



AtkinsRéalis



Rosefield Solar Farm (EN010158)

**Buckinghamshire Council's Comments on the
Applicant's Response to Deadline 3 Submissions**

Buckinghamshire Council

July 2026

Introduction

This document provides Buckinghamshire Council's comments on the Applicant's response to Deadline 3 submissions **[REP4-081]**.

The responses are provided to assist the Examining Authority in progressing the Examination by clarifying the Council's position on specific matters and identifying where there is agreement, and where further information, amendment or justification is required.

In doing so, the Council has sought to engage constructively on technical matters and to provide proportionate commentary to support the Examination process.

Where no comment is provided, the Council's position remains as set out in its previous submissions. The absence of comment should not be taken as agreement with the Applicant's response. Comments are provided only where the Council considers that there is new or additional material arising from the Applicant's response, or where further clarification or emphasis is required to assist the Examining Authority.

It should be noted that the Council is currently awaiting further information and submissions from the Applicant on Ecological matters. This includes in relation to bats and BNG. As such, the Council will provide comment on receipt of the updated documents and information from the Applicant at the next Deadline.

Unless expressly stated, the content of this document does not represent a change to the Council's overarching position on the Proposed Development. Where agreement is identified on particular technical matters, this should not be taken to indicate that the Council's overall concerns regarding the scheme have been resolved.

Table 3.1: Buckinghamshire Council (Responses to Examining Authority's first written questions (ExQ1)) [REP2-090]

The Council is currently awaiting further information and submissions from the Applicant on Ecological matters. This includes in relation to bats and BNG. As such, the Council will provide comment on receipt of the updated documents and information from the Applicant at the next Deadline.

Ref.	Page Reference, Question to, and Question	Summary Position	Applicant's Response	Buckinghamshire Council Comments
3.1.2	Page 2, Q1.5.6	Comment noting that there are no outstanding requests for amendments regarding air quality mitigation or monitoring within the outline CEMP(Tracked) (Rev 2) [REP1-079] or outline OEMP (Tracked) (Rev 2) [REP1-081]. Buckinghamshire Council note in their Local Impact Report (LIR) [REP1-112], decommissioning is anticipated to take place approximately 40 years after commissioning, a timescale in which it is not feasible to predict the air quality conditions or the specific mitigation measures as outlined in the outline DEMP (Tracked) (Rev 2) [REP1-083]. Therefore, Buckinghamshire Council suggest a new air quality assessment is undertaken immediately prior to decommissioning. Clarity is also sought on operational traffic movements and the enforceability of staff minibus arrangements to ensure that traffic related air quality impacts remain within the parameters assessed. This has also been asked of the Applicant and may result in the requirement for additional air quality mitigation. Buckinghamshire Council acknowledge that the above management plans have been updated to confirm that the Applicant will liaise with TCS Biosciences and Preston Farms during the preparation of the detailed CEMP, OEMP, and DEMP. Buckinghamshire Council welcomes the Applicant's updates	Mitigation measures have already been incorporated into the Outline Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan (Outline DEMP) [EN010158/APP/7.4.5]. The Applicant will undertake an update to the dust risk assessment portion of the air quality assessment prior to the decommissioning phase, which will be incorporated into the detailed Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan in line with guidance and legislation at the time of decommissioning to mitigate air quality and dust impacts. A detailed Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan will be produced prior to decommissioning as secured in the Draft Development Consent Order (DCO) [EN010158/APP/3.1.7]. This will be submitted to and approved by the Relevant Planning Authority prior to the decommissioning phase. The Outline DEMP [EN010158/APP/7.4.5] has been updated at Deadline 4 to include a commitment to undertake a revised dust risk assessment at the time of decommissioning. Staff mode shares during construction are detailed in ES Volume 4, Appendix 15.1: Transport Assessment [EN010158/APP/6.4.2] and will be enforced through the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (Outline CTMP) [EN010158/APP/7.5.4]. As such, the mode share and use of staff buses is guaranteed by law as set out in the Draft DCO [EN010158/APP/3.1.7]. The level of operational traffic is set out in ES Volume 4, Appendix 15.1: Transport Assessment [EN010158/APP/6.4.2] in Section 4.2, which states: "During the operational phase, up to 24 LGV trips per day, on average, are predicted to cater for cleaning of panels and general Site maintenance."	The council welcome and accept the amendment of the Outline DEMP to include that the applicant will undertake an updated dust risk assessment portion of the air quality assessment prior to the decommissioning phase, which will be incorporated into the detailed Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan.

Ref.	Page Reference, Question to, and Question	Summary Position	Applicant's Response	Buckinghamshire Council Comments
		which identify specific measures to include within each document which are intended to address the sensitivities of nearby businesses. Buckinghamshire Council notes, however, that it will be for local businesses to raise any specific concerns that they may have about these updates and how they will operate to avoid and mitigate harms to their business, and Buckinghamshire Council will consider any submissions to the Examination in considering this issue further.		
3.1.3	Page 3, Q1.7.1	<u>Arboricultural impacts – Survey data: methodology and accuracy</u> Comment that Buckinghamshire Council notes the Applicant's explanation that the arboricultural baseline was informed by both ground and drone-derived survey data, and that the Drone survey is said to have been supported by high-density ground control points and to provide survey-grade positional accuracy. Buckinghamshire Council's concern is not resolved by those statements alone. The AIA itself confirms that inspection was restricted in numerous areas because trees were located in hedgerows or on ditch edges, which restricted views and the ability to measure stem dimensions, while also confirming that trees were plotted using aerial drone survey topographical base mapping. Further clarity is still required to demonstrate that: all stem measurements, categorisations and condition assessments were undertaken through direct ground-based inspection in accordance with BS 5837:2012;	The Applicant notes the Council's comments regarding survey methodology, data accuracy, and the classification of woodland features. However, it is not agreed that there is uncertainty within the arboricultural baseline that would materially affect the assessment of impacts or the design of mitigation measures. Clarifications are bulleted below in line with Q1.7.1: - All stem measurements, BS 5837:2012 category assessments, age class assessments and condition assessments were undertaken by a suitably qualified arboricultural consultant during site-based surveys applying Visual Tree Assessment (VTA) principles. Arboricultural attributes were derived from direct observation and professional judgement in accordance with BS 5837:2012 and were not derived from aerial survey data. - Aerial drone survey data was used solely as a topographical base mapping resource to support the spatial plotting of arboricultural features across the Site. Species identification, dimensions, condition assessments, crown spread measurements, age classifications and BS 5837 categories were obtained through ground-based survey. Aerial data was not used to infer or supplement arboricultural attribute data where field observations were unavailable. - Whilst some trees were located within hedgerows or ditches, these constraints did not materially affect the survey outcomes. Measurements were taken from the most appropriate accessible locations using standard arboricultural survey techniques and professional judgement. Crown spreads were assessed on site and recorded in accordance with BS 5837:2012. The Applicant is satisfied that any access constraints did not materially influence categorisation,	The Applicant's clarification is noted. The Council's remaining concern is that buffers should be cross-referenced to retained features, RPAs and the relevant AMS/CEMP/LEMP controls and should be measured from the edge of the retained feature rather than centrelines. The Council maintains that some buffers remain below what would be expected having regard to VALP and the function of the retained arboricultural/ecological feature. In respect of bats addressed under the ecology headings, the Council will address the updated position on bats once the Applicant submits the relevant evidence. The Council does not repeat this point for each part of the Response produced by the Applicant which addresses bats, but this applies throughout.

Ref.	Page Reference, Question to, and Question	Summary Position	Applicant's Response	Buckinghamshire Council Comments
		- aerial data was used for positional plotting only, rather than to fill gaps in arboricultural attribute data; - any access constraints did not materially affect measurement accuracy, categorisation, crown spread plotting, or the identification of constraints; and - any conflicts or gaps between the two datasets were resolved in a way that does not affect RPAs, stand-off distances, fencing alignment or layout decisions in arboriculturally sensitive locations. Further comment that Buckinghamshire Council requires greater clarity on: - which recorded features are properly functioning woodland parcels; - how those have been distinguished from ordinary tree groups; - and how the assessment and buffer strategy have been adapted to reflect woodland as an integrated system rather than a collection of individual trees. Ecology Comment noting Buckinghamshire Council agree further surveys are not required as the outline CEMP [REP1-078] and outline LEMP [REP1-086] have addressed these matters. Buckinghamshire Council note that the additional information provided in the Bat Technical Study [REP1-105] does not address Buckinghamshire Council's concerns that solar farms may be displacing bats for	constraint identification, Root Protection Area calculations or the conclusions of the assessment. - All arboricultural features were ground-truthed, ensuring no reliance on aerial data alone. Where discrepancies arose between the drone-derived mapping and site observations, these were resolved in favour of the ground survey data. Any gaps in information were addressed through site verification and professional interpretation, ensuring a complete and coherent dataset. Consequently, no conflicts between datasets materially affected Root Protection Areas, stand-off distances, indicative fencing alignments or design decisions in arboriculturally sensitive locations. - The term woodland was used within the assessment to describe tree-dominated habitats exhibiting continuous or near-continuous canopy cover, woodland structure and function, and sufficient scale to operate as woodland rather than scattered trees or linear features. Tree group descriptions and classifications are provided within Annex A of ES Volume 4, Appendix 7.13: Arboricultural Impact Assessment [EN010158/APP/6.4.2] [REP2-044], for example G70 – woodland belt, G71–G72 – woodland, G79 – woodland and G86 – woodland, and so on. These examples demonstrate that groups have been consistently identified and described within the AIA in accordance with standard arboricultural practice. - Trees have been recorded as individuals (prefix T) or as groups (prefix G) within the survey data tables in line with the BS 5837:2012 definition of a group as: “trees that form cohesive arboricultural features either aerodynamically (e.g. shelter), visually (e.g. avenues or screens) or culturally including for biodiversity (e.g. woodlands, parkland or wood pasture)”. Woodland features were therefore assigned a group prefix where appropriate, whilst their woodland characteristics were clearly described within the survey schedules. Classification was informed by canopy continuity, spatial extent, woodland structure, landscape function and professional judgement. The term woodland has been applied more broadly within the tree data table to describe tree-dominated habitats with a continuous or near-continuous canopy, typically of a larger scale (generally exceeding approximately 5,000m² and 20m in width), and exhibiting characteristics distinct from linear or fragmented tree features such as hedgerows or belts. - The assessment has considered woodland features as integrated landscape and ecological systems rather than simply collections of	

Ref.	Page Reference, Question to, and Question	Summary Position	Applicant's Response	Buckinghamshire Council Comments
		reasons which are not yet understood. The placement of panels in these fields therefore could make them unsuitable for bats to forage, even if livestock are present. Further comment noting that the issue of only one detector being placed in the open fields has been overlooked when conclusions have been drawn, and Buckinghamshire Council therefore do not consider that this study is suitable to inform decision making. Comment noting that the proposed buffers for hedgerows and woodland are being incorrectly measured from the centre point of each hedgerow. The Applicant has stated the reason for this is to provide consistency across the Site. While this could be acceptable for 'standard width' hedgerows (e.g. 3m width stated by Natural England), there are several existing hedgerows in the Site that have widths in excess of 3m stated by Natural England. Examples of these include the corridors around fields B7, B8 & B10 which comprise important links to existing woodlands: Sheephouse Wood, Decoy Pond Wood and Shrubs Wood. The hedgerow linking these woodlands exceeds 16m in width in many sections. Taking the central point of hedges this wide to calculate the buffer is not considered proportionate or acceptable. Further comment that Infrastructure within Fields B6, B7, B8, B10, B11 between Shrubs Wood and Sheephouse Wood SSSI, and Fields D28 and D29 between Finemere SSSI and Runts Wood has the greatest potential to result in significant impacts on Bechstein's bat by severing / impacting known existing foraging and commuting routes. The impact could be avoided by the removal of panels and infrastructure from	individual trees. In addition to the assessment of individual tree constraints where relevant, the design process utilised the National Forest Inventory (2021) dataset and site survey information to identify woodland extents and inform stand-off distances. Enhanced offsets have been applied to Ancient Woodland, and the assessment has considered woodland edge effects, connectivity, long-term management requirements and the protection of woodland function as a whole. The resulting buffer strategy therefore reflects both individual tree constraints and the wider characteristics and sensitivities of woodland features. The Applicant is pleased that Buckinghamshire Council agree further surveys are not required, but the purpose of the paired detector exercise in the Bat Technical Study [EN010158/APP/8.5] [REP1-105] was not designed to address concerns that solar farms may be displacing bats. It was requested by Natural England that the difference in activity between open fields and boundary features was tested, and that is all that was tested. The aims and limitations of the study are clearly set out, and it cannot be said to have failed in something it did not set out to do; nor is this study critical to the decision needing to be made. The potential displacement of bats from solar farms is noted, but there are no longitudinal (i.e. before/after) studies of effects on well-designed, well-managed, established solar farms and findings from short-term studies are mixed, with some showing benefits. That notwithstanding, the potential for displacement effects has been accommodated within the mitigation to ensure both that i) commuting bats can commute across the wider landscape and ii) they can access sufficient retained/replacement grassland of better quality and extent than that to be lost, as detailed in ES Volume 2, Chapter 7: Biodiversity [EN010158/APP/6.2.5] and secured via the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Outline CEMP) [EN010158/APP/7.2.5] and Outline LEMP [EN010158/APP/7.6.5]. The Applicant is proposing 95ha of grassland creation (more than twice what is being lost) as alternate grassland foraging habitat for bats and ground-nesting birds as mitigation for the permanent pasture being lost within Fields B3, B6, B7 and B8. This grassland is better distributed compared to the existing, both across the landscape and in relation to the known locations of Bechstein's bat maternity roosts (see Bat Technical Study [EN010158/APP/8.5] [REP1-105 Appendix I PDF p208]).	

Ref.	Page Reference, Question to, and Question	Summary Position	Applicant's Response	Buckinghamshire Council Comments
		these locations. Buckinghamshire Council require details of the proposed bat monitoring scheme to ensure adequate levels of assessments are implemented to fully inform on the species of concern, Bechstein's Bat.	It bears repeating that, whilst Natural England and others have expressed concerns about the fields between Shrubs Wood, Decoypond Wood and Sheephouse Wood, the three breeding colonies that comprise the single population of Bechstein's bats are centred on three different woodlands: Finemere Wood SSSI, Grendon and Doddershall Woods SSSI and Ham Home-cum-Ham Green Woods SSSI (as stated in Natural England's Commissioned Report 558 "The Bernwood population of Bechstein's Bats", see Bat Technical Study [EN010158/APP/8.5] [REP1-105] PDF p170). There will, of course, be other, as-yet unidentified maternity roosts (each survey is a snapshot), but the pattern seen to date has been compiled from multiple radio-tracking surveys over many years. However, the Applicant is still in dialogue with Natural England over Fields B3, B6, B7 and B8 (which Natural England considers to be important for future resilience) and is confident that an agreement can be reached that would address the points made in their representation. The Applicant notes that the additional fields referenced by Buckinghamshire Council are not a subject of concern of Natural England and are not part of the discussions currently in progress. Regarding hedgerow buffer measurement: a response has previously been provided within the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations [EN010158/APP/8.3] [PDA-006] RR-203 page 202 and the hedgerow buffer measurement is secured within the Design Commitments [EN010158/APP/5.9.6]. The spatial extent of development as set out in the DCO Application has similarly been based on offsets from the centreline of the hedgerows. This is considered to be the most consistent data source available across the Site and practicable on the ground. This approach was similarly taken for both Byers Gill and Springwell consented solar DCOs. Regarding their size, the approach taken to date has been to increase buffer widths in areas where the corridors are considered to be more sensitive. As stated within Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations [EN010158/APP/8.3] [PDA-006], RR-203 page 210, buffers from hedgerows linking Shrubs Wood, Sheephouse Wood and Decoypond Wood (B3/B7, B6/B7, B7/B8, B7/B10, B10/B11, B10/B9 and B8/B9) have been increased from 10m to 15m in recognition of the importance of protecting the commuting corridors between these woodland. The Applicant is willing to review the size of buffers in particular locations as part of the evolving bespoke approach, and has requested that Natural England make location-specific recommendations.	

Ref.	Page Reference, Question to, and Question	Summary Position	Applicant's Response	Buckinghamshire Council Comments
			In taking into account trees located within hedgerows, the buffers have also accommodated the root protection zones of those trees. Regarding monitoring: the Applicant has submitted additional detail in relation to the bat monitoring strategy in the Outline LEMP [EN010158/APP/7.6.5] at Deadline 4 and will seek to engage further with Natural England and Buckinghamshire Council.	
3.1.10	Page 12, Q1.10.12	Comment noting that during the preparation of the ES, Buckinghamshire Council advised the Applicant's Historic Environment specialist that East Claydon was being considered as a potential conservation area and that it was of a similar age and level of significance to Botolph Claydon Conservation Area, who agreed that it was similar and would be treated as an area with the same level of significance in the assessment. The assessment is of "East Claydon Village (group of listed and non-listed buildings)", and it is ascribed the same medium significance as the other nearest conservation areas. Its character, appearance and special interest and the nature of the contribution of its setting to its significance is not described in detail. This is also the case with other conservation areas. The Applicant's assessment assesses impacts on the setting of the 'group' in the same way as for other conservation areas. Buckinghamshire Council therefore feel that there are shortcomings in the conservation area assessments, which do not define the contribution of setting to significance in sufficient detail. Further comment noting that Buckinghamshire Council identify the prominence of the village, its church and the fringing trees form a landmark for a considerable distance, in views from the east and south east as well as its	Further detail on the character, appearance and special interest of East Claydon village (as a candidate conservation area) has been added to Annex D of ES Volume 4, Appendix 9.1: Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment and Setting Assessment [EN010158/APP/6.4.3] submitted at Deadline 4. The character and appearance of the Conservation Areas is provided within Annex D of ES Volume 4, Appendix 9.1: Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment and Setting Assessment [EN010158/APP/6.4.3] (Middle Claydon Conservation Area at section 2.32 and Botolph Claydon Conservation Area at section 2.33). The Applicant considers that the relationship between East Claydon and Botolph Claydon would be minimally affected by the Proposed Development and that the prominence of East Claydon in views from the east and south east would only be affected from areas within and immediately adjacent to the Order Limits as reported within Annex D of ES Volume 4, Appendix 9.1: Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment and Setting Assessment [EN010158/APP/6.4.3].	As set out in previous submissions, the Council considers that the setting of East Claydon Village includes extensive views from the south, south east and east as well as from the north east and disagrees that "the prominence of East Claydon in views from the east and south east would only be affected from areas within and immediately adjacent to the Order Limits". The band of development in the foreground and middle ground of long views of the conservation area would clearly harm the contribution of this element of the setting to the village's significance.

