



Planning Inspectorate
Arolygiaeth Gynllunio

Hearing Transcript

Project:	Rosefield Solar Farm
Hearing:	Recording of issue specific hearing 3 (ISH 3) - Part 4
Date:	07 July 2026

Please note: This document is intended to assist Interested Parties.

It is not a verbatim text of what was said at the above hearing. The content was produced using artificial intelligence voice to text software. It may, therefore, include errors and should be assumed to be unedited.

The video recording published on the Planning Inspectorate project page is the primary record of the hearing.

FULL TRANSCRIPT (with timecode)

00:00:12:14 - 00:00:23:00

Okay, now turn four and we'll resume with agenda items seven seven D. Sorry, which relates to Glen Sinclair effects.

00:00:27:23 - 00:00:50:17

I beg your council's response to our further written questions. Q 2.1.1 that's lib reference rep 4094 and notes that paragraph 6.3.1 of the applicants glinting glare assessments. And that's lib reference app dash 082 would appear to imply that local roads are low sensitivity receptors,

00:00:52:03 - 00:01:24:03

and if so, it seeks further clarification of this given potential road safety concerns. The council has also requested the submission by the applicant of the solar voltaic building developments glint and Glare guidance from 2022, which is referenced in the glinting glare assessment as well as that informs the basis for the significance of effects criteria, potentially. Question. First of all, is the applicant have local roads been assumed to be low sensitivity in the Glen Sinclair assessment?

00:01:27:06 - 00:01:39:09

In Stirling on behalf of the applicant. Am I pass to Mr. Ian who's on line, who's a technical expert on the Eglinton Glare topic, and can explain to you the guidance that's been used in the relevant classifications. Thank you.

00:01:39:11 - 00:01:40:01

Thank you.

00:01:42:03 - 00:02:15:27

Good afternoon sir. My name is Ian, 30, from ep seven and I'm speaking on behalf of the applicant. Um, we did supply a copy of the guidance on, uh, photovoltaic, uh, installations. And so I hope that you've received that, um, the guidance is fairly clear on how different categories of roads are assigned significance, and it states fairly clearly using flow chart that local roads are to be considered low impact.

00:02:18:18 - 00:02:22:06

Do you have the examination lib reference for the guidance that was submitted please.

00:02:23:15 - 00:02:32:09

I don't we it was only provided last night so I'm not sure that it's been given. It won't be references yet, but maybe the the applicant team can.

00:02:35:12 - 00:03:00:00

Have me standing on behalf of the applicant. Apologies not. We're not quite sure where the guidance. Mr.. Sorry, you're saying who it's been provided to or why it would have an examination library reference. Um, we can clarify that. I understand you're referring to the page per guidance you want to

give. I think that's publicly available. Mr.. Authority, maybe that's something you could speak to in a bit more detail.

00:03:00:27 - 00:03:15:26

Yeah, absolutely. Sorry. That is a good point. Yes. Um, the guidance is publicly available. Uh, I just didn't go. I sent a copy last night with my, uh, speaking notes to the applicant team, so I'm not sure whether that was provided or not, but, yeah, it is publicly available.

00:03:17:06 - 00:03:46:09

Well, it would be helpful to the examining authority if the if there is a documents referenced that is submitted into the examination. So we can consider that without, you know, searching things ourselves, not something we're supposed to do. So if that can be provided please. So it's it's referenced in paragraph 6.31 of the Glencairn assessment. It's the City of Altaic Building and Development clinical guidance from 2022, which I don't think we've received in the examination as far as I'm aware. Um, so if that can be submitted, please, that would be helpful.

00:03:47:08 - 00:04:00:17

On behalf of the applicant. Yes, we can append it to, um, some overall submissions and if it would assist, we're happy to share it with the action Group in advance of deadline five and the council as well, if they don't have a copy. The deadline five is several weeks away.

00:04:01:06 - 00:04:03:00

Yes, that would be helpful. Thank you.

00:04:05:08 - 00:04:19:29

Um, so could the applicant please elaborate on its position in terms of the sensitivity of local roads and its conclusion that there would be no significant effects that comes off the back of that place, given the concerns that the council may have on on that in terms of road safety.

