant has also updated Chapter 12 of the ES to clarify that soil structure is a more appropriate term for what is currently assessed in the ES.</p> <p>To the applicant and Buckinghamshire Council:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Should the Chapter 12 of the ES be updated to assess soil ecosystems in line with the updated guidance? If not, why not?</li> </ol> <p>To the applicant:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Notwithstanding the above question, whilst the applicant updated table 12.2 of the ES at deadline 2 to clarify that soil structure is a more appropriate term for what is assessed in the ES, the ExA and Buckinghamshire Council <a href="#">[REP3-053]</a> note that the term soil ecosystems continues to be applied elsewhere in Chapter 12 of the ES. Undertake a review of the ES and update the terminology as appropriate.</li> </ol>
Q2.15.4	<p>The applicant</p>	<p><b>Agricultural grazing</b></p> <p>In response to ExQ1 Q1.4.2, the applicant <a href="#">[REP2-087]</a> stated that the "...Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) secures under section 3.3 that the management of grassland within the Order Limits will be undertaken by a combination of sheep (under panels) and cattle grazing (areas with no panels)". However, paragraph 3.3.27 of the oLEMP <a href="#">[REP2-067]</a> also states that "If grazing for any reason is not possible then a late summer cutting regime will be implemented." The applicant also suggests in response to ExQ1 Q1.18.4 that Rosefield Solar Farm would be responsible for managing the grazing in partnership with suppliers.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Under what circumstances would grazing not be possible?</li> <li>2. The assessment of soil ecosystems in paragraph 12.10.14 of the ES appears to assume that nutrient input from grazing would occur which contributes to the applicant's conclusion of a slight beneficial effects during operation. Confirm the implications for the conclusions in the ES if grazing were not to occur.</li> <li>3. Provide further details of how the layout and design and of the proposed development would enable grazing to be feasible during the operational phase.</li> <li>4. Is the potential grazing dependant on it being a commercially viable operation? If so, provide details to demonstrate that grazing would be viable.</li> </ol>
Q2.15.5	<p>Buckinghamshire Council</p>	<p><b>Soil handling</b></p> <p>The Council's LIR <a href="#">[REP1-112]</a> identifies concern regarding the trafficking of soil during the winter months. The applicant's response to the LIR <a href="#">[REP2-085]</a> points to support from Natural England in relation to measures in the outline Soil Management Plan (oSMP) <a href="#">[REP2-069]</a> regarding</p>

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		the handling of wet soil and that soil would not be worked when it is above the plasticity limit detailed in the oSMP. Is the use of plasticity limits as set out in the oSMP an appropriate means of controlling the handling of wet soil appropriate in lieu of seasonal restrictions? If not, why not?
Q2.15.6	The applicant	<b>oSMP - Institute of Quarrying Guidance Good Practice Guide for Handling Soils in Mineral Workings</b> Respond to Buckinghamshire Council's request <a href="#">[REP3-055]</a> for the oSMP [REP2-069] to apply the principles on page 16 of the Institute of Quarrying Guidance Good Practice Guide for Handling Soils in Mineral Workings.
Q2.15.7	The applicant	<b>Soil reinstatement</b> The applicant's response to ExQ1 Q1.18.12 <a href="#">[REP2-087]</a> states that "The entirety of the Order Limits will be reinstated to the same ALC grade as prior to installation of the Proposed Development as set out and secured in Outline SMP". Would this include the 10 hectares of green and blue infrastructure that is assumed to be permanently lost in the ES Chapter 12 <a href="#">[REP2-031]</a> ? If not, should the oSMP <a href="#">[REP2-069]</a> make this clear?
Q2.15.8	A.E.J. & F.J. Claridge	<b>ALC Report</b> The ExA notes your deadline 3 submission <a href="#">[REP3-069]</a> in which concerns are raised regarding soil surveys, soil classification and the use of "the best field on the whole farm" for biodiversity net gain. Provide specific comments in relation to the applicant's assessment of your land as set out in the ALC Report <a href="#">[REP2-048]</a> . Does the report accurately reflect your understanding of the quality of soils across your holding?
Q2.15.9	The applicant	<b>Future baseline – climate change</b> The applicant's response to the ExA's first written questions (ExQ1) Q1.18.6 acknowledges that ES Volume 4, Appendix 8.2: Climate Change Resilience Assessment <a href="#">[APP-105]</a> notes increased winter precipitation, increase in magnitude and frequency of extreme rainfall events, and increased risk of drought as a likely climate change effect during the operational phase and that such changes may affect elements relating to soil resources such as moisture conditions. Clarify how such conditions have been taken into account in ES Chapter 12 <a href="#">[REP2-031]</a> .
Q2.15.10	The applicant	<b>ES Chapter 12 – formatting</b> Correct the formatting issues present in table 12.4 of ES Chapter 12 Population (clean) <a href="#">[REP2-031]</a> .
Q2.15.11	The applicant	<b>ES Chapter 12 – magnitude</b> Provide further justification for the negligible magnitude of effect identified for the land take of 3.01 hectares of grade 2 agricultural land during the construction phase in the context of the criteria for magnitude specified in table 12.8 <a href="#">[REP2-031]</a> . Buckinghamshire Council <a href="#">[REP3-053]</a> and the ExA note that the description of magnitude in table 12.8 indicates that a "minor" magnitude of effect for grade 2 land would be more accurate. Such a change would also indicate a moderate or large effect according to table 12.9 which would be significant. Update ES Chapter 12 as appropriate.