Ref.	Page Reference, Question to, and Question	Summary Position	Applicant's Response	Buckinghamshire Council Comments
		relationship with Botolph Claydon as contributory elements to its setting.		
3.1.11	Page 13, Q1.10.13	Comment noting the extent of setback from the listed building was not determined in consultation with Buckinghamshire Council's Historic Environment specialist. Buckinghamshire Council considers the impact of the solar PV arrays on the setting of Pond Farmhouse to be severe (leading to Buckinghamshire Council's view that there is impact at the upper end of the scale of less than substantial harm – see LIR para 4.5.6 and 4.5.56) and setting arrays further from the listed building would be welcomed. Excessive screening to the east of the Farmhouse (Field B4 is to the west) may also cause harm, as the farmhouse's role as a satellite farm of Claydon House and the relationship of Pond Farmhouse to the wider Claydon House estate would be partly severed and made less legible.	As noted within the Written Summary of Applicant's Oral Submissions at Issue Specific Hearing 1 (ISH1) [EN010158/APP/8.16] [REP3-049], the setback from Pond Farmhouse has taken account of a combination of factors including heritage significance, residential amenity and the generating capacity of the site. The Applicant acknowledges that the presence of the Solar PV development within the setting of Pond Farmhouse will result in a significant effect (as is reported within ES Volume 2, Chapter 9: Cultural Heritage [EN010158/APP/6.2.3]). The Applicant considers that the harm to the significance of Pond Farmhouse lies within the middle of the scale of less than substantial. The proposed screening to the east of Pond Farmhouse is acknowledged to contribute to this effect but has been included at the request of National Trust in order to minimise the effect on the approaches to (and therefore setting of) Claydon House. The effect on Claydon House and Claydon Park is acknowledged within Annex D of ES Volume 4, Appendix 9.1: Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment and Setting Assessment [EN010158/APP/6.4.3] to include the presence of Solar PV development within the historic estate holding (which includes Pond Farmhouse) and the effects on Claydon House have been agreed with Historic England and National Trust as being at the lower end of less than substantial, this agreement is set out within the Statement of Common Ground with Historic England [EN010158/APP/5.16.3] and Draft Statement of Common Ground with National Trust [EN010158/APP/5.17.2] [REP2-020].	No further comment. The Council's views on the levels of harm to both Pond Farmhouse and Claydon House are set out in other submissions to the ExA.
3.1.13	Page 13, Q1.11.2	Comment noting that the methodology is acceptable, however the Highways Authority does recommend that in locations where there are significant constraints on the network thresholds that percentage increases are not always appropriate, and in these instances any impact should be assessed. Based on the present information it is not expected that any additional locations are requiring additional assessment. The LIR has identified locations where greater information in the assessment has been requested and is required.	The Applicant notes the comments and that the assessment of the junction of Station Road/A41 has been provided to Buckinghamshire Council for review, noting that sufficient junction capacity exists at this location. The junction modelling is included in the latest version of ES Volume 4, Appendix 15.1: Transport Assessment [EN010158/APP/6.4.2] submitted at Deadline 4. The Applicant acknowledges Buckinghamshire Council's note on the Oxfordshire Rail Freight Interchange DCO and will keep it under review. If sufficient information becomes available to sufficiently assess the cumulative impact, the Applicant will include it within the update to ES Volume 2, Chapter 17: Cumulative Effects [EN010158/APP/6.2.3] [REP2-037] at a future deadline.	The Council is satisfied that appropriate assessment has been carried out regarding the junction and it has been demonstrated that the movements can be accommodated. The Council note the position regards the Rail Freight Interchange DCO.

Ref.	Page Reference, Question to, and Question	Summary Position	Applicant's Response	Buckinghamshire Council Comments
		Further comment that the ExA should consider the progress of the Oxfordshire Rail Freight Interchange DCO application at Ardley and its potential for cumulative impacts. At present it is considered that the scheme is not developed sufficiently to assess the cumulative impacts.		
3.1.14	Page 14, Q1.11.30	Comment noting Buckinghamshire Council's concerns primarily arises from the way in which 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 any combined assessment is undertaken (for example paragraphs 17.7.18 and entries within Tables 17.11–17.13). This places reliance on anticipated mitigation outcomes for individual schemes, rather than robustly testing whether the combined presence of multiple developments gives rise to cumulative harm and thus assessing the reasonable worst case. It should be noted; part of Buckinghamshire Council's disagreement is about how the Applicant has exercised judgment more generally in measuring the magnitude of cumulative effects. Further comment that there are specific topic-based concerns that arise in respect of the Proposed Development, one example is the detailed comments on cumulative arboricultural effects from para 4.3.151, or the consideration of cumulative landscape effects from para 4.4.70.	The Applicant notes the Council's concern regarding the treatment of cumulative effects and the reliance on mitigation secured through other schemes. The approach adopted by the Applicant in ES Volume 2, Chapter 17: Cumulative Effects [EN010158/APP/6.2.3] [REP2-037] is consistent with standard EIA practice and in line with the PINS Advice on Cumulative Effects, and reflects a proportionate assessment based on available information. For schemes that are consented or sufficiently advanced, it is reasonable to assume that mitigation measures required through their respective consents would be implemented and that any residual effects would be reduced to a level deemed acceptable through the decision making process. On this basis, the Applicant has adopted a precautionary but proportionate approach by taking account of the likely residual effects of these schemes, rather than assuming unmitigated impacts which would represent an unrealistic worst-case scenario and risk overestimating cumulative effects. For schemes that are not yet consented or do not have publicly available Environmental Statements, there is insufficient environmental information available to undertake a detailed or robust cumulative assessment. In these instances, it would not be appropriate for the Applicant to speculate on the nature, magnitude, or spatial extent of potential impacts, nor on the mitigation that may be secured through design or planning conditions. The Applicant has therefore applied proportionate professional judgement, using available data and established assumptions to avoid introducing unnecessary uncertainty or overly conservative scenarios that would not represent a realistic worst case. It is recognised that cumulative assessment inherently involves a degree of professional judgement, particularly where information is incomplete. The methodology applied seeks to balance this uncertainty with a reasonable and defensible approach, ensuring that the assessment remains robust and reasonable, and that conclusions are not materially skewed by either under- or over-estimation of cumulative effects.	Buckinghamshire Council notes the Applicant's response and recognises that the assessment of cumulative effects necessarily involves the exercise of professional judgement. The Council accepts that the Applicant has explained the basis for its methodology and the assumptions applied in undertaking the cumulative effects assessment. However, the Council remains of the view that the approach adopted has the potential to understate cumulative effects by pigeon-holding such effects and relying on the assumption that mitigation secured through other developments will fully address residual effects before the combined influence of multiple schemes is considered. More broadly, the Council's concerns extend to the Applicant's exercise of professional judgement in assessing the magnitude and significance of cumulative effects, and also the Applicant's underlying assessment of environmental effects across the DCO (as an underestimation of the environmental effects of the Proposed Development is likely also to underestimate the cumulative effects of the Development). The parties therefore remain in disagreement on this matter.

Ref.	Page Reference, Question to, and Question	Summary Position	Applicant's Response	Buckinghamshire Council Comments
			See the Applicant's Response to Buckinghamshire Council's Local Impact Report [EN010158/APP/8.11] [REP2-085] in relation to cumulative arboricultural effects (Ref. 3.34, 3.79 3.84, and 3.86) and cumulative landscape effects (Ref. 8.18 and 8.19). As a summary, the Applicant does not agree that the cumulative effect of impacts from the Proposed Development and other relevant developments would result in a gradual erosion of arboricultural value across the Site as set out within ES Volume 4, Appendix 7.13: Arboricultural Impact Assessment [EN010158/APP/6.4.2] [REP2-044] . In regards to cumulative landscape effects, the Applicant has assessed the inter-project cumulative effects, including sequential (kinetic) effects, with other relevant developments. As presented in ES Volume 2, Chapter 17: Cumulative Effects [EN010158/APP/6.2.3] [REP2-037] and ES Volume 4, Appendix 17.2: Landscape and Visual Inter-project Cumulative Effect Assessment [EN010158/APP/6.4.3] [REP2-057] , cumulative effects have been considered in terms of the additional effects of the Proposed Development and also the combined effects of all cumulative schemes together.	
3.1.15	Page 14, Q1.11.31	Comment that the Applicant has not provided sufficient project design detail to inform the direct and cumulative impact assessment for ALC and soils. The ES is based on the removal of 647.05 ha of agricultural land over 40 years without providing any limits or understanding of how much direct soil disruption will occur or how much agricultural production, if appropriate, will continue over the operational period. These are relevant factors in the ES assessment for soil and ALC and it is recommended that they be provided. Further comment noting that the cumulative assessment does not give weight to non-BMV land in spite of it likely supporting the majority of agriculture in Buckinghamshire and does not consider the loss of soil resources. The current assessment also discusses the quality of agricultural land rather than the quantity affected. Commenting noting that the necessary detail on cumulative effects on non-BMV	Information regarding the existing baseline land use, including specifics on agricultural production and crop rotations, will be included within a separate document at Deadline 5. The design of the Proposed Development allows for some agricultural use, with a managed grassland and potential grazing on the land beneath the Solar PV modules during operation. The Grid Connection areas will be returned to the landowners following construction, which will be available for agricultural use where applicable. The extent of direct soil disturbance would be limited to construction working areas, cabling routes and large electrical infrastructure such as the Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) and associated compounds. Furthermore, the Outline Soil Management Plan (Outline SMP) [EN010158/APP/7.7.3] [REP2-069] establishes a framework through which to control soil handling, trafficking and reinstatement, ensuring that soils are protected and that areas affected during construction are restored in accordance with good practice. Given the worst-case scenario approach to the direct and cumulative impact assessments, the Applicant considers that the level of detail provided is sufficient to inform the assessment of likely significant effects, and proportionate to the current stage of the Proposed Development. The Applicant notes the Council's comment regarding the focus on BMV land and land quality rather than quantity within ES Volume 2, Chapter 17: Cumulative Effects [EN010158/APP/6.2.3] [REP2-037]. This approach	Regarding detail around project design detail, the Council would like to see a breakdown of ALC grades and land use for all areas of the Proposed Development in the document submitted to the Examination. The Applicant has provided a preliminary breakdown of ALC grades and land take for areas of key infrastructure (including for the BESS, which has been sited on non-BMV land) in the revised ES Volume 2, Chapter 12 ([REP4-033] and [REP4-034]). However, there is a disconnect between the total area of the proposed development shown in Table 12.3 of the revised ES, as compared to Table 12.4. The areas in Table 12.4 don't match Table 12.3 (not all areas have been included) and it is not clear what activities are proposed in some areas of the site. BC notes that the Applicant has added text to ES Volume 2, Chapter 17: Cumulative Effects [REP2-038], and welcomes the greater narrative around the cumulative effects on agricultural land and food production.

Ref.	Page Reference, Question to, and Question	Summary Position	Applicant's Response	Buckinghamshire Council Comments
		land and soil ecosystem services is unlikely to result in the identification of a significant cumulative effect, but the outcome would be more than the negligible effect reported. Furthermore, the additional detail would establish the necessary baseline to inform both required mitigation and best practice options to protect soils and the ALC services they provide.	reflects national planning policy, which places particular emphasis on the protection of BMV land. The Applicant also recognises that non-BMV land forms an important component of the wider agricultural land resource and contributes to agricultural production and soil-based ecosystem functions. The assessment does not seek to imply that non-BMV land is of no value, but rather reflects the policy-led weighting given to land quality in determining the significance of effects. Furthermore, the Applicant notes that undertaking a reliable cumulative assessment of total agricultural land affected within the wider area is inherently challenging, as provisional ALC mapping does not define agricultural land areas to a suitable level of accuracy.	
3.1.16	Page 15, Q1.11.33	Comment noting that the updated oOEMP provides a framework for the monitoring and control of operational noise produced by the proposed development. Buckinghamshire Council consider that express provisions should manage the distinct issue of cumulative noise effect (and how the Applicant will go about engaging with other noise-emitting developments). Further comment that Buckinghamshire Council notes, however, that such provisions are unlikely to address the concerns that the Council has about the residual noise effects of the proposed development and current uncertainty about those effects on sensitive receptors.	An assessment of cumulative noise effects is included within ES Volume 2, Chapter 17: Cumulative Effects [EN010158/APP/6.2.3] [REP2-037], which concluded that there would be no significant adverse inter-project cumulative effects on noise, post-mitigation. The procedure to be followed in the event of a noise complaint being received as set out in Outline Operational Environmental Management plan (Outline OEMP) [EN010158/APP/7.3.5] has been amended at Deadline 4 to include consultation with other developments, where appropriate. The concerns raised about operational phase noise levels generated by the Proposed Development and the effect on sensitive receptors have been discussed at the ISH1 Hearing and within the Written Summary of Applicant's Oral Submissions at Issue Specific Hearing 1 (ISH1) [EN010158/APP/8.16] [REP3-049], with further commentary provided elsewhere within this document (Ref. 3.4.56 and 3.5.24).	The Council note the Applicant's position regards cumulative noise effects; while this is recognised, the ExA have the Council's submissions on noise effects on particularly tranquil areas. The Council also welcomes the amendment to the Outline OEMP to include consultation with other developments, where appropriate, in response to any noise complaints received. The Council considers that this additional commitment provides a helpful mechanism for collaborative investigation where potential cumulative noise issues arise and reflects the concerns previously raised regarding interaction with other noise-emitting developments. The Council continues to encourage the Applicant to maintain a proactive approach to noise management and stakeholder engagement during operation.
3.1.17	Page 15, Q1.12.6	Comment noting that Buckinghamshire Council finds such an approach acceptable within appropriate limits, and that they will engage with the Applicant in respect of such DCO provisions. Buckinghamshire Council consider that any duty on it should not obviate obligations on the Applicant to consult with relevant bodies where appropriate, and this should be recorded in the DCO. Buckinghamshire Council has	The Applicant shared proposed amendments to the text of Schedule 16 (Procedure for discharge of requirements) with Buckinghamshire Council on 15 June 2026. The Applicant received comments from the Council on 16 June 2026 and incorporated these changes into the updated Draft DCO [EN010158/APP/3.1.7] submitted at Deadline 4. The Council indicated that it had no further substantive points on this issue at this stage. The Applicant notes, in any case, that Schedule 16 does not obviate the need to consult with relevant bodies. Schedule 2 of the Draft DCO [EN010158/APP/3.1.7] describes where the relevant planning authority must consult with other relevant bodies where appropriate, which allows the	The Council is now content with the terms of Schedule 16 in the draft DCO.

Ref.	Page Reference, Question to, and Question	Summary Position	Applicant's Response	Buckinghamshire Council Comments
		previously raised concerns about Schedule 16, and, if such requirements are to be included in the DCO which require Buckinghamshire Council to consult other parties, this must be taken into account in that Schedule. As indicated in the LIR, discussions are yet to occur in relation to Schedule 16, and Buckinghamshire Council would welcome the opportunity to have those with the Applicant.	relevant planning authority to remain in control of the process for discharging all of the DCO requirements, which is standard practice in DCOs. Schedule 16 provides a framework in which the requirements are discharged. As the relevant planning authority is the lead authority for discharging DCO requirements, Schedule 16 sets out a framework, including timescales, in which communications between the Applicant, the relevant planning authority and any consultee that the relevant planning authority must consult with are made. For example, paragraph 3(7) of Schedule 16 sets out the steps in which the process for when a relevant consultee must be consulted. The Council is free to consult any other bodies that it wishes when discharging requirements, which is outside of the scope of Schedule 16, however it is only those listed in Schedule 2 of the Draft DCO [EN010158/APP/3.1.7] that it must consult with.	
3.1.18	Page 15, Q1.12.9	Comment noting the following modifications to be made to Article 16(2): • (2) Such an agreement may, without prejudice to the generality of paragraph (15)- ○ (a) make provision for the street authority to carry out any function under this Order which relates to the street in question; ○ (b) specify a reasonable time for the completion of the works; and/or ○ (c) contain such terms as to payment and other matters as the parties consider appropriate, including such matters as may be included in agreements made pursuant to section 278 or section 38 of the 1980 Act. • (3) The undertaker will not commence Works 9 (or associated development works (j)), insofar as they fall within	With regards to the addition of “<i>including such matters as may be included in agreements made pursuant to section 278 or section 38 of the 1980 Act</i>” – the Applicant considers that this amendment is not required because it is already addressed in the updated Outline CTMP [EN010158/APP/7.5.4] submitted at Deadline 4 (see updated drafting at paragraph 3.5.10). With regards to the proposed addition of Article 16(3), the Applicant notes there are two cross-referencing errors, which makes it difficult to comment on the exact phrasing of the whole paragraph. The Applicant understands where it states “paragraph (15)” it should read “Article 16”. The Applicant is unclear what the reference to Article 11(10) should refer to as the last paragraph in Article 11 is Article 11(3). Regardless of this, the Applicant opposes the addition of the Article 16(3) as approval by the relevant planning authority is sufficiently covered by the existing controls in the Draft DCO [EN010158/APP/3.1.7]. Work No. 9 is a permitted preliminary work, as defined in Article 2, the requirements of the Draft DCO (Schedule 2) impose conditions on it, which means Work No. 9 cannot be carried out until certain Requirements for that phase are discharged by the relevant planning authority. These requirements are: • Landscape and ecological management plan – Requirement 7(4); • Fencing and other means of enclosure – Requirement 8(3); • Archaeology – Requirement 10(3); • Construction and environmental management plan – Requirement 11(4);	This issue is now addressed in the Council's document commenting on the ExA's Schedule of Changes to the draft DCO.

Ref.	Page Reference, Question to, and Question	Summary Position	Applicant's Response	Buckinghamshire Council Comments
		the scope of Article 11) to the extent that they involve works to a highway, prior to entering into an agreement pursuant to paragraph (15) which provides details of the specification of the works which will reasonably satisfy the highway authority for the purpose of Article 11(10), and related provisions in relation to the maintenance and adoption of such works pursuant to that article.	- Construction traffic management plan – Requirement 13(4). Note in particular with regards to the proposed Article 16(3) that paragraph (1) of Requirement 13 requires this plan to be approved in consultation with the local highway authority and National Highways; and - Rights of way and access strategy – Requirement 16(8). Additionally, the Outline CTMP [EN010158/APP/7.5.4] details road improvement works that the Applicant will undertake, in sections 3.4 and 3.5. The Applicant will “<i>undertake road improvements works on the existing road network.</i>” (paragraph 3.5.1.) and the detailed construction traffic management plan(s) will include details of approvals when the Applicant undertakes road improvement works (paragraph 3.5.10): <i>“The Applicant will reimburse the highway authorities for the technical approval process at the time the applications are made, in line with costs for similar Section 278 or Section 184 applications made under the Highways Act 1980. The detailed Construction Traffic Management Plan(s) will detail the exact process for these technical approvals.”</i>	
3.1.19	Page 16, Q1.12.10	Comment noting that while Buckinghamshire Council will comment on the replies provided by the Applicant on the Articles of the DCO, at this stage Buckinghamshire Council considers that the ExA's suggested amendments to the definition of 'maintain' would be appropriate to ensure that such effects outside those assessed in the ES do not eventuate.	The Applicant refers to its corresponding response in the Applicant's Response to the Examining Authority's First Written Questions [EN010158/APP/8.13] [REP2-087] which explains that an amendment to the definition of “maintain” to be necessary on the basis that the scope of the authorised development is controlled through Schedule 1 of the Draft DCO [EN010158/APP/3.1.7] , the relevant management plans and the process for discharge of Requirements.	The Council note this and the terms of Article 5(3) of the DCO controlling the scope of maintenance. As confirmed at ISH2 and in [REP3-057] .
3.1.20	Page 17, Q1.12.12	Comment noting that Buckinghamshire Council notes these comments which accord with its own concerns prefaced in Table 5-1 of its LIR.	The Applicant has provided a response on items in Table 5-1 of Buckinghamshire Council's LIR [REP1-112] in rows 14.25-14.40 of the Applicant's Response to Buckinghamshire Council's Local Impact Report [EN010158/APP/8.11] [REP2-085] .	The Council confirms that it is satisfied by the relevant controls in the outline plans. As confirmed at ISH2 and in [REP3-057] .
3.1.22	Page 17, Q1.12.17	Comment noting that Buckinghamshire Council suggest the following wording: Where any power under this article ceases to be used in respect of a street or public right of way, the undertaker shall return that street or public right of way to its original	The Applicant acknowledges Buckinghamshire Council's concern but considers the current suite of control documents, secured by Schedule 13 of the Draft DCO [EN010158/APP/3.1.7] and related Requirements, adequately addresses the repair, reinstatement and management of streets and public rights of way. The Applicant has made commitments to repair the condition of streets in the Outline CTMP [EN010158/APP/7.5.4] including in:	This issue is now addressed in the context of the ExA's Schedule of Changes to the draft DCO.