00:04:21:11 - 00:05:03:29

Yeah. Ian Foley, on behalf of the applicant, as I stated, the the guidance on solar Caltex and Linden Blair, it's fairly clear that local roads are to be treated as low sensitivity and that the highest significance would be low and therefore mitigation is not required for for effects as a result of that. Now just I guess to elaborate on that and give a little more detail, I guess the the guidance is not particularly specific on the reasoning as to why it's low significance, other than local roads tend to be, uh, or have slower speed limits and contain less traffic.

00:05:05:00 - 00:05:27:12

But just the implications or the practical implications of that is that users or drivers on those roads have more ability to slow down, to stop and to take action. That would prevent the effects of solar glare. Whereas drivers on major roads would have less ability to navigate traffic safely, stop or slow down to take action.

00:05:30:12 - 00:05:42:10

So was any specific consideration given to the speed limit, its traffic volumes on the local roads within the study area? Or was that taken as just being the local definition? From the guidance that you've applied.

00:05:43:10 - 00:06:01:15

We've assumed, yes, or considered that the use of those roads and without any evidence to the contrary, it seems fairly obvious to us that they are local roads. They are not, you know, dual carriageways. They don't have air traffic control measures, really. So they are typically local roads.

00:06:03:00 - 00:06:06:29

Thank you. Mr. Gazelka, does the council have any comments in response, please?

00:06:07:21 - 00:06:45:19

Thank you, Sir. Daniel Gazelka for Buckinghamshire Council. I've, I've spoken to our, um our traffic expert on this as well, Mr. Duncan, who was on the line as well. Um, I think where this concern came from was, was primarily because we thought 6.3.1 said that, um, and it would appear that it does. Um, our view would be that that is a low by which I mean appears to be quite a low assessment of sensitivity for what is vehicular traffic on a road which will be traveling, you know, at speeds depending on if it's a national speed limit, 30 to 60 miles an hour.

00:06:45:28 - 00:07:17:11

Um, obviously the effects of glint and glare from a perspective of severity when you're thinking about sensitivity, receptor severity could be very high. It can cause a crash. I mean that that is the reality of glint and glare. And so what we're really arguing over, it would seem, is the susceptibility of these, you know, vehicles travelling along these roads to glint and glare. And our position and our concern was page a power in its guidance. As I understand it, you simply say local roads are low sensitivity.

00:07:17:20 - 00:07:56:02

Um, we consider that there should be an assessment of the actual roads that are affected here. Um, considering whether that is a conclusion that can be come to with the roads here, I should say, when it's been referred to as guidance page power, are experts who do lots of these applications. You may have seen them in other schemes if you've looked at the applications. Um, but it's not government issued guidance or anything of that nature. It's just what page of power as a private entity have published as the guidance that they use? Um, our concern ultimately is that this assesses the sensitivity of local roads to low my understanding.

00:07:56:04 - 00:08:34:17

The applicant may be able to correct his major. Roads are assessed as high. Um, and ultimately, this all comes to the fact that glint and glare effect on vehicles, on roads where there may be, you know, multiple cars where there may be HGVs as a result of a scheme, um, all come to a conclusion of position that low sensitivity is too low, and the applicant should have seriously considered that these are medium sensitivity receptors, and that may have an effect on the overall conclusions reached, because it may mean that there is any terms, a moderate effect which may be significant.

00:08:34:19 - 00:08:54:03

So that's how it all shakes out. Um, but at core and the reason why we've taken this as a traffic matter, because we don't have experts on how you actually measure glints and glare, is that point the idea that an effect that could cause crash, um, would be considered a low sensitivity receptor?

00:08:55:07 - 00:09:12:03

Thank you. Does he have any further comments? I mean, just initial of view. Local roads perhaps does capture a broad range of roads of different conditions. Um, perhaps a fairly broad brush approach to that. Does they have any further comments than what they've just heard from the the council, please?