<b>16. Transport and access</b>		
Q2.16.1	The applicant  Buckinghamshire Council	<b>Staff parking during construction</b> In relation to on-site staff parking during construction, the applicant's response to the Examining Authority's (ExA) first written question (ExQ1) Q1.19.6 <a href="#">[REP2-087]</a> states that the "total number of parking spaces will be determined once the confirmed number of staff has been made (but will not exceed the assessed 600 employees stated in the assessment)." Should the outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (oCTMP) <a href="#">[REP2-065]</a> make a clearer commitment to tie the number of spaces to the mode share? If not, why not?
Q2.16.2	The applicant  Buckinghamshire Council	<b>Pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians</b> To the applicant and Buckinghamshire Council:  1. Is there any data available regarding the use of public rights of way (PRoW), permissive paths and the highway network in the study area of Environmental Statement (ES) Chapter 15 Transport and Access <a href="#">[APP-058]</a> (including Station Road/Dewes Lane, Snake Lane/Fidlers Field and Granborough Road), by pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians? If so, please submit the data.  To the applicant:

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		2. If available, explain how such data has informed the applicant's assessment of effects on ES Chapter 15 Transport and Access <a href="#">[APP-058]</a> . If no such data is available, explain how the applicant has been able to reach a conclusion of minor (not significant) effects for all receptors assessed.
Q2.16.3	The applicant	<b>Construction traffic route</b> Provide further justification for the proposed construction traffic route having regard to any reasonable alternatives that were considered.
Q2.16.4	The applicant Buckinghamshire Council	<b>oCTMP - mode share</b> At issue specific hearing 1, the Council indicated <a href="#">[REP3-056]</a> that it would explore the coverage of the mode share in the oCTMP <a href="#">[REP2-065]</a> with the applicant further. Please provide an update on discussions and update the oCTMP if appropriate.
Q2.16.5	The applicant	<b>Junction modelling at the A41/ Station Road junction</b> In its response to ExQ1 Q1.19.8 <a href="#">[REP2-087]</a> stated that junction modelling for the A41 / Station Road junction would be provided at deadline 3. This information does not appear to have been forthcoming. Submit this information at deadline 4 and confirm the outcome of any discussions held with Buckinghamshire Council on this issue.
Q2.16.6	Buckinghamshire Council Parish councils	<b>Traffic Management Group</b> The applicant's response to ExQ1 Q1.19.13 <a href="#">[REP2-087]</a> states that it considers that the Traffic Management Group as proposed in the oCTMP <a href="#">[REP2-065]</a> should be condensed to make the group focussed and to ensure actions occur quickly. Furthermore, the applicant considers that business and tourism interests should not be members of the group as they are already catered for through the inclusion of elected members and parish councillors, who as effective spokesmen and spokeswomen for their communities, can advise of any matters relevant for all groups.  Do Buckinghamshire Council and relevant parish councils support the applicant's suggested approach that elected members would represent local business interests on the Traffic Management Group?
<b>17. Water environment</b>		
Q2.17.1	Environment Agency (EA)	<b>Flood risk – compensation</b> Have the amendments that the applicant has made to Environmental Statement (ES) Appendix 16.1: Flood Risk Assessment <a href="#">[REP3-028]</a> and the outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) <a href="#">[REP3-031]</a> at deadline 3 satisfied your outstanding concerns on flood risk as set out in the latest version of the statement of common ground between you and the applicant <a href="#">[REP3-014]</a> at 1.3? If not, what further action should the applicant take?
Q2.17.2	EA	<b>Flood modelling – use of proxy</b> Have the amendments that the applicant has made to ES Appendix 16.1: Flood Risk Assessment <a href="#">[REP3-028]</a> at deadline 3 satisfied your outstanding concerns on the use of proxy for fluvial and pluvial flood risk as set out in the latest version of the statement of common ground between you and the applicant <a href="#">[REP3-014]</a> at 1.5? If not, what further action should the applicant take?
Q2.17.3	EA	<b>Penstock</b> Have the amendments that the applicant has made to ES Appendix 16.1: Flood Risk Assessment <a href="#">[REP3-028]</a> and the outline Drainage Strategy <a href="#">[REP3-040]</a> at deadline 3 satisfied your outstanding concerns in relation to the operation of penstocks as set out in the latest version of the statement of common ground between you and the applicant <a href="#">[REP3-014]</a> at 1.9? If not, what further action should the applicant take?
Q2.17.4	EA	<b>Per-and polyfluoroakyl substances (PFAS)</b> Have the amendments that the applicant has made to the oCEMP <a href="#">[REP3-031]</a> and outline Operational Environmental Management Plan <a href="#">[REP3-032]</a> at deadline 3 satisfied your outstanding concerns on PFAS as set out in the latest version of the statement of common ground between you and the applicant <a href="#">[REP3-014]</a> at 4.5? If not, what further action should the applicant take?