Ref.	Page Reference, Question to, and Question	Summary Position	Applicant's Response	Buckinghamshire Council Comments
		condition at the earliest opportunity, unless agreed otherwise with the relevant planning authority.	• section 3.4: Road Reconstruction (Snake Lane/Fiddlers Field) which also has regard to when it is appropriate to undertake the works (outside of Summer school holidays so as to not impact Hogshaw Farm and Wildlife Park). • section 3.5: Physical Works which includes provision for road improvement works on the existing network. • section 4.7: Wear & Tear Agreement: in which a legal agreement with Buckinghamshire Council is suggested to cover the cost of abnormal wear and tear on the road network between the A41 and the Site access junctions. This will be agreed with Buckinghamshire Council following the granting of the Development Consent Order. The wear and tear agreement will address concerns about possible damage to the public road, verges and structures. It will be based upon condition surveys of the road to ensure that the condition of the road does not deteriorate solely as a result of the construction works. These measures are secured by Requirement 13 of the Draft DCO [EN010158/APP/3.1.7] which states that no part of the authorised development may commence until a construction traffic management plan for that part (which is substantially in accordance with the Outline CTMP [EN010158/APP/7.5.4]) has been submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority in consultation with the local highway authority and National Highways. Further, the Outline Rights of Way and Access Strategy (Outline RoWAS) [EN010158/APP/7.8.5] [CR1-026] details the principles, management and inspection requirements as well as the extent and nature of any closure, diversion and/or improvement to the Public Rights of Way (PRoW) network and permissive footpaths. There are measures which will be secured in the detailed Rights of Way and Access Strategy - which is to be prepared substantially in accordance with the Outline RoWAS [EN010158/APP/7.8.5] [CR1-026] per Requirement 16 of the Draft DCO [EN010158/APP/3.1.7] – including: • Installation inspections of any temporary diversions will be undertaken on a regular basis by the Principal Contractor during construction; • Carrying out of any required remedial works to ensure that diversions remain in good condition during the construction period. This will include temporary fencing, signage and surface condition to ensure it always remains safe and accessible; • Contact details will be provided on signage placed around the construction site so that people have a direct route to report any	

Ref.	Page Reference, Question to, and Question	Summary Position	Applicant's Response	Buckinghamshire Council Comments
			concerns relating to PRoW and permissive path management directly with the project team; Temporarily diverted PRoW will be reinstated to their original route and to at least their original condition following track and cable trench construction activities.	
3.1.24	Page 17, Q1.12.24	Comment noting agreement that Article 40(4) appears to contain an error and should refer to Requirement 7 rather than Requirement 8. Buckinghamshire Council considers that Article 40 remains broadly drafted, given that wording around the felling or lopping of trees within the Order Limits to facilitate construction vehicles and the removal of hedgerows identified in Schedule 12, and that the exercise of such powers depends on the underlying arboricultural baseline and protection strategy being sufficiently robust to ensure that important trees and hedgerows are properly identified and safeguarded. Buckinghamshire Council remains concerned that: - the arboricultural baseline is not yet demonstrated to be sufficiently robust in all areas; - woodland classification and buffer derivation remain uncertain in places; - there is still no Outline AMS demonstrating how impacts would be avoided in practice; and - some works, including vegetation removal and highway-related preliminary works, may arise at an early stage, increasing the importance of clear pre-works protection and method principles. Further comment noting that it would be preferable to Buckinghamshire Council for	The Applicant amended 'Requirement 8' to 'Requirement 7' in the Draft DCO [EN010158/APP/3.1.7] at Deadline 2 (see the Schedule of Changes to the Draft DCO [EN010158/APP/8.1.6]). The Applicant refers to section 4.6.14 of the Explanatory Memorandum [EN010158/APP/3.2.4] [CR1-010]. That section explains the purpose of Article 40, including to remove those hedgerows specified in Schedule 12 (Hedgerows to be removed) to the maximum extents shown on the Vegetation Removal Parameters (which is Appendix 3 of the Outline LEMP [EN010158/APP/7.6.5]). The Vegetation Removal Parameters display: - the existing vegetation (trees and hedgerows); - the trees and hedgerows to be removed; - the important hedgerows to be removed; - the vegetation to be clipped within visibility splays; - the hedgerows to be replanted above the cable corridors; and - the hedgerows to be replanted outside visibility splays for junction and highways works. These are shown over the Order Limits. The Applicant considers that the Vegetation Removal Parameters are therefore already linked to identified features and assessed impacts, as the features are displayed on the plans of the Vegetation Removal Parameters). It is also linked to approved arboricultural protection/method documents as the Vegetation Removal Parameters are contained in Appendix 3 of the Outline LEMP [EN010158/APP/7.6.5] which is itself an arboricultural protection/method document. The applicant addresses Buckinghamshire Council remaining concerns in line with the bulleted points: - The applicant refers to Ref 3.1.3 in this document. The arboricultural baseline is based on a BS 5837:2012-compliant ground survey undertaken by a suitably qualified arboricultural consultant and supported by drone-derived topographical data used for positional plotting only. All arboricultural features were ground-truthed and any discrepancies between datasets were resolved in favour of site	While the Applicant has identified the documents that would manage future tree and hedgerow works, the Council's concern is not the existence of those documents but whether they presently provide sufficient certainty regarding the extent of impacts and the protection measures that would apply prior to vegetation clearance and other preliminary works. In the absence of an Outline AMS and with outstanding concerns regarding the arboricultural baseline and woodland buffers, the Council remains of the view that Article 40 is too broad and it doesn't require the applicant to provide the evidence needed to warrant the removal of hedgerows and trees.

Ref.	Page Reference, Question to, and Question	Summary Position	Applicant's Response	Buckinghamshire Council Comments
		the tree and hedgerow works to be more clearly linked to identified features, assessed impacts, and approved arboricultural protection/method documents rather than relying solely on a broad "reasonable belief" test.	observations. The Applicant therefore considers the arboricultural baseline to be robust and proportionate to the current stage of design. • The applicant refers to Ref 3.1.3 in this document. The Applicant does not agree that there is material uncertainty regarding woodland classification or buffer derivation. Woodland features were classified in accordance with BS 5837:2012 and described within the survey schedules, with woodland characteristics clearly identified where relevant. Buffer distances were informed by site-specific survey information, National Forest Inventory data, relevant standing advice, and the sensitivity of the features concerned. • The Applicant points to response Ref. 3.2.10 in regards to an outline AMS. • The Applicant agrees that appropriate protection measures are required prior to any works commencing. The Outline CEMP [EN010158/APP/7.2.5] secures the implementation of tree protection fencing and other arboricultural safeguards before site mobilisation and construction activities begin. In addition, the Applicant has agreed to provide further detail within the Outline CEMP [EN010158/APP/7.2.5] at Deadline 4. Please Ref 3.2.10 of this document. The Applicant acknowledges the Council's preference for tree and hedgerow works to be clearly linked to identified features, assessed impacts and approved arboricultural documents. However, the Applicant considers that the application already provides a clear framework for doing so. The ES Volume 4, Appendix 7.13: Arboricultural Impact Assessment [EN010158/APP/6.4.2] [REP2-044], identifies the trees, hedgerows and woodland features affected by the Proposed Development and assesses the likely impacts arising from the works. The Outline CEMP [EN010158/APP/7.2.5], Design Commitments [EN010158/APP/5.9.6], Outline LEMP [EN010158/APP/7.6.5] and the requirement for a detailed Arboricultural Method Statement (AMS) provide the mechanism through which protection measures and working methods will be secured and implemented.	
3.1.27	Page 19, Q1.12.44	Comment noting that Buckinghamshire Council is in the process of arranging engagement with the Applicant in relation to the procedure for discharging requirements contained in Schedule 16 of the draft DCO. On that basis it proposes to provide an update at Deadline 3. This will	The Applicant has amended Schedule 16 (Procedure for discharge of requirements) of the Draft DCO [EN010158/APP/3.1.7] submitted at Deadline 4 following engagement with Buckinghamshire Council. The updated wording is agreed between the parties to introduce more flexibility in timescales and clarifications around process.	The Council is now content with the wording in the draft DCO for Schedule 16.

Ref.	Page Reference, Question to, and Question	Summary Position	Applicant's Response	Buckinghamshire Council Comments
		also allow parallel discussion of the points raised in Q1.12.6 above.		
3.1.29	Page 19, Q1.13.1	Air Quality – Comment noting that Buckinghamshire Council agrees with the conclusion set out in Section 3.3 of the Health Effects Report, but given the extended timescale to decommissioning, Buckinghamshire Council considers that a new air quality assessment should be undertaken immediately prior to decommissioning to inform the final Dust Management Plan. Further comment noting that Buckinghamshire Council seeks clarification on the assessment criteria applied to reaching the conclusion that potential effects from road traffic exhaust emissions during operation would not be significant for human receptors and that adverse effects on human health would be limited, querying why the screening criteria set out in the Environmental Protection UK (EPUK) and Institute of Air Quality Management (IAQM) guidance Land Use Planning and Development Control: Planning for Air Quality have not been referenced or considered. Comment noting that while Buckinghamshire Council supports the overall structure and alignment of the Health Effects Report with ISEP best practice, further clarity is required on how guidance has been applied, improved prominence within the ES, and consistency of reporting across documents. Comment noting that, although no significant residual effects are identified for regulated physical health pathways, the	Mitigation measures have already been incorporated into the Outline DEMP [EN010158/APP/7.4.5]. The Applicant will undertake an update to the dust risk assessment portion of the air quality assessment prior to the decommissioning phase, which will be incorporated into the detailed Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan in line with guidance and legislation at the time of decommissioning to mitigate air quality and dust impacts. A detailed Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan will be produced prior to decommissioning as secured in the Draft DCO [EN010158/APP/3.1.7]. This will be submitted to and approved by the Relevant Planning Authority prior to the decommissioning phase. The Outline DEMP [EN010158/APP/7.4.5] has been updated at Deadline 4 to include a commitment to undertake a revised Dust Risk Assessment at the time of decommissioning. The screening criteria set out in the Environmental Protection UK (EPUK) and Institute of Air Quality Management (IAQM) guidance Land Use Planning and Development Control: Planning for Air Quality have been referenced and considered as per 6.8.12 and 6.8.13 of the ES Volume 2, Chapter 6: Air Quality [EN010158/APP/6.2.2] which state: ‘It is anticipated that there would be four two-way Light Duty Vehicle trips per day during the operation (including maintenance) phase (refer to ES Volume 2, Chapter 15: Transport and Access [EN010158/APP/6.2] [APP-058] for further details).’ ‘The Proposed Development is not expected to generate traffic exceeding Environmental Protection UK and Institute of Air Quality Management guidance [Ref. 6-20] and Design Manual for Roads and Bridges LA 105 Air Quality [Ref. 6-23] screening criteria (refer to Table 6.12) once operational. Therefore, it is considered that further assessment of the operation (including maintenance) phase traffic emissions is not required. The increased road traffic emissions resulting from the Proposed Development are expected to have a negligible impact on air quality, and nearby human receptors and designated sites during the operation (including maintenance) phase.’ Matters raised in Buckinghamshire Council’s response to Q1.13.1 duplicate positions raised in other submissions at Deadline 2, and have been responded to within Table 4.1 of the Applicant's Response to Deadline 2 Submissions [EN010158/APP/8.18] [REP3-051] – specifically items 4.1.1 to 4.1.7.	The Council welcome the amendment of the Outline DEMP to include that the applicant will undertake an updated dust risk assessment portion of the air quality assessment prior to the decommissioning phase, which will be incorporated into the detailed Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan.

Ref.	Page Reference, Question to, and Question	Summary Position	Applicant's Response	Buckinghamshire Council Comments
		Council considers that important health and wellbeing impacts remain (particularly relating to landscape, PRoW, and vulnerable sub-populations) and that further place-based assessment, clearer reporting, and targeted mitigation are required.		
3.1.34	Page 26, Q1.15.10	Comment noting that the introduction of additional hedgerow and/or tree planting within the vicinity of the BESS would increase the amount of mitigation vegetation but would not on its own sufficiently reduce the impact that arises from the introduction of the BESS fencing. The proposed fencing would still introduce an element that would be out of character despite the introduction of additional hedgerow and/or tree planting.	The assessment of the effects of the BESS and the associated acoustic screen is based on a worst-case, maximum parameters model in ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010158/APP/6.2.3]. The requirement for additional mitigation planting will be determined at the detailed design stage. The introduction of new hedgerow and/or tree planting is likely to be sufficient to reduce the scale of effects as a result of the fencing experienced along the PRoW to the immediate west of the BESS. However, the wider experience of footpath users between Botolph Claydon and Runts Wood is determined primarily by visibility of the BESS and wider Solar PV development and this will remain unchanged as a significant effect on the landscape character. The assessment of effects of the BESS and associated acoustic screen is also based on a worst-case, maximum parameters model in ES Volume 2, Chapter 9: Cultural Heritage [EN010158/APP/6.2.3]. The effect on the heritage significance of Botolph Claydon Conservation Area, East Claydon village and the listed buildings within them is determined primarily by the change in the character of the surroundings and the obstruction of views as a result of the Proposed Development. The proposed mitigation planting would not alter the effects on heritage significance which are assessed as at most slight and not significant.	While the response is noted, the Council remain of the view that the anticipated impacts of the BESS and its associated structures are insufficiently avoided and mitigated. It is maintained that the proposed fencing would remain incongruous. The Council note, however, its suggestion pursuant to the Action Point for ISH3 concerning Design Commitments which does somewhat progress the mitigation position.
3.1.35	Page 26, Q1.15.11	Comment noting the following in the document: Defining the Special Qualities of Local Landscape Designations in the Aylesbury Vale District Report, was prepared to enhance Buckinghamshire Council's landscape evidence base and to inform the Local Plan by defining the landscapes special character and qualities. The following key criteria's have been highlighted as being relevant to the study area and provide context to the qualities of the area: • Distinctiveness: Distinctive band of low, generally open limestone hills, ridges	The assessment of the effects on the Special Qualities of the Area of Attractive Landscape (AAL) is provided in sections 10.10.147-10.10.159 and 10.10.467-10.10.482 in ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010158/APP/6.2.3] . The specific mitigation measures are stated in the Design Approach Document [EN010158/APP/5.8.3] [CR1-014] , consideration of the Area of Attractive Landscape (AAL) has been an important consideration in the design of the Proposed Development. Project Principle 6.2 specifically refers to respecting the Special Qualities of the AAL designation.	While the Applicant's comments are noted, the Council's concerns remain in respect of the Area of Attractive Landscape.

Ref.	Page Reference, Question to, and Question	Summary Position	Applicant's Response	Buckinghamshire Council Comments
		and plateau to the north of Aylesbury Vale. Strong character and sense of place as a result of the coherent character of the landform, consistent land use of agricultural fields (pastoral and arable) and the scattering of attractive villages. • Perceptual character: Strong sense of rural tranquillity, openness and sense of the dominance of landscape. The dominance of landscape and sense of openness – particularly on the plateau in the east of the area, provides opportunities to appreciate the landscape from roads and public rights of way. Frequent attractive views of the undulating hills from the many vantage points. Views to the Vale of Aylesbury to the south from vantage points and many of the villages perched on the ridge– e.g. Quainton Hill, Wingrave, Aston Abbots – with the landscape providing an attractive setting to villages. Wheat fields provide attractive tones of yellowy-orangey colour in summer that glints in the sunshine. • Landscape and scenic quality: High scenic quality of the undulating hills and ridges from within the area and within views from outside the area (e.g. Middle Claydon Conservation Area; refer to other relevant Conservation Area Appraisals for specific views)... Some very old and characterful historic buildings – e.g. in Aston Abbots, Whitchurch and Oving. Picturesque villages present a smaller scale, and the landscape is usually visible from vantage points within them (e.g. from		

Ref.	Page Reference, Question to, and Question	Summary Position	Applicant's Response	Buckinghamshire Council Comments
		Wingrave). Church towers are local landmarks. Mature trees and hedgerows nestle buildings and structures into the landscape. - Natural character: Ancient woodlands, with a particular concentration in the west of the area – many of which are also SSSI/ LWS. - Cultural character: Strong sense of history – remaining ancient woodland in the west of the area that was once part of the medieval hunting forest of Bernwood, irregular and assart fields; Large number of Scheduled Monuments, concentrated within the medieval villages; Large number of Conservation Areas – ..., containing characterful listed buildings, many of them timber framed; Earthworks of well preserved ridge and furrow e.g. North Marston, and at Quainton Hill are amongst the finest surviving examples to be found in England. Function: Good network of public rights of way including long distance trails – e.g. the Bernwood Jubilee Way, North Buckinghamshire Way, Outer Aylesbury Ring, Matthew's Way.		
3.1.37	Page 28, Q1.16.14	Comment noting that the updated documents provide greater detail and confidence in respect of regular monitoring, both proactively and reactively in the event of complaints being received. However, the detail of mitigation is still lacking and therefore Buckinghamshire Council's uncertainty on this matter remains.	For all phases of the Proposed Development, a range of mitigation measures have been identified that can be implemented in order to achieve the acoustic criteria set out in ES Volume 2, Chapter 13: Noise and Vibration [EN010158/APP/6.2.3]. At this stage, it is appropriate to identify potential construction and decommissioning phase mitigation measures that can be adopted to control noise and vibration levels so that significant adverse effects do not occur, however, the mitigation measures should not be fixed, so that the most effective solution can be adopted on a case-by-case basis as part of the Detailed Construction Environmental Management Plan(s). The mitigation	For the reasons previously expressed the Council still has concerns about the sufficiency and details of the mitigation.