00:09:13:20 - 00:09:43:20

Amy. Sorry. So you've got that obviously what I'm going to say. If you get anything else to add then please follow up. Um, Amy Stirling, on behalf of the applicant, I guess what we've established is the position is that the guidance has been used in the local roads have been categorised as as low sensitivity. I think your position is but nevertheless even taking them one by one and considering the individual sensitivity, notwithstanding that the local roads are not just applying that blanket sensitivity, although the outcome would be the same.

00:09:43:28 - 00:10:06:03

We've done some work in preparation for this hearing to confirm that, but I appreciate that isn't currently before the examination. So we can submit that along with our speaking not at deadline five. Um, maybe that's not the best place, but we'll think of a better place perhaps for deadline five, but that more granular analysis has been carried out in preparation for today and the result is the same, notwithstanding the guidance.

00:10:06:26 - 00:10:11:08

So the applicant has carried out a formal assessment of the local roads within the study area.

00:10:11:14 - 00:10:24:15

Amy Stirling, on behalf of the applicant. Yes, I have it in front of me, sir, so I will find out. We'll make sure to submit that into examination. But it was only prepared for the purposes of this heading to the sensitivity test, to the work that had already been undertaken.

00:10:24:20 - 00:10:27:02

Thank you. Has that been shared with the Council at all?

00:10:28:06 - 00:10:31:18

Mr.. On behalf of the applicant, I only got it last night, so I suspect not.

00:10:32:11 - 00:10:50:07

Um, Danny, for the council. Um, obviously we welcome seeing that as soon as we can. Just for clarity. Clarity for you, sir. Um, so was that include situations where some of those local roads have, in fact, been assessed as medium sensitivity, and it shakes out to there is no significant effect still.

00:10:51:02 - 00:10:56:15

In me standing on behalf of the applicant. That's where I am, exceeding my technical expertise. So I'll pass to Mr. Sodhi.

00:10:58:11 - 00:11:33:03

On behalf of the applicant. We we've conducted and actually the the text before you um, prepared last night is actually an extension of the text that's included within the original report. So it is detailed commentary on each of the receptors, each of the local roads within the area, within the study area. Um, whilst we still categorize the significance of those roads as low, the conclusion would be low or no significant effect, even if they were of moderate or high sensitivity.

00:11:34:12 - 00:11:48:07

We just I mean, in general terms, we don't think that there are significant glare effects from the the PB array on the local roads due to the, um, the orientation of the panels and the approach of the roads.

00:11:50:06 - 00:11:57:08

So the updated assessment still assumes low sensitivity, but then comments on if it was medium, the result would be the same as that.

00:11:57:10 - 00:11:57:27

It doesn't make.

00:11:57:29 - 00:11:58:19

Summary.

00:11:58:25 - 00:12:04:19

Sorry for the applicant. It doesn't make that comment. No, but that is an inference I would draw now.

00:12:06:21 - 00:12:17:23

I think it's difficult to comment without having the document. Um, I think that could be shared with with the council perhaps before deadline five and with an action point to comment on it at deadline five.

00:12:17:27 - 00:12:43:16

Uh, the council. Thank you sir. And before we're sent that, if you're able to do a sensitivity test in the sense of not sensitivity in AA terms, but changing that from low to medium just so we can see if it makes no difference in the sense that everything will be non-significant in the EIA terms, this point goes nowhere anyway. So if you can do that kind of sensitivity test, that would be helpful as well I think so thank you.

00:12:43:18 - 00:12:45:22

Yeah that's the action point as well please.

00:12:47:07 - 00:12:51:23

Um does the action group have any comments? Sorry Councillor Gibson.

00:12:53:07 - 00:13:15:07

Thank you sir. Kathy Gibson, councillor for your council. Um, that's a good question. I hope it's not a bit sort of far out here, but I've just got to question you about aircraft because, um, apparently Sinclair can affect pilots, and there are a few private airfields in the vicinity of Rose field, but it's wondered whether the Civil Aviation Authority had been contacted by you.

00:13:19:10 - 00:13:19:28

Stirling.

00:13:21:04 - 00:13:45:07

Amy Stirling, on behalf of the applicant, I can't comment right now as to whether the CAA were a consultant. I would have to check back to the list of consultees. I'm being told from the back. Yes, we have contacted the CAA. Obviously this is an open forum as well and anyone who's able to participate, there have been public notices continually and newspapers and and so on. So far as we're aware, no concerns have been raised.