Ref.	Page Reference, Question to, and Question	Summary Position	Applicant's Response	Buckinghamshire Council Comments
			strategy set out in the Outline CEMP [EN010158/APP/7.2.5] and Outline DEMP [EN010158/APP/7.4.5] are in line with the level of detail provided in other NSIPs of this scale/type. The mitigation strategy that has been adopted to achieve the operational phase acoustic criteria is set out in the Outline OEMP [EN010158/APP/7.3.5]. At the detailed design stage, the mitigation strategy would be refined by the Applicant, with the finalised approach subject to review by Buckinghamshire Council, as stipulated by Schedule 2 of the Draft DCO [EN010158/APP/3.1.7]. This aligns with other NSIPs of this scale/type.	
3.1.38	Page 28, Q1.17.1	Comment noting that, in principle, Buckinghamshire Council considers that effects on Preston Farms Ltd and TCS Biosciences potentially meets the test in para 4.2.15 of NPS EN-1. Buckinghamshire Council state that they are not in a position to verify the scientific and supply chain evidence itself. As matters stand it is clear that the evidence raises important questions about the supply chain for medications for UK public health services, and it is important that the issue be considered carefully and on a precautionary basis. Further comment that Buckinghamshire Council notes that [REP1-133] includes suggestions for ways in which the Proposed Development might be amended such that 'interference' may not be unacceptable and that the business may continue to operate, employing suitable biosecurity risk controls. What these involve and how effective they would be are really a matter for the businesses. These matters should be explored fully, given the existing proposals for mitigation do not appear to address the matters identified.	The Applicant does not agree that any effect of the Proposed Development on Preston Farms Ltd and TCS Biosciences Ltd is capable of meeting the refusal criteria as set out in Paragraph 4.2.15 of NPS EN-1. This is because the policy makes clear that <i>"Where residual non-HRA or non-MCZ impacts remain after the mitigation hierarchy has been applied, these residual impacts are unlikely to outweigh the urgent need for this type of infrastructure. Therefore, in all but the most exceptional circumstances, it is unlikely that consent will be refused on the basis of these residual impacts. The exception to this presumption of consent are residual impacts onshore and offshore which present an unacceptable risk to, or unacceptable interference with, human health and public safety, defence, irreplaceable habitats or unacceptable risk to the achievement of net zero"</i> (our emphasis). The exceptions test in Paragraph 4.2.15 of NPS EN-1 makes clear that, for residual impacts to justify the refusal of consent, the impact(s) in the Proposed Development's case must result in an 'unacceptable risk' or give rise to 'unacceptable interference' with human health and public safety. As quoted in response to Ref. 5.5.6 of Applicant's Response to Deadline 2 Submissions [EN010158/APP/8.18] [REP3-051], the Applicant noted that the question of the importance of sustainable national supply of donor animal blood supply for use across the NHS was raised in a parliamentary debate on 28 April 2026¹. The Parliamentary Under-Secretary for Health and Social Care stated that: <i>The Department recognises that animal blood-enriched agar is a critical component in microbiological diagnostics, and we recognise the importance of a sustainable and secure supply of such materials.</i>	The Council note that this response reflects the Applicant's disagreement with the position set out by Preston Farms and TCS Biosciences. Ultimately the resolution of that dispute will fall to be determined as between the evidence advanced by those parties. The Council maintains its position and does not consider that these comments materially change the reasoned position it set out in answer to this question. The Council takes this opportunity to reinforce the request made at ISH3 and accepted by the Applicant to provide further granular analysis in the reporting that underpins the findings of the Population assessment, through a technical appendix. BC would expect information set out here to be reflected in the description of relevant mitigation and design connected to the relevant receptor and the way in which the Applicant has applied professional judgement in this case (i.e. Preston Farms Limited and TCS Biosciences). The Council also takes this opportunity to suggest that there may be some mitigation achieved by acceding to the request made by Preston Farms and TCS Biosciences Ltd to move the access and track in SA46 (assuming it will be present in that field) as far east as possible to attempt to further minimise effects on the sensitive landholding and animals on site. The Council will comment further, as appropriate, once the requested appendix is made available to the Examination.

¹ [Blood Agar: 28 Apr 2026: Hansard Written Answers - TheyWorkForYou](#)

Ref.	Page Reference, Question to, and Question	Summary Position	Applicant's Response	Buckinghamshire Council Comments
		Buckinghamshire Council considers that, at this stage, it is important that these effects are properly assessed. In this regard, Buckinghamshire Council response to Q1.13.1 highlights that the Health Effects Report [REP1-056] does not provide satisfactory assessment of sensitive geographic sub-populations as receptors. This cites Preston Farms/TCS Biosciences as a relevant human health receptor for which further assessment is considered necessary, leading to targeted mitigation, underpinned by appropriate evidence. The completion of this assessment will provide the opportunity for the Applicant to engage fully with the mitigation hierarchy, including avoidance. When this assessment becomes available Buckinghamshire Council will comment on it.	• <i>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. To date there has been no issues with supply.</i> • <i>Where challenges in the supply of key products arise, these would be escalated to the Department's National Supply Disruption Response, which works collaboratively with suppliers, manufacturers, and system partners to understand the nature of the disruption and to support appropriate mitigations.</i> The approach taken in the Health Effects Report (Annex A to ES Volume 4, Appendix 5.5: Health and Wellbeing Summary Statement [EN010158/APP/6.4.6] is compliant with the IEMA (now ISEP) guidance on developing assessments for health and wellbeing effects. This includes a proportionate approach to identifying and considering the sensitivity of geographically defined higher exposure sub populations in the context of population scale effects on public health. In terms of the specific receptor identified (Preston Farms Ltd/TCS Biosciences Ltd) – as set out within Applicant's Response to Written Representations [EN010158/APP/8.12] [REP2-086] – specifically Appendix 1: Response to the Written Representation received from TCS Biosciences Ltd and Preston Farms – bespoke and responsive mitigation that will be flexible based on business requirements at the time has been developed through engagement with the receptor to acknowledge the individual characteristics and sensitivities of the operation, including bespoke approaches to management of noise, traffic, biosecurity and access for grazing animals. This mitigation is secured within the Outline CEMP [EN010158/APP/7.2.5] and Outline OEMP [EN010158/APP/7.3.5]. While it is recognised that employment and employees are local health receptors, TCS Biosciences Ltd as a business is not directly a health receptor for assessment. The assessment draws on of ES Volume 2, Chapter 14: Population [EN010158/APP/6.2.4] to consider the potential for employment and employees to be affected by any change in viability of businesses as a result of the Proposed development, and despite the high sensitivity of receptors, does not identify the potential for significant effects on this determinant of health. The Applicant recognises that TCS Biosciences Ltd supplies the NHS. It is not clear the extent to which TCS Bioscience Ltd.'s viability is predicated on this supply chain relationship, but it is acknowledged that TCS Biosciences Ltd has a	

Ref.	Page Reference, Question to, and Question	Summary Position	Applicant's Response	Buckinghamshire Council Comments
			variety of other clients and a commercial business model that is not solely reliant on the NHS as a customer. In any case, the Applicant does not consider that there is a risk that, as a direct result of the Proposed Development: a) TCS Biosciences Ltd would be rendered unviable and therefore unable to continue to supply the NHS; or b) That the NHS would experience major effects on its operating model such that the diagnostics arm would be unviable – this is demonstrated through comments in the Written Summary of Applicant's Oral Submissions at Issue Specific Hearing 1 (ISH1) [EN010158/APP/8.16] [REP3-049] 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." The Applicant has submitted a Preliminary Biosecurity Statement [EN010158/APP/8.28] at Deadline 4 which proposes a range of measures to minimise and avoid biosecurity risks during construction and operation, including access and induction procedures, the use of a defined access tracks which can be fenced and gated, a disinfectant protocol and indemnity arrangements. The proposed biosecurity procedures will be developed further prior to construction in a Biosecurity Method Statement to be appended to the Construction Environmental Management Plan once the detailed design and TCS Bioscience Ltd/Preston Farm's Ltd grazing regime for the construction period are known. Furthermore, the Applicant has offered temporary grazing fields in Parcel 2 while construction takes place in Parcel 3 in case the business would like to further minimise biosecurity and disturbance risks. As such, the Applicant has offered a range of mitigation measures that address any potential risks to the business and its role in the medical supply chain.	
3.1.41	Page 29, Q1.19.15	Comment noting that at present the agreement has not been submitted to the Highway Authorities knowledge. It would be expected to be modelled on similar agreements reached with HS2 Ltd and EWR Connection Stage 1. Further engagement is	The Applicant will develop a Wear and Tear agreement with Buckinghamshire Council post-consent and prior to construction as is normally the case for infrastructure projects. It is not considered necessary or usual to develop such an agreement during the DCO examination.	Noted. The agreement will need to ensure that action can be taken swiftly and any funding arrangements do not incur delays. The Council would expect this agreement to be in place prior to commencement of the development.

Ref.	Page Reference, Question to, and Question	Summary Position	Applicant's Response	Buckinghamshire Council Comments
		required with the Applicant to understand their proposals for the form of this legal agreement. Further comment that the Applicant should propose a first draft to base negotiations between Buckinghamshire Council and the Applicant on this. Buckinghamshire Council is concerned to ensure that it is secured in such a way as to allow expedient facilitation of works when required and minimal delays in ensuring funds are made available.		

Table 3.2: Buckinghamshire Council (Comments on any further information received (comments on any further information requested by the ExA and received by deadline 2)) [REP3-053]

Ref.	Page Reference	Summary Position	Applicant's Response	Buckinghamshire Council Comments
3.2.1	Pages 3 and 4	Comment summarising the latest state of the SoCG between Buckinghamshire Council and the Applicant. In summary, - Air Quality: matter 1-3 is now agreed - Noise: matter 9-2 disagreement remains on real world impacts on some residential receptors - Noise: matter 9-5 is now agreed - Human Health: matter 10-2 is to be updated to note disagreement with the level of assessment undertaken in the Population Chapter. - Population and Human Health: comment noting Buckinghamshire Council's comments in the LIR have not yet been captured in the SoCG. - Cultural Heritage: comment noting that an assessment of Bernwood Farmhouse is yet to be undertaken, despite it not appearing in the Historic Environment Record. Further comment noting that an assessment of St	The Applicant welcomes Buckinghamshire Council's summarisation of the matters that have been agreed or remain under discussion at Deadline 2, as written into Draft Statement of Common Ground with Buckinghamshire Council [EN010158/APP/5.22.4]. The Applicant is continuing to engage with Buckinghamshire Council regularly to further positions of agreement in the Statement of Common Ground. An updated version of Draft Statement of Common Ground with Buckinghamshire Council [EN010158/APP/5.22.4] has been submitted at Deadline 4 to reflect these updates and the outcomes of recent engagement.	The Council welcomes the inclusion of St Mary's Church in the Chapter 9 Cultural Heritage Assessment in Deadline 4, although there is disagreement on the level of harm.

Ref.	Page Reference	Summary Position	Applicant's Response	Buckinghamshire Council Comments
		Mary's church appears to have been omitted from the Deadline 2 draft		
3.2.2	Pages 3 - 5	Comment noting that Botolph House has been incorrectly identified as Grade II listed when it is in fact Grade II*, although its high significance has been appropriately recognised in the assessment tables. Comment noting that Bernwood Farmhouse should be included in the assessment as a locally significant asset, and that there remains disagreement with the Applicant on the level of change for certain receptors due to differing interpretations of setting and the effectiveness of proposed screening mitigation. Examples are given: • Claydon House and park and the contribution of its wider setting including cumulative effects • All Saints Church • Pond Farmhouse • Rosehill Farmhouse • Blackmoorhill Farmhouse (Winter's Tale) • St Mary's Church • Setting of East Claydon (as a village of the same level of significance as Botolph Claydon)	The Applicant has corrected the typographical error in ES Volume 2, Chapter 9: Cultural Heritage [EN010158/APP/6.2.3] relating to the grading of Botolph House within the updated version submitted at Deadline 4. The Applicant has agreed through consultation with Buckinghamshire Council that detailed assessment of Bernwood Farm is not necessary as the effects on this non-designated heritage asset of low importance would not be significant. The position of the Applicant is that the harm to its significance would be within the middle of the range of less than substantial harm, whilst it is understood that Buckinghamshire Council consider that the harm would be greater but still less than substantial harm. The respective positions are set out within the Draft Statement of Common Ground with Buckinghamshire Council [EN010158/APP/5.22.4] submitted at Deadline 4. The Applicant has considered the information provided by Buckinghamshire Council within their Deadline 3 submission and has incorporated this within Annex D of ES Volume 4, Appendix 9.1: Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment and Setting Assessment [EN010158/APP/6.4.3] submitted at Deadline 4. However the Applicant respectfully maintains that the harm to significance is at the lower end of less than substantial for Claydon House, Claydon Park, All Saints Church, Rosehill Farmhouse and Blackmoorhill Farmhouse, St Mary's Church, East Claydon village, Botolph House and Botolph Claydon Conservation Area and within the middle of the scale of less than substantial harm for Pond Farmhouse. The Applicant and Buckinghamshire Council agree that the harm to the significance of these assets is less than substantial but disagree on the level of harm and in some cases the significance of effect which would result. The respective positions of the Applicant and Buckinghamshire Council are detailed within the Draft Statement of Common Ground with Buckinghamshire Council [EN010158/APP/5.22.4].	No further comment. For the Council's views on heritage assets mentioned please see [REP4-090] submission and other submissions on these heritage assets.

Ref.	Page Reference	Summary Position	Applicant's Response	Buckinghamshire Council Comments
		• Botolph House • Botolph Claydon Conservation Area		
3.2.5	Page 6, Row 1	Comment welcoming the breakdown of ALC grades in Table 12.4 of the Soil Chapter but that this breakdown is unclear due to formatting errors.	ES Volume 2, Chapter 12: Soil [EN010158/APP/6.2.3] Table 12.4 has been updated at Deadline 4 to fix the formatting errors.	The Council welcomes the correction to the formatting but points out that there is a disconnect between the total area of the proposed development shown in Table 12.3 of the revised ES, as compared to Table 12.4. The areas in Table 12.4 don't match Table 12.3 (not all areas have been included) and it is not clear what activities are proposed in some areas of the site.
3.2.6	Pages 6 and 7	Comment noting that the Applicant has not updated the assessment of impacts on ALC Grade 2 land in line with the stated IEMA methodology in the Soils Chapter which indicates the magnitude should be classified as minor rather than negligible. Comment noting that this would result in a moderate adverse and therefore significant effect, and that the Applicant's reliance on the proportion of non-BMV land does not justify downplaying the assessed impact on Grade 2 land.	The assessment of impacts in ES Volume 2, Chapter 12: Soil [EN010158/APP/6.2.3] on ALC Grade 2 land has concluded that a negligible magnitude of impact is the correct classification. The extent of ALC Grade 2 land is limited (3.01ha), and there is no loss or reduction in soil function or soil volumes, as all Grade 2 land is either untouched, under a grass sward in the areas of Solar PV development, or hosting ecological mitigation/enhancement. Furthermore, given the small area of Grade 2 land, the timing of construction works will be managed carefully to consider weather conditions, soils will only be worked and trafficked on when they are suitably dry and below the plastic limit. All construction activities subject to committed mitigation in the Outline SMP [EN010158/APP/7.7.3] [REP2-069]. A negligible magnitude of impact on a very high sensitivity receptor results in a slight adverse and not significant effect. The justification of negligible magnitude is not based on the proportion of non-BMV land, but rather comes from a use of professional judgement that the small area of the receptor and land use does not justify a minor magnitude of effect.	The assessment is contradictory between Grade 2 land compared with Grades 3a and 3b land. For Grades 2, 3a and 3b land, the Applicant states that there will be a temporary reduction in availability of agricultural land. However, they state that Grades 3a and 3b will experience a minor impact while Grade 2 land (very high sensitivity) will experience a negligible impact even though the three grades should fall under the same magnitude criteria. Overall, 3.01 ha of Grade 2 land will be temporarily affected by construction, 2.4 ha of which will be under solar PV panels and 0.61 ha hosting ecological mitigation. This falls into the category of a minor impact according to IEMA guidance. In providing justification for assessing the impact on ALC Grade 2 land as negligible, the Applicant confuses their assessment of soil structure with ALC. They state that there will be no loss or reduction in soil on areas of ALC Grade 2 land. However, soil structure and volume are not the basis for assessing loss of land from agricultural production. It is the availability of agricultural land for agricultural production that is the basis and paragraph 12.5.17 states that areas used for key infrastructure such as solar PV panels will be unavailable for agricultural production for the operational lifetime of the project.
3.2.7	Page 7, Row 2	Comment noting that the updated Population Chapter does not reference the updated Outline Rights of Way and Access Strategy [EN010158/APP/7.8.3] throughout. Further noting that additional operational detail provided by TCS Biosciences	The Applicant has not updated the references to the Outline Rights of Way and Access Strategy within ES Volume 2, Chapter 14: Population [EN010158/APP/6.2.4], noting that the most up to date references are captured within the Guide to the Application. The Applicant has acknowledged, reviewed and responded to additional operational detail provided to the examination by TCS Biosciences Ltd. The Applicant considers that its assessments accurately reflect the business's sensitivity to change. Throughout the pre-application and post-submission period, the Applicant has been engaging with TCS Biosciences	Noted. The Council remains concerned that the Applicant's Population assessment does not accurately reflect the potential impacts of the Proposed Scheme on this receptor (and others within the Population assessment). The Council takes this opportunity to reinforce the request made at ISH3 and accepted by the Applicant to provide further granular analysis in the reporting that underpins the findings of the Population assessment, through a technical appendix. The Council would expect information set out here to be reflected in the description of relevant mitigation and design connected to the

Ref.	Page Reference	Summary Position	Applicant's Response	Buckinghamshire Council Comments
		raises concerns that the Applicant's Population Chapter assessment does not accurately reflect the business's sensitivity to change or fully address its potential impacts. Comment noting that this calls into question the accuracy of paragraph 14.8.30 and the conclusions on residual effects in paragraph 14.10.16 of the Population Chapter with any revisions likely to have consequential implications for the reporting set out in Table 14.25.	Ltd to understand the operation of its business, its sensitivity and the importance of a bio-secure and controlled environment. As such, within ES Volume 2, Chapter 14: Population [EN010158/APP/6.2.4], TCS Biosciences Ltd is accorded the maximum level of sensitivity to change (i.e. Very High) in accordance with the appropriate guidance (Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) 'LA 112 Population and Human Health') referenced in that chapter (and agreed within ES Volume 4, Appendix 5.1: EIA Scoping Report [EN010158/APP/6.4] [APP-079]). The magnitude of change afforded to TCS Biosciences Ltd in ES Volume 2, Chapter 14: Population [EN010158/APP/6.2.4] is minor – also in accordance with the Applicant's application of criteria set out in guidance (Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) 'LA 112 Population and Human Health') - and in light of mitigation and compensation to be put in place to manage the scale of change. The criteria considers whether there is likely to be: a) Loss, damage or change to attributes, quality or key characteristics or vulnerability (A <u>Moderate/Major</u> change would mean loss or severe damage e.g. direct total or partial acquisition and demolition compromising viability; a <u>Minor</u> change would be a discernible change in attributes, minor loss of or alteration to key characteristics – e.g. amendment to access or acquisition of land resulting in changes to operating conditions that do not compromise overall viability); and/or b) Introduction of severance with adequate accessibility provision (a <u>Moderate/Major</u> change would require the introduction of complete or severe severance with limited/moderate accessibility provision; a <u>Minor</u> change provides adequate accessibility provision). As the Applicant considers that effects on TCS Biosciences Ltd are mitigated through the provision of land swaps with equal or better provision of land in terms of quality and access, and additional mitigation has been developed through engagement with affected parties and in-line with standards and guidance for the management of (e.g. air quality, noise, traffic/access) adverse effects – and is designed to be flexible and responsive - the assessment concludes that although the businesses affected are of high or very high sensitivity, that the magnitude of change would be minor resulting in a non-significant effect.	relevant receptor and the way in which the Applicant has applied professional judgement in this case (i.e. Preston Farms Limited and TCS Biosciences). BC will comment further, as appropriate, once the requested appendix is made available to the Examination.
3.2.10	Pages 8 (Row 3) - 10	Comment welcoming updates to the Arboricultural Impact Assessment with further comment noting that it	The Applicant acknowledges the Council's concern regarding the relationship between indicative tree protection fencing and areas identified as having potential Root Protection Area (RPA) impacts. However, the Applicant does not agree that this demonstrates a deficiency in the	The Council welcomes the revisions to the Arboricultural Impact Assessment and notes the Applicant's commitment to provide additional detail through the Outline CEMP and detailed AMS process. The Council remains concerned that some potential conflicts between indicative tree protection measures and RPAs

Ref.	Page Reference	Summary Position	Applicant's Response	Buckinghamshire Council Comments
		would be helpful if G98 could remain clearly identified and safeguarded through the detailed design and protection process. Further comment noting that Buckinghamshire Council remain concerned with the updated Annex E to the Arboricultural Impact Assessment. Examples are provided and further comment is made noting that the submitted plans do not clearly demonstrate how protective fencing will avoid conflicts with retained root protection areas, suggesting that the tree protection strategy remains unresolved. Comment noting that in the absence of an Outline Arboricultural Method Statement, Buckinghamshire Council is being asked to rely on subsequent detailed design to address these conflicts, which is considered a significant outstanding concern.	protection strategy or indicates that arboricultural impacts have not been appropriately assessed. The plans are intended to identify potential interactions on a precautionary basis and to ensure that such locations are carried forward into the detailed design process. The presence of indicative fencing in proximity to potential RPA impacts does not imply that impacts will occur but rather identifies locations where detailed construction methodologies may be required to avoid or minimise effects. As discussed with Buckinghamshire Council, the Applicant has agreed to provide additional detail within the Outline CEMP [EN010158/APP/7.2.5] at this Deadline 4 to clarify the nature of any works that may be required within these areas and the associated mitigation measures that would be implemented to protect retained trees and RPAs. This will provide further clarity on how potential interactions within buffer areas will be managed. Accordingly, the Applicant considers that the assessment appropriately identifies potential constraints and interactions, whilst the combination of the secured requirement in Paragraph 1.1.13 and Table 3.2 of the Outline CEMP [EN010158/APP/7.2.5] and by Requirement 11 of the Draft DCO [EN010158/APP/3.1.7] for a detailed Arboricultural Method Statement, and ongoing design refinement, provides a robust mechanism to ensure retained trees, buffers and RPAs are protected in practice.	have not yet been fully resolved and continues to consider that an Outline AMS would have provided greater certainty, the Council acknowledges that the matter is moving in a positive direction and anticipates that the remaining concerns may be capable of being addressed through the additional information expected at Deadline 5.
3.2.13	Page 11 and 12	Comment welcoming the increased awareness of how elderly groups may be more sensitive locally in 6.4.3 Environmental Statement Volume 4, Appendix 5.5: Health and Wellbeing Summary Statement (Tracked) with further comment that the additions appear more narrative than assessment based.	The Applicant considers that sensitivity considerations are already clearly carried through within the assessment of significance under each determinant of health. The assessment within ES Volume 4, Appendix 5.5: Health and Wellbeing Summary Statement [EN010158/APP/6.4.6] clearly sets out the approach to identifying pathways and determinants of health, and identifies how sub-population characteristics (in this case predominantly age) influence the sensitivity to change in health and wellbeing as a result of each determinant. The assessment considers how in each case mitigation has been developed that addresses the determinant of health – in most cases this applies equally to populations and sensitive sub-populations, as mitigation is	This is noted. The Council takes this opportunity to reinforce the request made to the Applicant to provide further granular analysis in the reporting that underpins the findings of the Human Health assessment, through a technical appendix. The Council would expect information set out here to be reflected in the description of relevant mitigation and design connected to the relevant receptor and the way in which the Applicant has applied professional judgement in each case. At ISH3, the Applicant noted that the drafting of the commitment to consulting with the Community Liaison Group would be improved for clarity, signposting the measures already secured, rather than

Ref.	Page Reference	Summary Position	Applicant's Response	Buckinghamshire Council Comments
		Further comment requesting clearer signposting of how these sensitivity considerations are carried through to the assessment of specific pathways and to any targeted mitigation, where relevant.	developed to reduce the potential for significant adverse effects on all receptors (e.g. users of PRow, or residents at home). Principally, as set out in within ES Volume 4, Appendix 5.5: Health and Wellbeing Summary Statement [EN010158/APP/6.4.6] the more prevalent (older) sub-population is likely to be more sensitive to change as there is likely to be a higher propensity to dependence on local connections and access to healthcare, a higher degree of social isolation, a more home-based resident population, and higher rates of conditions including respiratory disease and multimorbidity. The mitigation in-place to address (for example) air quality, traffic/transport and noise inherently considers sensitivity to the health of vulnerable sub-populations within thresholds that determine the mitigation to be applied. Buckinghamshire Council agrees that for the regulated physical health pathways of air quality, noise and vibration, traffic and access, land contamination and operational safety, no significant residual adverse effects are predicted following mitigation, subject to the delivery of the proposed design measures, DCO requirements and management plans. Notwithstanding this, there are determinants of health that are less regulated by standard health thresholds, are more subjective, and experienced individually – for example the influence of landscape and visual change on users of PRow and residential property – and these are the only potentially significant effect pathways / determinants of health reported within ES Volume 4, Appendix 5.5: Health and Wellbeing Summary Statement [EN010158/APP/6.4.6]. However, such effects may not result in the need for differential types of 'targeted' mitigation per sensitive sub-population – mitigation includes embedded and bespoke mitigation per receptor (i.e. inhabited property, or walked routes) that includes planting, offsets and screening detailed in the Design Approach Document [EN010158/APP/5.8.3] [CR1-014] and Outline LEMP [EN010158/APP/7.6.5], and secured by the Design Commitments [EN010158/APP/5.9.6]. For clarity, direct reference to these geographically-specific, receptor-led mitigations have been included within an update to Annex A (Health Effects Report) of ES Volume 4, Appendix 5.5: Health and Wellbeing Summary Statement [EN010158/APP/6.4.6] submitted at Deadline 4. In addition to this, the Outline LEMP [EN010158/APP/7.6.5] and Outline RoWAS [EN010158/APP/7.8.5] [CR1-026] secure important enhancement measures relevant to positive health pathways, including the provision of new permissive footpaths and increased accessibility,	presenting them as examples, as per the final paragraphs of the Applicant's response here. The Council will comment further, as appropriate, once the requested appendix and edits to the Human Health reporting ([REP4-062] and [REP4-063]) are made available to the Examination.

Ref.	Page Reference	Summary Position	Applicant's Response	Buckinghamshire Council Comments
			opportunities for recreation in the natural environment, and environmental improvements. To account for the ability for local affected residents to influence the specifics of mitigation that respond to their specific concerns, and therefore address potential health pathways, the Applicant has committed to consult with the Community Liaison Group (CLG) on relevant points of interest during the detailed design stage, prior to the submission and approval of the detailed design in accordance with Requirement 7 of the Draft DCO [EN010158/APP/3.1.7]. This could include, for example, the location and content of interpretation boards and waymarking signage and the options for planting alongside PRoW and permissive paths, as appropriate – this enables a community-led, effect and geographical receptor-based approach to be enacted to develop and direct mitigation to those locations for the people likely to be affected the most.	
3.2.14	Pages 12 and 13	Comment noting that Buckinghamshire Council considers the Applicant has only partially addressed earlier concerns, with several substantive issues remaining unresolved, and therefore maintains its position that further iteration of the assessment is required.	The Applicant is content that the assessment provided within Annex A (Health Effects Report) of ES Volume 4, Appendix 5.5: Health and Wellbeing Summary Statement [EN010158/APP/6.4.6] is proportionate, in-line with ISEP guidance on assessment of health determinants at an appropriate scale. Notwithstanding this, the Applicant has provided some contextual amendments to Annex A (Health Effects Report) of ES Volume 4, Appendix 5.5: Health and Wellbeing Summary Statement [EN010158/APP/6.4.6] submitted at Deadline 4. These amendments do not represent further, additional assessment, which the Applicant does not consider is necessary, but are intended to make more explicit the approach and findings of the assessment, and to clearly set out the approach to linking receptor identification to effects to bespoke mitigation. This does not change the assessment of significance concluded by Annex A (Health Effects Report) of ES Volume 4, Appendix 5.5: Health and Wellbeing Summary Statement [EN010158/APP/6.4.6]. The Applicant does not consider that further amendments are required to Annex A (Health Effects Report) of ES Volume 4, Appendix 5.5: Health and Wellbeing Summary Statement [EN010158/APP/6.4.6] and refers Buckinghamshire Council to the Applicant's Response to Deadline 2 Submissions [EN010158/APP/8.18] [REP3-051]	The Council respectfully disagrees with the Applicant's view. The Council notes that the Applicant seeks to connect the updates to [REP4-062] and [REP4-063] to addressing comments raised by BC. However, the edits fail to address the concerns, as most recently expressed at ISH3. The Council has subsequently prepared a TN to the Applicant, at the request of the ExA, to illustrate the level of analysis that the Council is seeking, benchmarked to precedent from other transferable DCO processes and tailored to the content of the Applicant's submission to date. The Council takes this opportunity to reinforce the request made to the Applicant to provide further granular analysis in the reporting that underpins the findings of the Human Health assessment, through a technical appendix. The Council would expect information about relevant mitigation and design connected to the relevant receptor and the way in which the Applicant has applied professional judgement in each case. The Council will comment further, as appropriate, once the requested appendix and edits to the Human Health reporting ([REP4-062] and [REP4-063]) are made available to the Examination. The human health reporting ([REP4-062] and [REP4-063]) does identify some significant adverse effects as not fully mitigated (i.e. using the wording 'mitigated as far as practicable'), which are not then reported in the corresponding part of the NTS.
3.2.15	Page 13, Row 2	In relation to 6.4.3 Environmental Statement Volume 4, Appendix 10.6:	Increased hedgerow heights (beyond that proposed) within Parcel 1 in particular are not achievable due to the need to maintain the health of the elm hedgerows. The Applicant considers that the proposed poplar planting	Although there would be some increased screening of direct views from Claydon House, the important views from Knowl Hill to Claydon House would prominently include the development and

Ref.	Page Reference	Summary Position	Applicant's Response	Buckinghamshire Council Comments
		LVIA Visualisations Claydon House, comment that while the photomontage is welcomed, it demonstrates that proposed planting is difficult to distinguish at the distances shown, limiting its ability to illustrate mitigation effectiveness. Comment noting that the visualisations raise concerns regarding potential impacts on long-distance views of the tower of All Saints Church, including whether its landmark role and contribution to setting and significance would be adversely affected	along Three Points Lane will, once fully established, help to filter views of the Proposed Development from Claydon House. The Applicant maintains that the residual effect is at the lower end of less than substantial harm. Historic England and National Trust agree with this conclusion as set out within the Draft Statement of Common Ground with National Trust [EN010158/APP/5.17.2] [REP2-020] and Statement of Common Ground with Historic England [EN010158/APP/5.16.3]. The Applicant has presented an assessment of All Saints Church within ES Volume 4, Appendix 9.1: Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment and Setting Assessment [EN010158/APP/6.4.3] and ES Volume 2, Chapter 9: Cultural Heritage [EN010158/APP/6.2.3] including consideration of its (limited) role as a landmark in long-distance views and concludes that the harm to its significance is at the lower end of less than substantial and that the Proposed Development will result in a slight effect which is not significant.	there would be increased severance of the Claydon House estate land farmed by Pond Farmhouse from the former parkland to the south of Calvert Road. The Council have provided its view of the harm to Claydon House in previous submissions In relation to All Saints Church the Council disagree that its role as a landmark is limited. The tower is clearly visible in views from the south and south west and the elements if its setting that preserve its survival as a landmark contribute strongly to its significance, as legible evidence of its historic relationship with the surrounding area.
3.2.16	Pages 13 (Row 3) and 14	In relation to 7.7.3 Outline Soil Management Plan (Tracked), comment noting that the Applicant presents contradictory conclusions on soil resilience, classifying soils as having medium resilience based on field capacity days while also describing them as slowly permeable, seasonally waterlogged, and constrained by wetness. Comment noting that, in accordance with the Institute of Quarrying guidance, the Site's clay and heavy clay loam soils should be considered to have low resilience to structural damage, and that reliance on field capacity data risks overestimating soil handling suitability and	The Applicant does not consider the Outline SMP [EN010158/APP/7.7.3] [REP2-069] to contain contradictory conclusions on soil resilience. The description of the soils as slowly permeable, seasonally waterlogged and constrained by wetness relates to the baseline soil characteristics and the principal agricultural limitation identified through the ALC survey. By contrast, the classification of the soils as having medium resilience relates specifically to their susceptibility to structural damage during handling under suitable conditions, in accordance with the methodology cited in the Outline SMP [EN010158/APP/7.7.3] [REP2-069] for soils with fewer than 150 Field Capacity Days. The Applicant's position is therefore that the soils are wetness-limited in ALC terms, but can be managed as medium resilience soils for handling purposes. The Applicant acknowledges that, in accordance with the Institute of Quarrying (IoQ) guidance, clay and heavy clay loam soils have an inherently low resilience to structural damage when considered on the basis of textural class alone. However, the IoQ guidance also states that the resilience is significantly modified by the soil water regime (Soil Wetness Class) and the local climate. This is consistent with the IEMA (now ISEP) guidelines classifying the clay and heavy clay loam soils as medium resilience due to the field capacity days being fewer than 150. Furthermore, the Outline SMP [EN010158/APP/7.7.3] [REP2-069] explicitly recognises compaction as the principal risk associated with the Proposed	The Institute of Quarrying (IoQ) guidance specifies that soils that are weakly developed and non-calcareous (like those on this site) have a low resilience to structural damage. The Council is therefore still of the opinion that the soils on this site, which are clay/heavy clay loam weakly developed non-calcareous soils in wetness class IV, require more precautionary handling and mitigation. However, the Council has agreed to accept the Outline SMP [REP2-070] as it contains appropriate methods for soil handling but would emphasise the importance of ensuring that the contractor does not design construction methods based on an overestimation of the resilience of the soils to structural damage.

Ref.	Page Reference	Summary Position	Applicant's Response	Buckinghamshire Council Comments
		underestimating compaction risks.	Development and sets out a comprehensive framework of control measures. Soil handling suitability is therefore not overestimated in the Outline SMP [EN010158/APP/7.7.3] [REP2-069] .	

Table 3.3: Buckinghamshire Council (Comments on responses to Examining Authority's first written questions (ExQ1)) [REP3-054]

Ref.	Page Reference	Summary Position	Applicant's Response	Buckinghamshire Council Comments
3.3.1	Page 3, Table Ref. Q1.4.7	Comment noting that the site selection objectives were not subject to consultation, which may have contributed to unaddressed flaws in the design, including issues relating to TCS Biosciences/Preston Farms and landscape effects. Comment noting that given the Proposed Development's scale exceeds the lower end of the originally considered 250–500MW range, greater emphasis should have been placed on avoidance within the mitigation hierarchy, as this remains a relevant and necessary consideration in the assessment.	The Applicant points to the response provided to Q1.4.7 in Applicant's Response to the Examining Authority's First Written Questions [EN010158/APP/8.13] [REP2-087]. As part of its statutory consultation, the Applicant published a Preliminary Environmental Information Report (see Consultation Report Appendices I-1 [EN010158/APP/5.2] [APP-028]) which included Chapter 4: Reasonable Alternatives Considered. This provided a summary of the reasonable alternatives considered by the Applicant for the Proposed Development (up to the time of publication), including the initial selection of the Site and through the development of the design. This included commentary on factors which contributed to the selection of the Site and consultees were invited to provide comments on this. This approach is common in the development of solar NSIPs, and the Applicant disagrees with the assertion that this may have contributed to unaddressed flaws in the design. As part of the approach to EIA at the Site-level, an iterative approach has been adopted where significant environmental effects have been avoided where possible through design refinements and iterations, as a result of consultation and as detailed further within ES Volume 1, Chapter 4: Reasonable Alternatives Considered [EN010158/APP/6.1] [APP-047] and the Design Approach Document [EN010158/APP/5.8.3] [CR1-014]. The Design Approach Document [EN010158/APP/5.8.3] [CR1-014] sets out, in detail, the Applicant's actions (in accordance with consultation feedback received) and decisions to demonstrate compliance with design-related policy in NPS EN-1, NPS EN-3 and the Planning Inspectorate's Advice on Good Design. The Applicant notes the point being made by Buckinghamshire Council, whilst the Applicant was seeking land that could facilitate 250 – 500MW, the Applicant was awarded a 500MW grid connection that, therefore, the Applicant has sought to maximise at the site-level. Government's energy objectives are to ensure that the supply of energy always remains secure, reliable, affordable, and consistent with meeting the UK's legally binding	The Council notes the Applicant's response and accepts that information regarding site selection and alternatives was presented through the consultation process. The Council's concern is not that alternatives were absent from the documentation, but rather that the underlying site selection objectives and the weight afforded to competing constraints were not subject to meaningful scrutiny at an earlier stage. In the Council's view, this may have contributed to issues that have persisted throughout the evolution of the scheme, including those relating to TCS Biosciences/Preston Farms and landscape effects.

Ref.	Page Reference	Summary Position	Applicant's Response	Buckinghamshire Council Comments
			target to cut GHG emissions to net zero by 2050 (NPS EN-1 (2023) Paragraph 2.3.3). Meeting these objectives requires new low-carbon infrastructure to come forward with pace and scale. Section 3.7 of the Statement of Need [EN010158/APP/5.6] [APP-036], explains that there is a limited number of available and timely connections for grid-scale developments. Therefore, maximising the utilisation of any such connection is consistent with the government's energy objectives. To underutilise an existing and available grid connection, which has been prioritised as part of NESO's Connections Reform process, is not consistent with achieving the government's objectives, and would increase the risk that government's objectives will not be met. This is because doing so would increase the burden on finding and delivering additional grid connections which may not be possible at the scale and timing required to achieve and sustain the Clean Power Mission. Therefore, as reported in Paragraph 3.7.15 of the Statement of Need [EN010158/APP/5.6] [APP-036] and through the design of the Proposed Development, the Applicant has sought to maximise use of the connection capacity which has been made available to it.	
3.3.3	Page 5, Table Ref. Q1.4.10	Comment noting that the Applicant relies on the cumulative effects assessment to demonstrate consideration of other developments, but this does not equate to actively seeking opportunities to reduce those effects through coordinated design. Comment noting that the Applicant has not demonstrated that consolidation principles (such as co-location or rationalisation of infrastructure to minimise land take and impacts during site selection) have been meaningfully explored.	The ES Volume 2, Chapter 17: Cumulative Effects [EN010158/APP/6.2.3] [REP2-037] considers other developments within the 10km Zone of Influence from the Proposed Development that fall within the short list, including HS2, East West Rail, Grendon Prison, East Claydon Greener Grid Park, East Claydon BESS, Tuckey Farm, Fox Covert, Padbury Brook and Longbreach Solar Farm. The Applicant has engaged in discussions with East Claydon BESS, HS2, and reached out the East West Rail. The Applicant notes that each project has its own bespoke requirements and timelines for construction meaning that full consolidation of infrastructure is not feasible. However, the Applicant has committed to working with other developers to manage interactions and reduce any associated potential cumulative impacts, where practicable, as secured within the Outline CEMP [EN010158/APP/7.2.5].	The Council notes the Applicant's response and acknowledges the engagement that has taken place with neighbouring infrastructure projects. However, the Council's concern is not limited to consultation and coordination during construction, but whether opportunities to reduce cumulative effects through coordinated design and the application of consolidation principles were actively explored at an earlier stage in the development of the scheme. Whilst the Council accepts that full consolidation of infrastructure may not be feasible given differing project requirements, programmes and consenting regimes, it remains unclear to the Council the extent to which opportunities for co-location, shared infrastructure, rationalisation of land take, or other measures to minimise cumulative impacts were considered and discounted during site selection and design development. The Council therefore maintains its position that the cumulative effects assessment demonstrates an awareness of neighbouring developments but does not, in itself, demonstrate that opportunities to avoid or reduce cumulative effects through coordinated design were fully explored. The parties therefore remain in disagreement on this matter.