00:13:46:11 - 00:13:54:11

Thank you. Um and claims action Group. Any comments on Glyn Sinclair in terms of transport and access, please?

00:13:54:24 - 00:14:37:09

Thanks, sir. Carly Tinkler of Clayton Solar Action Group. Um, yes, I think you understand. Clayton Solar Action Group's position on Glint and Glare. One, two points that I'd like to make about effects on the roads is to bear in mind. And I don't believe that the glint and glare assessment has considered that, unlike motorways and dual carriageways, these minor roads and lanes are used by people for recreational purposes because they're quite quiet, and therefore our concern is that the effects of glint and glare would not only potentially result in a crash, but it could also affect people using the roads, on bicycles, on foot and on horseback.

00:14:37:11 - 00:15:16:08

And the other point that I don't believe that the glint and glare assessment has considered is that when people are driving along the local roads, they haven't considered the sequential effects of of the glint and glare, in other words. I understand that they have assessed it from from a certain point, but in fact, as people are travelling around, they could experience it multiply and often not expect it. You know, I think the argument in the informal method is that people can move away from the effect, or they they will know that because the sun is low in the sky, that there's more likely to be an effect of glinting glare.

00:15:16:10 - 00:15:29:17

But when you're driving quite fast, than people will drive fast along some of these lanes, and that you will, you will not know where the effect is coming from from one moment to the other. So there's an augmentation of of the risk.

00:15:30:00 - 00:15:33:26

Thank you. Thank you. Um, can the applicant respond, please.

00:15:35:04 - 00:15:44:11

Give me Stirling on behalf of the applicant and past and Mr.. Sorry to comment on the effects of glint and glare on non-motorized users which I understand is the point being made.

00:15:46:05 - 00:16:30:14

On behalf of the applicant. The, um our assessment does consider, uh, multiple viewing points. So it does consider the kind of progress of vehicles along the road. Um, whilst the. I guess the main point of the assessment is to consider impact upon drivers. Um, the the same considerations would be given to cyclists or those on horseback, albeit they may be at slightly different heights. But our assessment does consider, uh, drivers of carts, which I would imagine are a similar height to cyclists and drivers of HGVs, which would be probably, uh, similar height to um, users of horses.

00:16:30:16 - 00:16:35:16

So in that way, we in that sense, we do assess those, uh, receptors.

00:16:39:00 - 00:16:47:13

And the points around the sequential experience of exploring experiencing Glen Sinclair. Any comments on that point, please?

00:16:48:24 - 00:17:16:27

Yes. Ian, on behalf of the applicant, we, uh, we do consider the, um, the implications, although at this point, qualitatively, qualitatively only. We do consider the implications of each parcel of PV panels. So we look at each one in isolation. And then the implications for each of those parcels upon each receptor. So if there were going to be combined effects we would consider that at this stage.

00:17:17:25 - 00:17:18:18

Thank you.

00:17:20:26 - 00:17:23:28

Um, Mr. Burton, I believe you had your hand up.

00:17:25:10 - 00:17:26:07

Thank you, sir.

00:17:26:09 - 00:18:01:15

James Burton for Preston Farms and Biosciences. I don't want to speak out of turn because I'm conscious this is under the transport and access heading, but various points have been made about various receptors that were and weren't assessed clearly in the. Yes, we were not assessed in terms of glint and glare. Another example I say that's not being assessed properly. It another reason we are relying so heavily on being told what exactly We'll come forward in terms of screening and when.

00:18:01:17 - 00:18:16:27

So could I, perhaps through you ask the applicant to really keenly bear that in mind when it's working up that action point at the very at the very least, with apologies for straying outside transport and and traffic.

00:18:18:24 - 00:18:19:25

Yes. Stirling.

00:18:22:18 - 00:18:23:08

Mr. Griffiths.

00:18:23:10 - 00:18:28:29

Amy. Selling on behalf of the applicant. Yes. We can bear that in mind when drafting a response to that action point.