Ref.	Page Reference	Summary Position	Applicant's Response	Buckinghamshire Council Comments
3.3.5	Page 6, Table Ref. Q1.7.5	Comment noting that tree removal may require a protected species licence if bats are found to be roosting within affected trees, and that this remains uncertain at the current stage. Comment noting that bat monitoring (forming part of the proposed mitigation) would itself require licensing from Natural England, and that their input is advisable given existing concerns about additional monitoring of this population.	The Applicant believes it is unlikely that a licence with regards roosting bats would be required due to the fact that the vast majority of the roost resource (trees within and outside of woodlands) is unaffected. It is unlikely that one would be encountered within the small number of trees (approx. 16) that may require removal, several of which have no or limited suitability to support roosting bats. Given the known importance of the tree roost resource, the Applicant has worked to ensure that the design of the Proposed Development minimises potential tree loss. The predicted tree loss of three trees with potential to support maternity roosts is a worse-case scenario. Should an important tree roost be identified, such tree loss may be avoidable through micro-siting at construction stage (this would require balancing all relevant constraints, including those posed by other protected species, as detailed within Outline CEMP [EN010158/APP/7.2.5]). Note that Potential Roost Features (PRFs) are categorised as PRF-I (only suitable for individual bats or very small numbers of bats either due to size or lack of suitable surrounding habitats) or PRF-M (suitable for multiple bats and may therefore be used by a maternity colony). However, this is a structural assessment that does not take into account location or context. Here, trees considered to pose a risk of supporting more important roosts on a structural basis only, i.e. those supporting PRF-M are all located to the north-east of Runts Wood. These are within the 3km CSZ of Bechstein's bats, but outside of their recorded home range (Natural England, 20242); the risk of finding a maternity roost of Bechstein's bats in a tree to be removed is therefore low. The Outline CEMP [EN010158/APP/7.2.5] secures a commitment to surveying trees to be removed before felling and, in the unlikely event that a roost is found, a licence would be sought from Natural England in the normal way. This approach has been accepted on other consented NSIPs, such as in the Springwell Solar Farm Order 2026 and the Byers Gill Solar Order 2025. It is not likely that the monitoring anticipated would require licensing, since no separate trapping/radio-tracking is proposed (or would be licensed, as per Natural England's response at Examination.	As described above, given the information outstanding on this issue the Council will comment when the information becomes available at the upcoming Deadline.
3.3.20	Page 20, Table Ref. Q1.10.1	Comment noting that the inclusion of interpretation boards within the oLEMP is welcomed, and that thematic interpretation	The Applicant has agreed with Buckinghamshire Council through ongoing consultation that the Outline LEMP [EN010158/APP/7.6.5] secured through Requirement 7 in the Draft DCO [EN010158/APP/3.1.7] provides an appropriate mechanism to secure future agreement regarding the locations, content and ongoing maintenance of any interpretation boards.	No further comment in addition to comments already made. Improvements to visitor amenity for the National Trust visitors may not necessarily be a historic environment benefit. The Council assume that a financial contribution is made to compensate for the inconvenience of the Proposed Development.

Ref.	Page Reference	Summary Position	Applicant's Response	Buckinghamshire Council Comments
		relating to the wider landscape, heritage assets, and local history (particularly around Claydon House) would be beneficial. Further discussion with the Applicant on the approach to interpretation to explain the wider landscape of Claydon House and the most significant listed buildings/the history of the villages would be welcomed. Comment noting that the proposed financial contribution is assumed to have a mitigatory or compensatory purpose, potentially addressing impacts on the visitor experience and associated heritage asset management.	This agreement is set out within the Draft Statement of Common Ground with Buckinghamshire Council [EN010158/APP/5.22.4]. The Applicant considers that the financial contribution to National Trust to assist them with improvements to the visitor experience and access is not required as mitigation for the Proposed Development and should be counted as a benefit of the Proposed Development.	
3.3.21	Page 21, Table Ref. Q1.10.6	Comment noting that the proposed planting is welcomed in mitigating views from nearby listed properties, but that its current extent is insufficient to fully screen views from the rear of 23 Orchard Way and Quamby. Comment noting that the planting should be extended slightly further, particularly at the point where the north field boundary meets existing tree screens, to address	The woodland is intended to infill the gap between the existing woodland fingers on the northern edge of Field D3 (South) - it is a graphical representation of where the woodland will be located, rather than a design of the woodland block itself at this stage, which would be refined at the detailed design stage in the detailed Landscape and Ecological Management Plan.	The Council welcome the stated intent that the screening on the north side of Field D3 (South) will fill the current gap and that the LEMP will provide a mechanism for the Council to ensure that it does. Without this screening there would be harm to listed buildings on the south side of Orchard Way.

Ref.	Page Reference	Summary Position	Applicant's Response	Buckinghamshire Council Comments
		the narrowness of the western screen and ensure more effective visual mitigation.		
3.3.22	Page 23, Table Ref. Q1.10.8	Comment noting that Buckinghamshire Council still considers that there would be harm at the upper end of the scale of less than substantial harm to Pond House	The Applicant maintains that the harm to the significance of Pond Farmhouse is within the middle of the range of less than substantial harm.	The way that the Proposed Development engulfs the listed buildings setting, severing its key relationships with the Claydon Estate, points to at least less than substantial harm at the upper end of the scale.
3.3.27	Page 27, Table Ref. Q1.11.4	Comment noting that while reference is made to the overarching HS2 Hybrid Bill, it is not clear how the specific effects of ID5 have been captured within the cumulative effects assessment. Comment noting that in the absence of this clarity, it cannot be assumed that localised cumulative effects have been properly considered.	All planning applications made under the HS2 hybrid bill were consolidated under a single ID 'HS2' which was then assessed. Only those planning applications that were made for the stretch of HS2 within 10km of the Proposed Development were considered, in line with the assessment methodology (ES Volume 2, Chapter 17: Cumulative Effects [EN010158/APP/6.2.3] [REP2-037]), and therefore localised cumulative effects were properly considered.	The Council considers that greater transparency regarding the relationship between individual HS2 planning applications and the cumulative assessment would have been beneficial, the explanation provided is noted and no further comments are made at this stage.
3.3.29	Page 28, Table Ref. Q1.13.3	Comment noting that while the Applicant has made updates to ES Appendix 5.5: Health and Wellbeing Summary Statement, Buckinghamshire Council considers their comments to only be partially addressed from previously identified concerns, particularly in relation to sub-population sensitivity. Comment noting that other substantive issues	The Applicant is content that the assessment provided within Annex A (Health Effects Report) of ES Volume 4, Appendix 5.5: Health and Wellbeing Summary Statement [EN010158/APP/6.4.6] is proportionate, in-line with ISEP guidance on assessment of health determinants and sensitivity of sub-populations at an appropriate scale. Notwithstanding this, the Applicant has provided some contextual amendments to Annex A (Health Effects Report) of ES Volume 4, Appendix 5.5: Health and Wellbeing Summary Statement [EN010158/APP/6.4.6] which has been submitted at Deadline 4. These amendments do not represent further, additional assessment, which the Applicant does not consider necessary, but are intended to make more explicit the approach and findings of the assessment, and to clearly set out the approach to linking receptor identification to effects to bespoke mitigation. This does not change the assessment of significance	Refer to response to 3.2.14.

Ref.	Page Reference	Summary Position	Applicant's Response	Buckinghamshire Council Comments
		raised at Deadline 2 remain unresolved, and Buckinghamshire Council's position on those matters is unchanged and requires further response from the Applicant.	concluded by Annex A (Health Effects Report) of ES Volume 4, Appendix 5.5: Health and Wellbeing Summary Statement [EN010158/APP/6.4.6] . The Applicant does not consider that further amendments are required to Annex A (Health Effects Report) of ES Volume 4, Appendix 5.5: Health and Wellbeing Summary Statement [EN010158/APP/6.4.6] and refers Buckinghamshire Council to the Applicant's Response to Deadline 2 Submissions [EN010158/APP/8.18] [REP3-051] .	
3.3.30	Page 29, Table Ref. Q1.13.4	Comment noting that Buckinghamshire Council agrees with the Applicant's approach of distinguishing population-level health assessment from individual receptors, and recognises the importance of considering differential sensitivity across sub-populations in line with guidance. Comment noting that while confidentiality around individual vulnerability is appropriate, the assessment would be strengthened by clearly demonstrating how assumptions about higher-sensitivity sub-populations are incorporated into conclusions, mitigation, and monitoring.	The Applicant is content that the assessment provided within Annex A (Health Effects Report) of ES Volume 4, Appendix 5.5: Health and Wellbeing Summary Statement [EN010158/APP/6.4.6] is proportionate and in-line with ISEP guidance on assessment of health determinants at an appropriate scale. Notwithstanding this, the Applicant has provided a response to residual issues raised by Buckinghamshire Council within its Response to Deadline 3 Submissions [EN010158/APP/8.22], submitted at Deadline 4, and has provided some contextual amendments to Annex A (Health Effects Report) of ES Volume 4, Appendix 5.5: Health and Wellbeing Summary Statement [EN010158/APP/6.4.6] also submitted at Deadline 4. These amendments do not represent further, additional assessment, which the Applicant does not consider is necessary, but are intended to make more explicit the approach and findings of the assessment, and to clearly set out the approach to linking receptor identification to effects to bespoke mitigation. This does not change the assessment of significance concluded by Annex A (Health Effects Report) of ES Volume 4, Appendix 5.5: Health and Wellbeing Summary Statement [EN010158/APP/6.4.6]. The Applicant considers that it has been made clear in Annex A (Health Effects Report) of ES Volume 4, Appendix 5.5: Health and Wellbeing Summary Statement [EN010158/APP/6.4.6] how the identified and prevalent sensitive sub-populations may be more sensitive to change relating to the significant environmental effects identified, and this is inherently accounted for within the assessment of effects on health and wellbeing.	Refer to response to 3.2.14.
3.3.31	Page 30, Table Ref. Q1.13.5	Comment noting that Buckinghamshire Council considers the incorporation of CSAG material in ES Appendix 5.5: Health and Wellbeing Summary Statement remains largely narrative	The Applicant considers that the addition of information provided by stakeholders (CSAG) should be treated proportionately and in the context of wider public health information that helps to identify the characteristics of populations and sub-populations. The information was added to provide more explicit reference to the prevalent sensitive sub-populations that ES Volume 4, Appendix 5.5: Health and Wellbeing Summary Statement [EN010158/APP/6.4.6] had already identified within the area and accounted for within the assessment.	Refer to response to 3.2.14.

Ref.	Page Reference	Summary Position	Applicant's Response	Buckinghamshire Council Comments
		and would benefit from clearer signposting demonstrating how this additional context informs pathway-specific conclusions, identification of higher-exposure groups, and any targeted mitigation or monitoring. Comment noting that while the Applicant has appropriately caveated the use of CSAG information as contextual, further iteration is required to transparently show how it influences sensitivity assumptions and resultant conclusions on significance for affected sub-populations.	As the sub-populations and their sensitivity had already inherently been accounted for within the public datasets and community feedback reported in the ES Volume 4, Appendix 5.5: Health and Wellbeing Summary Statement [EN010158/APP/6.4.6], the inclusion of this information did not alter the assessment of significance for health and wellbeing effects. The assessment within ES Volume 4, Appendix 5.5: Health and Wellbeing Summary Statement [EN010158/APP/6.4.6] clearly sets out the approach to identifying pathways and determinants of health, and identifies how sub-population characteristics (in this case predominantly age) influence the sensitivity to change in health and wellbeing as a result of each determinant. The assessment considers how in each case mitigation has been developed that addresses the determinant of health – in most cases this applies equally to populations and sensitive sub-populations, as mitigation is developed to reduce the potential for significant adverse effects on all receptors (e.g. users of PRow, or residents at home). Principally, as set out in within ES Volume 4, Appendix 5.5: Health and Wellbeing Summary Statement [EN010158/APP/6.4.6] the more prevalent (older) sub-population is likely to be more sensitive to change as there is likely to be a higher propensity to dependence on local connections and access to healthcare, a higher degree of social isolation, a more home-based resident population, and higher rates of conditions including respiratory disease and multimorbidity. The mitigation in-place to address (for example) air quality, traffic/transport and noise inherently considers sensitivity to the health of vulnerable sub-populations within thresholds that determine the mitigation to be applied. Buckinghamshire Council agrees that for the regulated physical health pathways of air quality, noise and vibration, traffic and access, land contamination and operational safety, no significant residual adverse effects are predicted following mitigation, subject to the delivery of the proposed design measures, DCO requirements and management plans. Notwithstanding this, there are determinants of health that are less regulated by standard health thresholds, are more subjective, and experience individually – for example the influence of landscape and visual change on users of PRow and residential property – and these are the only potentially significant effect pathways / determinants of health reported within ES Volume 4, Appendix 5.5: Health and Wellbeing Summary Statement [EN010158/APP/6.4.6].	

Ref.	Page Reference	Summary Position	Applicant's Response	Buckinghamshire Council Comments
			However, such effects may not result in the need for differential types of 'targeted' mitigation per sensitive sub-population – mitigation includes embedded and bespoke mitigation per receptor (i.e. inhabited property, or walked routes) that includes planting, offsets and screening detailed in the Design Approach Document [EN010158/APP/5.8.3] [CR1-014] and Outline LEMP [EN010158/APP/7.6.5], and secured by the Design Commitments [EN010158/APP/5.9.6]. For clarity, direct reference to these geographically-specific, receptor-led mitigations have been included within an update to Annex A (Health Effects Report) of ES Volume 4, Appendix 5.5: Health and Wellbeing Summary Statement [EN010158/APP/6.4.6] submitted at Deadline 4. In addition to this, the Outline LEMP [EN010158/APP/7.6.5] and Outline RoWAS [EN010158/APP/7.8.5] [CR1-026] secure important enhancement measures relevant to positive health pathways, including the provision of new permissive footpaths and increased accessibility, opportunities for recreation in the natural environment, and environmental improvements. To account for the ability for local affected residents to influence the specifics of mitigation that respond to their specific concerns, and therefore address potential health pathways, the Applicant has committed to consult with the Community Liaison Group (CLG) on relevant points of interest during the detailed design stage, prior to the submission and approval of the detailed design in accordance with Requirement 7 of the Draft DCO [EN010158/APP/3.1.7]. This could include, for example, the location and content of interpretation boards and waymarking signage and the options for planting alongside PRow and permissive paths, as appropriate – this enables a community-led, effect and geographical receptor-based approach to be enacted to develop and direct mitigation to those locations for the people likely to be affected the most. The Applicant is content that the assessment provided within Annex A (Health Effects Report) of ES Volume 4, Appendix 5.5: Health and Wellbeing Summary Statement [EN010158/APP/6.4.6] is proportionate, in-line with ISEP guidance on assessment of health determinants at an appropriate scale. Notwithstanding this, the Applicant has provided some contextual amendments to Annex A (Health Effects Report) of ES Volume 4, Appendix 5.5: Health and Wellbeing Summary Statement [EN010158/APP/6.4.6] which has been submitted at Deadline 4. These amendments do not represent further, additional assessment, which the Applicant does not consider is necessary, but are intended to make more explicit the approach and findings of the assessment, and to	

Ref.	Page Reference	Summary Position	Applicant's Response	Buckinghamshire Council Comments
			clearly set out the approach to linking receptor identification to effects to bespoke mitigation. This does not change the assessment of significance concluded by Annex A (Health Effects Report) of ES Volume 4, Appendix 5.5: Health and Wellbeing Summary Statement [EN010158/APP/6.4.6]. The Applicant does not consider that further amendments are required to Annex A (Health Effects Report) of ES Volume 4, Appendix 5.5: Health and Wellbeing Summary Statement [EN010158/APP/6.4.6] and refers Buckinghamshire Council to the Applicant's Response to Deadline 2 Submissions [EN010158/APP/8.18] [REP3-051].	
3.3.32	Page 34, Table Ref. Q1.17.2	Comment noting that Buckinghamshire Council supports the Examining Authority's request for greater clarity on baseline conditions for the agricultural economy, and considers the Population Chapter's assessment approach insufficiently transparent, particularly where multiple businesses are grouped into single receptor categories with generalised assumptions. Comment noting that the lack of clearly presented underlying evidence and incomplete baseline information reduces confidence in the robustness of the assessment, and that further detailed and transparent reporting is required to demonstrate how conclusions for combined receptor groups have been reached.	Please refer to the Applicant's response to Q2.14.8 of the Examining Authority's Second Written Questions. The Applicant has undertaken an assessment of the effects on the agricultural economy, and agricultural and non-agricultural businesses by applying a single set of sensitivity, magnitude and significance criteria per assessment determined by guidance referenced in ES Volume 2, Chapter 14: Population [EN010158/APP/6.2.4], and in-line with the approach set out in ES Volume 4, Appendix 5.1: EIA Scoping Report [EN010158/APP/6.4] [APP-079]. The agricultural businesses and non-agricultural businesses affected are a combined receptor group, but the assessment clearly acknowledges the individual components of these groups in descriptions of the baseline set out in Section 14.5 of ES Volume 2, Chapter 14: Population [EN010158/APP/6.2.4] and ES Volume 3, Figure 14.6a-b: Businesses within the community study area [EN010158/APP/6.3] [APP-073]. It should be noted that the Applicant and TCS Biosciences Ltd had signed a Non-Disclosure Agreement which limited the amount of detailed information that could be submitted within ES Volume 2, Chapter 14: Population [EN010158/APP/6.2.4]. Further information about the specific operations of specific businesses (for example Prestons Farms Ltd, TCS Biosciences Ltd and other landowners and tenant farms within the Order Limits) have been iteratively made available to the examination throughout the process, which weren't fully available to the Applicant at the point of submission. Notwithstanding this, the highest value of sensitivity ('Very High') has been afforded to TCS Biosciences Ltd and Preston Farms Ltd within the assessment, in order to account for the specific, highly sensitive and unique operations that occur at this site for the business. Indeed, all affected agricultural operations within the Order Limits are given 'Very High' sensitivity ratings, in accordance with the sensitivity criteria set out within Table 14.21 of ES Volume 2, Chapter 14: Population [EN010158/APP/6.2.4].	Refer to response to 3.2.7.

Ref.	Page Reference	Summary Position	Applicant's Response	Buckinghamshire Council Comments
			Where practicable, the Applicant has sought to adapt and design mitigation to address this iterative information about the operations of affected agricultural and non-agricultural businesses, which has been incorporated into subsequently amended and submitted responses and updated Management Plans, in order to give a fuller picture of the approach to understanding and addressing potential impacts.	
3.3.33	Page 35, Table Ref. Q1.17.6 and Page 37, Table Ref. Q1.17.10	Comment noting that Buckinghamshire Council disagrees with the Applicant's conclusion in the Population Chapter that construction (or operation) effects on the tourism economy would be non-significant, particularly given concerns regarding the robustness of the underlying landscape, visual, and cultural heritage assessments that inform the magnitude of impact. Comment noting that the reasoning for a slight adverse residual effect is not clearly explained, and that the assessment fails to adequately link impacts on the tourism resource to accommodation demand, resulting in insufficient justification of the conclusions reached.	Effects on the value and volume of the tourist economy and its components are considered in ES Volume 2, Chapter 14: Population [EN010158/APP/6.2.4] in accordance with NPS EN-1. This includes an assessment of the potential for the change in the tourist/visitor economy at an economic scale, driven by changes to facilities and assets that contribute to the draw and experience of tourists in the local area, contributing to the value and volume of the wider tourist economy. This draws on effects reported across the ES, that may influence the tourist economy and its components including: • Visual effects, noise, vibration, air quality effects experienced by people; and • Where activities in the area could reduce accessibility or present physical obstructions to recreational and tourist facilities including accommodation, natural and cultural heritage, PRoW and tourist attractions. The scale and diversity of the wider tourist economy is broad, and its sensitivity is considered to be medium, in-line with the sensitivity criteria set out within Table 14.21 of ES Volume 2, Chapter 14: Population [EN010158/APP/6.2.4] as it has some capacity to absorb or respond to change and may result in some perceptible socio-economic loss or gain. There is no standard guidance for the sensitivity for the tourist economy, but the Applicant has taken into account relevant legislation, statutory designations or classifications, policy and published data and research for the tourist economy. Its conclusion is informed by the detail of the value, volume, components and diversity of the tourist / visitor economy set out in Section 14.2 and 14.5 in ES Volume 2, Chapter 14: Population [EN010158/APP/6.2.4]. The assessment draws on and is influenced by sensitivity criteria relating to individual components of the tourist economy likely to be affected, which may be more or less sensitive depending on the criteria applicable to each assessment, but considered in the context of effects on the tourist economy in-line with the policy requirements of NPS EN-1.	Refer to response to 3.2.7.

Ref.	Page Reference	Summary Position	Applicant's Response	Buckinghamshire Council Comments
			Statistics that demonstrate the scale and diversity of the visitor economy in the relatively localised context of the Proposed Development include: • There are a total of 169 visitor attractions within Buckinghamshire, with only 4 of these attractions falling within 'Winslow and Villages' and only 17 falling within 'Buckingham and Villages' (both areas that the Order Limits falls within). • Almost half of the visitor attractions within Buckinghamshire are historic houses, museums or art galleries, while the visitor attractions sector is also driven by a range of natural attractions including country parks and gardens (9%), farm and rare breed destinations (7%) and a range of both participant and spectator sports venues (20%) • When compared to other counties within the South East region, Buckinghamshire is recorded to have the second lowest number of trips per year and spend per year • There are 22,310 tourist jobs in Buckinghamshire • There are 1,464 restaurants, cafes or pubs within Buckinghamshire, with around 154 of these facilities (or 10%) falling within either 'Buckingham and Villages' or 'Winslow and Villages'. While change may be experienced by some receptors, this is limited geographically (to six groups of PRoW (around a third of PRoW in the Community Study Area) and one recreational receptor – Hogshaw Farm - experiencing significant visual effects) and managed by embedded and additional mitigation as far as reasonably practicable including new hedgerow planting, structural native woodland planting belts, offsets, lighting management, design commitments, and acoustic barriers. These measures are listed at Table 10.9 of ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010158/APP/6.2.3] and secured by the Design Commitments [EN010158/APP/5.9.6] and/or Outline LEMP [EN010158/APP/7.6.5]. In terms of the significant adverse visual effects referenced above – it is noted in ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010158/APP/6.2.3] that: a) This is a residual effect following mitigation. Embedded mitigation (referenced above) includes a 15m width belt of structural native woodland (early) planting along southern boundary of Fields D8, D9, D19 and D26 to soften and partially screen views of Solar PV modules, Satellite Collector Compound and BESS Hogshaw Farm. b) The effect would result in a 'large' scale of visual and landscape change during construction and in year 1 of operation, reducing to small (landscape) and medium/small (visual) by year 10 for viewpoint 19. For	

Ref.	Page Reference	Summary Position	Applicant's Response	Buckinghamshire Council Comments
			viewpoint 43 (pygmy goat enclosure – illustrating typical views from the attraction) this would be a medium scale of change at each phase (potentially large/medium during construction). c) During construction - Views of construction activity would be predominantly screened and filtered to the lower lying fields to the western boundary of the attraction, with more open views to the elevated ridge of land to the north west, primarily consisting of Fields D11, D14 and D15 as evidenced by Viewpoint 43. Views of construction activity to the north, in Fields D7 to D9, would largely be screened by intervening built form and vegetation to the northern edge of the attraction, albeit views from the car parks would potentially be more open. Construction activity to within Field D4 would also be increasingly visible to the more north western extents of the attraction as would potential views of activity to the Primary Construction Compounds in Fields D7 to D9. Overall, there would be a large/medium to medium scale of change across an intermediate extent of the wider visitor attraction set out in ES Volume 3, Figure 10.9b: Solar PV Modules Parcel 1 – Detailed Screening [EN010158/APP/6.3] [APP-069] d) During operation - Although Fields D19 and D26 are located to the western boundary of the Hogshaw Farm and Wildlife Park the Proposed Development would be often screened and filtered in views to these lower lying fields by existing field boundary vegetation. More open views of the Proposed Development would be experienced above this vegetation towards the elevated ridge of land to the north west, primarily consisting of Fields D11, D14 and D15. Views of the Proposed Development, including the BESS, to the north, in Fields D7 to D9, would largely be screened by intervening built form and vegetation to the northern edge of the attraction, albeit views from the car parks would potentially be more open. The Proposed Development would also be increasingly visible to within Field D4 to the more north western extents of the attraction as would potential views of activity the BESS in Fields D8 and D9 and the and Satellite Collector Compound in Fields D17. New mitigation planting to the eastern edge of Parcel 2, in the form of new tree belts and hedgerows established to 3.5m, would provide some additional screening and filtering of views to the lower levels of the Proposed Development, reducing the scale of change to medium across views. Design measures are bespoke to the sensitivity of specific receptors, effects and locations across the Site – for example, while perimeter fencing surrounding the Solar PV development will be offset at least 10m from either side of existing PRoW, the offset would be <u>at least 30m</u> from the Mid Shires Way and North Bucks Way within Fields E21/E22 and E23;	

Ref.	Page Reference	Summary Position	Applicant's Response	Buckinghamshire Council Comments
			and there would be specific measures such as a 15m width belt of structural native woodland (early) planting along western boundary of Fields E11, E20, E22 and E23 to soften and partially screen views of Solar PV modules, Main Collector Compound and Rosefield Substation from Botolph Claydon, Sion Hill Farm, Bernwood Jubilee Way, North Buckinghamshire Way/Midshires Way and PRow ECL/4/1. It is recognised that access to and enjoyment of the natural environment is one component of the tourist draw for the wider area – but as set out above, a range of attractions contribute more to the visitor economy. The experience of users of PRow on some routes within the wider area would be changed as a result of construction activity and the presence of the Proposed Development during the operational phase. However, the Environmental Statement confirms that this is limited to significant effects on visual amenity on a limited number of routes, with other environmental effects unlikely to be significant. Enhancements will be provided to the long-term accessibility of the area in order to promote and enhance access to the natural environment in areas that are not currently accessible to the community. This includes the creation of four new permissive paths totalling 3km. The routes would improve community connectivity between the existing public highway and community areas such as East Claydon, Middle Claydon and Botolph Claydon in the east and Calvert in the west. They would: • Increase the options for circular walks south from the village; • Allow access to Knowl Hill, which has not previously been publicly accessible, and elevated views towards Claydon House; • Allow users to experience the more open views retained from Bernwood Jubilee Way; and • Include a new public route accessible by horses across Parcel 2 which connects the existing PRow Bridleway (reference 'ECL/10/5') before tracking south west along the proposed internal access track through Field D27 and along PRow Footpath (reference 'QUA/41/1') to join PRow Bridleway (reference 'QUA/40/2' and 'QUA/40/3') (approximate length 0.9 km, of which 0.3 km follows the alignment of PRow Footpath reference 'QUA/41/1'). Assessment of the potential for change to access and environmental amenity has been undertaken where there may be the potential to affect the viability of tourist-facing businesses as a result of significant changes. These effects are limited geographically and not significant, with the exception of a small number of significant residual adverse effects relating	

Ref.	Page Reference	Summary Position	Applicant's Response	Buckinghamshire Council Comments
			to landscape and visual amenity during the operational (including maintenance) phase.	
3.3.34	Page 36, Table Ref. Q1.17.8	Comment noting that Buckinghamshire Council supports the need for greater clarity on the professional judgement applied in determining significance of effects in the Population Chapter and considers the current assessment insufficiently transparent (particularly where multiple agricultural businesses and landholdings are grouped into combined receptor categories). Comment noting that the approach does not adequately reflect individual circumstances and that further detailed assessment and reporting is required to clearly demonstrate how conclusions for combined receptor types have been reached.	This comment has been addressed in response to Ref. 3.3.32 above, and in response to Q2.14.8 within the Applicant's Response to the Examining Authority's Second Written Questions [EN010158/APP/8.23] .	Refer to response to 3.2.7.
3.3.35	Page 37, Table Ref. Q1.17.9	Comment noting that Buckinghamshire Council disagrees with the Applicant's categorisation of impact magnitude for agricultural businesses and landholdings in the Population Chapter, particularly in light of evidence presented at ISH1 indicating materially different stakeholder	This comment has been addressed in response to Ref. 3.3.32 above, and in response to Q2.14.8 within the Applicant's Response to the Examining Authority's Second Written Questions [EN010158/APP/8.23] .	Refer to response to 3.2.7.

Ref.	Page Reference	Summary Position	Applicant's Response	Buckinghamshire Council Comments
		views on viability and effects. Comment noting that this divergence in understanding suggests the Applicant's assessment may understate impacts and requires further justification and alignment with stakeholder evidence.		
3.3.36	Page 38, Table Ref. Q1.17.11	Comment noting that the Applicant has amended terminology but has not demonstrated how a 40-year operational timeframe has been meaningfully considered within the assessment, with no corresponding changes to impact magnitude or significance conclusions. Comment noting that further assessment is required to transparently set out how long-term effects (particularly on tourism linked to landscape, heritage, and recreation) have informed conclusions for combined receptor types.	A full position regarding the Applicant's assessment of effects on the tourist economy is set out in Ref. 3.3.33 above. The duration of the operational phase has been considered as an aspect within the assessment of effects on the tourism economy. This is a long-term, temporary effect over the 40-year operational phase of the Proposed Development – this duration had already been considered within ES Volume 2, Chapter 14: Population [EN010158/APP/6.2.4] . The Applicant's assessment considers that access to the natural environment, recreational use of PRoW, cultural heritage and landscape quality are all aspects contributing towards the value and volume of the tourist economy in Buckinghamshire. In order to assess the potential for changes to these environmental aspects, the assessment within ES Volume 2, Chapter 14: Population [EN010158/APP/6.2.4] has reviewed the significance of operational phase effects on receptors relevant to these aspects, which inherently considers the duration of these effects, and has identified that significant effects are limited and localised, particularly in the context of the tourist economy which is broad, diverse and resilient. While change may be experienced by some individual components contributing towards the tourist economy, this is limited geographically (to six groups of PRoW (around a third of PRoW in the Community Study Area) and one recreational receptor – Hogshaw Farm - experiencing significant visual effects) and managed by embedded and additional mitigation as far as reasonably practicable including new hedgerow planting, structural native woodland planting belts, offsets, lighting management, design commitments, and acoustic barriers. These measures are listed at Table 10.9 of ES Volume 2, Chapter 10: Landscape and Visual [EN010158/APP/6.2.3] and secured by the Design	Refer to response to 3.2.7 (re: Population) and 3.2.14 (regarding the Technical Note provided to the Applicant following ISH3 demonstrating how the Council wishes to see the expression of the lived experience of the Proposed Development reflected in the Human Health reporting).

Ref.	Page Reference	Summary Position	Applicant's Response	Buckinghamshire Council Comments
			Commitments [EN010158/APP/5.9.6] and/or Outline LEMP [EN010158/APP/7.6.5]. It is noted that during the operational phase: • There would be slight beneficial effects on community access (PRoW and Permissive Paths) and their users (WCH), through the creation of new permissive paths would also increase community accessibility and recreational opportunities in an area that is currently inaccessible. The routes would improve community connectivity between the existing public highway and community areas such as East Claydon, Middle Claydon and Botolph Claydon in the east and Calvert in the west; • Landscape mitigation (i.e. planting and hedgerows) will establish to reduce the magnitude of change for some landscape and visual receptors by year 10 of the operational phase.	
3.3.37	Page 38, Table Ref. Q1.18.3	Comment noting that Buckinghamshire Council disagrees with the Applicant's interpretation of national policy, including the assertion that consideration of agricultural land for food production is no longer required, and recommends that this statement be removed from the Soils Chapter and the Planning Statement. Comment noting that claims regarding soil benefits under solar development are not sufficiently evidenced. and that further information is required on historical cropping outputs and their contribution to the food system to properly assess impacts.	The assertion that consideration of agricultural land for food production is no longer required under national policy has been removed from ES Volume 2, Chapter 12: Soil [EN010158/APP/6.2.3]. The assertion has also been removed from the Planning Statement [EN010158/APP/5.7.5] at Deadline 4 at Buckinghamshire Council's request. Information regarding the existing baseline land use, including specifics on agricultural production and crop rotations, will be included within a separate document at Deadline 5. With regards to soil benefits under solar development, while the cited research does indicate that there may be a reduction in photosynthesis, biomass accumulation and carbon accumulation in areas directly underneath solar PV modules, there will still be a large area of managed grassland between and around solar PV modules that will improve soil nutrient retention, carbon storage and water retention where photosynthesis is unimpeded.	The Council welcomes the removal of the statement about the consideration of food production under national policy. The Council also welcomes the publication of a document at Deadline 5 outlining the specifics of agricultural production. The Council recognises that the Applicant expects only a minor beneficial effect on soil and does not claim significant benefits. The Council therefore accepts the description of potential benefits in ES Volume 2, Chapter 12: Soil [REP4-034].

Ref.	Page Reference	Summary Position	Applicant's Response	Buckinghamshire Council Comments
		Further comment requesting a written review of the cropping outputs for land proposed for the development over the past 5 years be provided for along with a discussion on what markets these crops are supplied too.		
3.3.38	Page 40, Table Ref. Q1.18.5	Comment noting that Buckinghamshire Council disagrees with the Applicant's claim of soil benefits, highlighting evidence that microbial improvement, carbon storage, and water retention under solar PV are uncertain and may in fact be negatively affected, particularly where construction leads to long-term soil disturbance and compaction. Comment noting that further clarification is required from the Applicant on the extent to which agricultural grazing has been secured within the Proposed Development, including how this will be maintained in practice and whether it will meaningfully support soil condition and agricultural productivity over time.	With regards to soil benefits under solar development, while the cited research does indicate that there may be a reduction in photosynthesis, biomass accumulation and carbon accumulation in areas directly underneath Solar PV modules, there will still be a large area of managed grassland between and around Solar PV modules that will improve soil nutrient retention, carbon storage and water retention where photosynthesis is unimpeded. Grazing is the Applicant's preferred method of grassland management and initial discussions have taken place with local suppliers who could graze the Proposed Development. Final agreements will be secured following consent and prior to operation of the Proposed Development. Where implemented, grazing has the potential to support soil condition over time by maintaining vegetative cover, reducing the need for mechanical cutting, and limiting soil disturbance associated with intensive cultivation. This can contribute to the maintenance of soil structure and may support the recovery of soils following disturbance from construction activities. In addition, grazing can support nutrient cycling through the return of organic matter to the soil, helping to maintain soil fertility and biological activity over time. It should also be noted that the assessment of effects presented within ES Volume 2, Chapter 12: Soil [EN010158/APP/6.2.3] does not rely on the delivery of grazing as a mitigation measure. The protection of soil resources and maintenance of soil function is instead secured through the implementation of the Outline SMP [EN010158/APP/7.7.3] [REP2-069], which controls soil handling, trafficking, and reinstatement during construction.	The Council recognises that the Applicant expects only a minor beneficial effect on soil and does not claim significant benefits. The Council therefore accepts the description of potential benefits. It is noted that the Applicant has not fully secured grazing and that it will be secured following consent.