00:18:29:21 - 00:18:38:24

Thank you. Uh, does anyone have any further points in relation to Glen Sinclair with regards to transport and access?

00:18:42:13 - 00:18:57:25

No. Okay. On that basis, that concludes this agenda item. Um, we'll be taking item eight tomorrow morning. Uh, so I'll hand over to Doctor Morgan, who will deal with the action points.

00:18:59:01 - 00:19:03:29

Okay. Then before closing, could we please run through the actions from today?

00:19:05:21 - 00:19:48:03

Certainly. Elizabeth can vouch on behalf of the applicant. So under agenda item two, the first action point is for the applicant to clarify the position on over planting, including when the development becomes operational. The applicant is to include in its response a response to Clayton Solar Action Group's deadline for representation. Rep for 103 and the figures provided at table two of that submission. The panel ratings and assumptions the applicant has used in its baseline and over planting calculations, and the context of the over planting ratio in policy, and a review of recent case law being the cases of Ross and Galloway.

00:19:50:08 - 00:20:14:19

Action point number two. The applicant is to identify decisions where the Secretary of State has considered the need for Bess as aligned with the need case for solar action point three is with the council to provide details around Start Crafts East Clayton Greener Grid Park project, including the officer's report, the outcome of the committee meeting and any other underlying documentation.

00:20:16:10 - 00:20:21:15

Action point four is with the applicant to signpost to its submissions on the location of the best.

00:20:23:15 - 00:20:50:11

Moving on to agenda item three Ecology and Biodiversity Action point five is with the applicant to provide a position paper on ground nesting birds and wintering birds in the context of the relevant populations. Action point six is with the applicant to provide a position paper setting out the applicant's approach to being as against the Clayton Solar Action Group's proposed approach to being, and the implications of taking each approach.

00:20:52:06 - 00:20:57:04

I should add all of these are for deadline five unless otherwise specified.

00:21:00:12 - 00:21:33:05

Agenda item for landscape and visual action. Number seven is with the Council to suggest draft wording to be included in the design commitments regarding color and vernacular specifications of acoustic barriers. So ideally this is to be provided as soon as possible in order for the applicant to comment at deadline five. Action point eight is with the action Group to suggest draft wording to be included in the design commitments to address their concerns around contrast, again, preferably as soon as possible, in order for the applicant to comment at deadline five.

00:21:35:17 - 00:21:54:14

Action number nine is with the Council to provide details about draft Regulation 19. I believe it was, which is regarding the Quentin Wing Hills area of attractive landscape to be included in Buckinghamshire Council's Local Plan and associated timescales for adoption of the updated plan.

00:21:56:11 - 00:22:51:17

Action number ten is with the applicant. Following discussion with Prestons and TCS to signpost the application documents to confirm the commitments to heights of planting around the Preston TCS fields. Action 11 is with the applicant to signpost the application documents to the applicant's previous submissions on the distinction between mitigation and enhancement. Action 12 is with the applicant to respond to Council's response to the second written question, 2.12.5, including with the use of the word potential mitigation in the outline lamp agenda item five water Environment action 13 is with the applicant to submit an addendum to the Flood Risk Assessment, which addresses the new flood map for planning surface water data sets, and also considers the depth mapping to confirm that the mitigation proposed is applicable.

00:22:52:24 - 00:23:05:18

Agenda item six. Cultural Heritage Action .14 is with the council to provide an update on the timescales of the candidate for local listing Burntwood Farmhouse if known.

00:23:07:21 - 00:23:37:06

Action .15 is with the applicant to provide a response to council's assessment of harm on each of the assets where there is disagreement. Per the summary table in the council's submission at 4090. Action .16 is with the applicant to update the summary table and chapter nine Cultural Heritage being rep for 029 to include the grade to Church of Saint Mary to reflect the updates the applicants made to its Cultural heritage. Assessment at deadline for

00:23:39:03 - 00:23:59:16

agenda item seven Transport and Access. Action .17 is with the applicant to update paragraph 7.3.2 of the outline tmp rep 4070 to reflect that the applicant would be agreeable to being part of a broader traffic management working group with other developments.

00:23:59:25 - 00:24:14:10

And so if I can just, uh, come in there. Sorry. Richard Griffiths, on behalf of the applicant, I've taken instructions, and, um, we will add in Preston Farms TCS into that working group at the same time as making that amendment. Thank you.

00:24:16:20 - 00:24:40:16

Action .18 is for the applicant to prepare a note further detailing the cumulative impact risks of the High Street Vicarage Road junction for construction traffic. Action .19 is with the applicant to update the preliminary biosecurity note to respond to the biosecurity measures in the Preston's deadline for submission to be appended to the outline tmp and outline tmp

00:24:42:12 - 00:25:24:06

action point 20 is with the applicant to confirm the level of flexibility in the current application to move the construction access on Grammar Road further along that road. Action .21 is with the applicant to clarify the guidance relied on in the applicant's glint and glare assessment app 082, and submit the solar PV and building Development Glint glare guidance of 2022, referred to in its assessment. Action .22 is with the applicant to provide the applicant's further assessment of the local roads in the study area, with an accompanying sensitivity test and having regard to TCS and Prestons as a receptor.

00:25:24:20 - 00:25:35:20

Again, to provide this as soon as possible and before deadline five in order for the council to be able to comment on the applicant's further analysis. That was all I had. Please speak up if I've missed anything.

00:25:36:17 - 00:25:37:26

Yes, I think, Mr. Burton.

00:25:37:28 - 00:26:10:11

Thank you. Thank you, Doctor Morton. James Burton, on behalf of TCS and Preston Farms. Thank you. That's very helpful list. Um, uh, almost comprehensive. Just one point, um, on action point ten. Um, I appreciate we may have a disagreement about whether the information is in the documents. I'd be grateful if the wording was adjusted from just signpost to where the information on screening is to actually please tell us what the screening will be.

00:26:11:06 - 00:26:44:29

Personally, I am convinced the information is not there in a sense that anyone can meaningfully pick up a plan and say aha, yes, this field will have that by this time, so our horses won't be affected when it when it starts, for example. So the word signpost I'm concerned about. Could, could it simply be an application to state what the screening will be. And, and when something like that. Um, that was also regarding the final action .22 I think.

00:26:45:01 - 00:27:25:13

I think that was clear. I know, I know Miss Sterling had it, but that was again, my point regarding the final action .22. It was back to the screening point again. And then um, one point regarding the, um. 0.99 the biosecurity note and apologies, I think Mr. Griffiths dealt. Dealt with this, um, earlier in the session, but, um, I would assume that the applicant would want to I certainly we would want the applicant to tie its biosecurity measures not just for the construction period, but also the operational period adequately into the relevant operational management plans.

00:27:25:15 - 00:27:32:09

Unless I missed it, the two reference, there are just construction plans. I may have missed it. Thank you.

00:27:32:11 - 00:27:36:10

Okay. Is the applicant happy to meet those those changes you.

00:27:36:12 - 00:27:59:27

Mr.. On behalf of the applicant, yes. I guess perhaps it missed them, but instead of signposting, we could just say provide information on. And that information may be signposting if it's already there or preventing additional information if it's not there. Um, yes. The intention was to update the biosecurity statement and Mr. Griffiths did refer to the outline operation Operational and Environmental Management plan. So happy to include that in the action as well.

00:28:00:27 - 00:28:08:16

Thank you. Any other comments on the actions at all? No. Okay. We'll move to the close then.

00:28:08:22 - 00:28:26:16

Amy Stirling, on behalf of the applicant, if I may. So just to run to main or herself, what's happening tomorrow then. So we're going to start on agenda item eight population. And we're going to then move to agenda item 12 health. And then we're going to move back to agenda item nine soils noise air quality. Then cumulative.

00:28:26:19 - 00:28:27:10

Order on.

00:28:27:12 - 00:28:28:21

Yeah okay guys. Great.

00:28:28:23 - 00:28:49:22

Thank you. Well okay so if you've spoken today would assist us. If you could please provide a written version of your submissions by deadline five which is Wednesday 29th of July 2026. This hearing will continue tomorrow at this location at 9:30 a.m.. The hearing is now adjourned. Thank you.