Ref.	Page Reference	Summary Position	Applicant's Response	Buckinghamshire Council Comments
3.3.39	Page 40, Table Ref. Q1.18.6	Comment noting that climate change is likely to alter soil conditions over the lifetime of the Proposed Development, with wetter winters and drier summers increasing the risk of degradation processes such as erosion within the operational period. Comment noting that these risks should be explicitly considered in relation to land drainage and long-term land management, to ensure that soil function and agricultural use are not adversely affected over time.	Climate change projections, including changes in rainfall patterns and seasonal variability, have been considered in the embedded design and mitigation measures for the Proposed Development. In particular, the Outline Drainage Strategy [EN010158/APP/7.11.4] [REP3-040] incorporates the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) to manage surface water runoff across the Site. These measures reduce the risk of localised erosion during periods of increased rainfall intensity, therefore supporting the soil stability, and reduce the potential for erosion under future climatic conditions. In addition, the Proposed Development would maintain a grassland cover across the majority of the Site during operation. This provides protection of the soil surface, reduces susceptibility to erosion during heavy rainfall events, and supports soil moisture retention during drier periods. The Applicant considers that the combination of drainage design, vegetation management, and soil protection measures provide an appropriate framework to protect soils against degradation processes within the operational period, and ensure that soil function and agricultural use are not adversely affected over time in line with climate change projections.	The Council notes that the Applicant has updated ES Volume 2, Chapter 12: Soil [REP4-034] to include a description of the impacts of climate change on soil under the proposed developed.
3.3.40	Page 41, Table Ref. Q1.18.9	Comment noting that Paragraph 12.8.13 the Soils Chapter states that <i>"for the purposes of this assessment, it has been assumed that Green Infrastructure has the potential to be permanent"</i>. Therefore, the assessment should be assuming that there is potential for BMV land to be permanently required for green and blue infrastructure.	The Applicant notes the Examining Authority's comments regarding the treatment of green and blue infrastructure within ES Volume 2, Chapter 12: Soil [EN010158/APP/6.2.3]. The wording in Paragraph 12.8.13 has been changed for clarity: Green and blue infrastructure is assumed to be temporary, as following decommissioning, these areas would be handed back to the landowner. Furthermore, the soils affected by green and blue infrastructure would remain capable of reinstatement to their original condition following decommissioning, as secured through the Outline SMP [EN010158/APP/7.7.3] [REP2-069].	The Applicant has clarified on a Teams call that areas targeted for blue infrastructure are pre-existing or within field margins so do not contribute to agricultural productivity. The Applicant has updated their document to state that green infrastructure is considered a temporary effect. The Council is satisfied that this matter can be closed.
3.3.41	Page 41, Table Ref. Q1.18.10	Comment noting that the Applicant has not updated the Soil Chapter's assessment of impacts on ALC Grade 2 land in accordance with the	The assessment of impacts on ALC Grade 2 land within ES Volume 2, Chapter 12: Soil [EN010158/APP/6.2.3] has concluded that a negligible magnitude of impact is the correct classification. The criteria related to temporary developments is a minor magnitude of impact if the impact is a temporary, reversible loss of soil-related features,	The Applicant conducts a contradictory assessment of Grade 2 land compared with Grades 3a and 3b land. For Grades 2, 3a and 3b land, the Applicant states that there will be a temporary reduction in availability of agricultural land. However, they state that Grades 3a and 3b will experience a minor impact while Grade 2 land (very high sensitivity) will experience a negligible impact. Overall, 3.01 ha of

Ref.	Page Reference	Summary Position	Applicant's Response	Buckinghamshire Council Comments
		agreed IEMA methodology, which indicates the magnitude should be classified as minor rather than negligible. Comment noting that this would result in a moderate adverse and therefore significant effect, and that the small proportion of Grade 2 land relative to the overall site does not justify diluting its assessment.	or a negligible magnitude of impact if 'no discernible loss or reduction or improvement of soil functions or soil volumes that restrict current or proposed land use'. The extent of ALC Grade 2 land is limited (3.01ha), and there is no loss or reduction in soil function or soil volumes, as all Grade 2 land is either untouched, under a grass sward in the areas of Solar PV development, or hosting ecological mitigation/enhancement. Furthermore, all construction will take place over a short period of time in summer when soils are least susceptible to damage, and construction activities are subject to committed mitigation in the Outline SMP [EN010158/APP/7.7.3] [REP2-069]. A negligible magnitude of impact on a very high sensitivity receptor results in a slight adverse and not significant effect. The justification of negligible magnitude comes from a use of professional judgement that the small area of the receptor and land use does not justify a minor magnitude of effect.	Grade 2 land will be temporarily affected by construction, 2.4 ha of which will be under solar PV panels and 0.61 ha hosting ecological mitigation. This falls into the category of a minor impact according to IEMA guidance. In providing justification for assessing the impact on ALC Grade 2 land as negligible, the Applicant confuses their assessment of soil structure with ALC. They state that there will be no loss or reduction in soil on areas of ALC Grade 2 land. However, soil structure and volume are not the basis for assessing loss of land from agricultural production. It is the availability of agricultural land for agricultural production that is the basis and paragraph 12.5.17 states that areas used for key infrastructure such as solar PV panels will be unavailable for agricultural production for the operational lifetime of the project. The Council is therefore not satisfied that the Applicant has understood ALC adequately and feel that they have adopted an approach of "diluting" BMV impacts by downgrading any likely effects.
3.3.42	Page 42, Table Ref. Q1.18.11	Comment requesting that the Applicant provide commentary on how the operation and maintenance practices for the solar PV modules will support sustainable agriculture.	During the operational phase, maintenance activities associated with the Solar PV modules are limited in frequency and do not involve significant ground disturbance. Access for maintenance is restricted to defined routes and would use appropriate plant, as detailed in the Outline SMP [EN010158/APP/7.7.3] [REP2-069]. Furthermore, the Proposed Development would maintain a continuous vegetative cover across the majority of the Site throughout the operational period. This approach supports soil protection by reducing exposure to erosion, maintaining soil structure, and promoting infiltration. Because the soils will remain in-situ throughout operation, following decommissioning soils will be capable of supporting sustainable agricultural production. Following the completion of construction activities, all grid connection areas will be returned to the landowners for the continuation of agricultural production where applicable.	The Council welcomes careful soil management and would like to stress the commitment within the Outline SMP [REP2-069] for a grass sward to be established at least six months prior to construction across as much of the land as practicable. It will be crucial to time sowing of the grass sward and the start of construction appropriately to ensure establishment of ground cover and protection of soil.
3.3.43	Page 43, Table Ref. Q1.19.15	Comment noting that while the oCTMP appropriately sets out its intended scope and objectives, a draft agreement template should be provided to give clarity on how these requirements will be secured in practice.	The Applicant will develop a Wear and Tear agreement with Buckinghamshire Council post-consent and prior to construction as is normally the case for infrastructure projects. It is not considered necessary or usual to develop such an agreement during the DCO examination.	The agreement can be put in place prior to commencement of works after the order is consented. The Council supports the urgent defects response times suggested within the oCTMP, and expects the applicants to ensure that any funding arrangements are set up in such a way as to ensure that works can be completed quickly with any compensating funds being made available without excess delay.

Ref.	Page Reference	Summary Position	Applicant's Response	Buckinghamshire Council Comments
		Comment noting that discussions at the issue specific hearing suggest agreement may be reached by Deadline 4 on managing wear and tear from construction and decommissioning, and further detail is therefore expected on how this will be addressed.		

Table 3.4: Buckinghamshire Council (Responses to comments on local impact reports (LIRs)) [REP3-055]

Ref.	Page Reference	Summary Position	Applicant's Response	Buckinghamshire Council Comments
3.4.24	Page 29, Ref. 3.56	Comment noting the preference for a clearly evidenced feature specific buffer strategy that is demonstrated on the value, sensitivity and long-term protection of affected features.	Comment is noted by the Applicant. The Applicant considers that the buffers from hedgerows and trees are bespoke taking full account of the sensitivity of the location and the protecting the hedgerows and root protection zones of mature trees which are such a prominent feature of the landscape, in addition the buffers have been increased in number of locations specifically due to concerns raised by consultees. Buffers from hedgerows linking Shrubs Wood, Sheephouse Wood and Decoypond Wood (B3/B7, B6/B7, B7/B8, B7/B10, B10/B11, B10/B9, B8/B9) have been increased from 10m to 15m and buffers along D29 and part of D28 between Finemere Wood and Runts Wood have been increased to 30m in recognition of the importance of protecting the commuting corridors between these woodland. The Applicant's position regards buffer widths and likely effectiveness has been articulated on numerous occasions within Applicant's Response to Written Representations [EN010158/APP/8.12] [REP2-086] for example 3.1.26 page 12. Please also see response to Ref. 3.1.3.	The Applicant response is noted. The Council maintains that buffers should be measured from edge of the relevant retained feature and should be sufficient having regard to VALP policy and function and sensitivity of the feature in question.
3.4.30	Page 35, Ref 3.68	Comment acknowledging the updated drainage material however, noting that without clearly defined buffers and detailed arboricultural methods, there remains uncertainty how works near retained features would avoid impacts on RPAs, buffer function, and runoff.	Following further engagement with Buckinghamshire Council, the Applicant has updated the Outline CEMP [EN010158/APP/7.2.5] at Deadline 4 to commit to methods of working during any drainage works, where the installation of the drainage is within a retained tree Root Protection Area (RPA) and cannot be avoided through detailed design. These include ensuring works are undertaken under the supervision of a suitably qualified arboriculturist and only permitting storage of materials, spoil or plant within RPA's where protection measures have been implemented in accordance with BC 5837:2012.	Applicant's response is noted. The Council will review whether the updated oCEMP wording provides sufficient controls for drainage works within or close to RPAs and retained arboricultural features when further information is submitted at deadline 5.

Ref.	Page Reference	Summary Position	Applicant's Response	Buckinghamshire Council Comments
3.4.31	Page 38, Ref. 3.76	Comment noting that the plans identify areas of potential conflict with retained trees, indicating anticipated impacts at the outline stage. It considers that generic offsets do not adequately demonstrate how hedgerow trees and their RPAs will be accommodated in practice, and therefore seeks greater feature-specific clarity.	The Applicant points to response Ref. 3.2.10 and clarity will be detailed within updates to the Outline CEMP [EN010158/APP/7.2.5] at Deadline 4.	Applicant's response is noted. The Council will review whether the updated oCEMP wording provides sufficient controls for drainage works within or close to RPAs and retained arboricultural features at deadline 5.
3.4.33	Page 44, Ref 4.1	Buckinghamshire Council notes that while visual impacts from Claydon House itself may be partly screened, the proposals would still affect the wider setting of the Grade I listed asset and its associated heritage features, including the church and surrounding estate landscape. It concludes that these impacts would harm important visual, spatial and associative relationships, resulting in harm towards the middle of the less than substantial scale.	The Applicant has considered the effects of changes in wider setting and concludes that the harm to Claydon House as a result of these changes will be at the lower end of less than substantial, a conclusion supported by Historic England (Statement of Common Ground with Historic England [EN010158/APP/5.16.3]) and National Trust (Draft Statement of Common Ground with National Trust [EN010158/APP/5.17.2] [REP2-020]).	No further comment, other than Council would point out that Historic England's remit is limited to grade I and grade II* designations and that in the summary of the engagement set out in the Statement of Common Gound agreed between the Applicant and Historic England [REP4-017] deals with views and screening rather than the wider relationships with associated assets and approaches.
3.4.36	Page 48, Ref 4.6	Comment that Buckinghamshire Council agree that with impacts of other projects on Pond Farmhouse are unlikely to elevate that from the applicant's proposals above the high end of less than substantial harm. However, the approaches to the farm and its western setting have and are impacted by other projects, as are Rosehill Farmhouse and Blackmoorhill Farmhouse.	The Applicant welcomes agreement that the cumulative effect on Pond Farmhouse is not higher than the effect of the Proposed Development in isolation (being moderate significance and significant), but maintains that this harm is at the middle of the scale of less than substantial. Likewise, whilst the Applicant acknowledges that HS2 and to some degree East West Rail will alter the approaches to Pond Farmhouse, Rosehill Farmhouse and Blackmoorhill Farmhouse, the Applicant considers that no cumulative effect will occur as stated in ES Volume 2, Chapter 17: Cumulative Effects [EN010158/APP/6.2.3] [REP2-037] .	The Council's assessment of Pond Farmhouse is that there would be harm from the cumulative projects, especially HS2. However, the severity of change from the Proposed Development is considerable (see the Council's previous submissions on Pond Farmhouse) and the harm would not be elevated above the upper end of less than substantial harm.
3.4.38	Page 50, Ref. 4.14	Exploration of the possibility of increased screening on the sides of the scheme facing away from Botolph Claydon to better screen longer views from the higher ground to east and south east would be welcomed by Buckinghamshire Council.	The planting within the area of the Site facing away from Botolph Claydon (the north of Parcel 2) can be further reviewed with Buckinghamshire Council at the detailed design stage, when the detailed layout of the Proposed Development is fully understood, as part of the detailed Landscape and Ecological Management Plan, in accordance with the Outline LEMP [EN010158/APP/7.6.5] .	This is welcomed by the Council, which appreciates that this is complex due to conflicting environmental considerations between topics.

Ref.	Page Reference	Summary Position	Applicant's Response	Buckinghamshire Council Comments
3.4.39	Page 51, Ref 4.15	Comment that the way in which especially buildings, their architecture and location were designed to interact with their surroundings historically, both functionally and aesthetically, is sometimes not addressed, leading to differences in interpretation of the impact/harm between Buckinghamshire Council and the Applicant.	The Applicant has given consideration to the way buildings were designed to interact with their surroundings historically, however guidance defines setting as “the surroundings in which an asset is experienced” and therefore the baseline for assessment is how the asset interacts with its surroundings at present. Whilst acknowledging that historic relationships are important, where they are no longer appreciated due to later changes within the setting (e.g. the tall hedgerow and roadside trees east of Botolph House reducing visibility of and from the house compared to its original setting) the contribution that these relationships make to significance is lowered.	The Council disagrees. These original and historic relationships can be experienced now. The detail of these surviving elements of setting have been set out in [REP4-090] . Referring to the Applicant's example of Botolph House, there currently remain views from the principal, upper floor of the building through the space north of the pond opposite on Botyl Road (where there is a gap in the screen) that preserve this vital original relationship and render it legible. It has been encroached upon by later planting (the hedge and trees) to its south. This means that a vital element of the building's contributory setting survives in only part of the views from the house, with a small portion of its setting making a strong contribution to its significance, and further diminution of this surviving relationship views would make it less legible and cause significant harm to the house's setting. The agricultural nature and largely unchanged landscape to the east and south east is also currently understandable in Botolph House's setting, despite not being visible from some areas around the building, where the contribution of the original setting to significance is diminished, where it is screened from view. The elements of Botolph House's setting and indeed contributory elements in the settings of many heritage assets, are not only experienced in static views but when moving kinetically around an asset. The agricultural character of the settings of assets is therefore experienced where the viewer has passed from a visible to a screened area and can appreciate the architecture of the building and how it was supposed to see and be seen and experienced. Historic England's guidance on setting indicates that setting includes how an asset is experienced in its widest sense, including understanding of its history and historical relationships and legible spatial relationships.
3.4.40	Page 51, Ref 4.17	The Council consider that some of the detailed assessments in Annex D of ES Volume 4, Appendix 9.1: Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment and Setting Assessment [EN010158/APP/6.4.2] lack sufficient detail, especially in relation to the architecture of the heritage assets, their significance and how various aspects of their settings contribute to their significance.	The Applicant has provided further details within the update to Annex D of ES Volume 4, Appendix 9.1: Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment and Setting Assessment [EN010158/APP/6.4.3] submitted at Deadline 4 but maintains that the harm to the significance of the assets is unaltered by this update.	In [REP4-061] the Applicant has added more contributory elements of setting to their assessment than they appear to have had previously that would be impacted, yet in the assessment the Applicant has not identified any additional or altered impacts/change or effects, despite there being more elements of significance and contributory setting (e.g. the stone facades of the cottages and the obvious role they were therefore designed to have in the setting of Claydon House, the earlier date of Pond Farmhouse). The only change to the assessment of impacts and effects in Chapter 9 of the ES [REP4-030] is the addition of the previously omitted grade II* St Mary's Church. The Council consider that the changes to the baseline understanding would have led to at least some changes to the impact assessment.
3.4.42	Page 62, Ref. 4.34	Comment that the issue with the accuracy of the assessment to relate to the analysis of the	The assessment of Claydon House has been agreed with Historic England (Statement of	See comments above in line 3.4.33.

Ref.	Page Reference	Summary Position	Applicant's Response	Buckinghamshire Council Comments
		contribution of the wider setting to the significance of Claydon House, its park (both within and outside the registered park and conservation area boundaries) and constituent heritage assets.	Common Ground with Historic England [EN010158/APP/5.16.3] and National Trust (Draft Statement of Common Ground with National Trust [EN010158/APP/5.17.2] [REP2-020]).	
3.4.46	Page 65, Ref 5.8	Comment noting that the CTMP requires coordination with HS2.	The Statement of Common Ground with High Speed 2 Limited [EN010158/APP/5.19] [REP1-030] commits to this engagement.	Buckinghamshire Council notes the Applicant's confirmation that engagement and coordination with HS2 is secured through the Statement of Common Ground with High Speed 2 Limited and is satisfied that this matter of engagement has been addressed.
3.4.47	Page 67 – Page 71 , Ref. 6.1, 6.2 and 6.4	Comment noting that the Council acknowledges that the Applicant has improved the clarity of its health assessment through additional material and updates, however, it is noted that these changes are largely descriptive. Buckinghamshire Council maintains its position that there is a need for: • Clearer signposting as to how sensitivity is carried through consistently into discrete receptor definition (place-based high-exposure receptors), significance judgements, and targeted mitigation/monitoring for the most affected groups • Clearer methodological signposting (including how the cited ISEP SIA in EIA guidance underpins social cohesion conclusions); • Improved prominence and ES-wide reporting of health conclusions (including updating the Non-Technical Summary); • Further avoidance and targeted mitigation to address residual significant landscape/visual and PRoW-related wellbeing effects (including cumulative effects) through a robust place-based assessment of geographically higher-exposure receptors (including the specific receptors and communities previously identified by the Council)	The Applicant has provided its position regarding signposting as to how sensitivity is carried through consistently into discrete receptor definition (place-based high-exposure receptors), significance judgements, and targeted mitigation/monitoring for the most affected groups under item 3.2.13 in this table. The ISEP (Social Impact Assessment in EIA) Guidance has been inherently applied within Annex A (Health Effects Report) of ES Volume 4, Appendix 5.5: Health and Wellbeing Summary Statement [EN010158/APP/6.4.6] – in respect of the approach to health and wellbeing effects, that guidance specifically refers back to other ISEP Guidance to be followed when considering effects on health and wellbeing, that is regularly referred to within the assessment. In specific reference to social cohesion, the Applicant considers that the referenced guidance does not set out methodology, baseline indicators or significance criteria for assessments on social cohesion, and as such considers the approach taken within Annex A (Health Effects Report) of ES Volume 4, Appendix 5.5: Health and Wellbeing Summary Statement [EN010158/APP/6.4.6] to be proportionate and relevant to all available guidance. The Applicant has provided its position regarding the approach to prominence of the assessment of health and wellbeing within the ES and Non-Technical Summary in response to the ExA's Written Question (Q2.10.1) – see Applicant's Response to the Examining Authority's Second	Refer to response to 3.2.14.

Ref.	Page Reference	Summary Position	Applicant's Response	Buckinghamshire Council Comments
			Written Questions [EN010158/APP/8.23] (Table 4-10). The Applicant is content that the assessment provided within Annex A (Health Effects Report) of ES Volume 4, Appendix 5.5: Health and Wellbeing Summary Statement [EN010158/APP/6.4.6] is proportionate, in-line with ISEP guidance on assessment of health determinants at an appropriate scale. Notwithstanding this, the Applicant has provided some contextual amendments to Annex A (Health Effects Report) of ES Volume 4, Appendix 5.5: Health and Wellbeing Summary Statement [EN010158/APP/6.4.6] which has been submitted at Deadline 4. These amendments do not represent further, additional assessment, which the Applicant does not consider is necessary, but are intended to make more explicit the approach and findings of the assessment, and to clearly set out the approach to linking receptor identification to effects to bespoke mitigation. This does not change the assessment of significance concluded by Annex A (Health Effects Report) of ES Volume 4, Appendix 5.5: Health and Wellbeing Summary Statement [EN010158/APP/6.4.6]. The Applicant does not consider that further amendments are required to Annex A (Health Effects Report) of ES Volume 4, Appendix 5.5: Health and Wellbeing Summary Statement [EN010158/APP/6.4.6] and refers Buckinghamshire Council to the Applicant's Response to Deadline 2 Submissions [EN010158/APP/8.18] [REP3-051].	
3.4.48	Page 69, Ref. 6.3	Buckinghamshire Council maintains its concerns that although the report references embedded and additional mitigation and draws on management plans and certified documents, the report should provide clearer assurance that the mitigation outcomes relied upon are accurately cross-referenced and secured at the level of specificity described, as this traceability issue is	The Applicant is of the view that the mitigation referred to within and relied upon for the residual assessment of effects on health and wellbeing are fully assured and traceable. Buckinghamshire Council has raised this point on several occasions, but has not provided any examples of where it is considered that “Annex A	Refer to response to 3.2.14.

Ref.	Page Reference	Summary Position	Applicant's Response	Buckinghamshire Council Comments
		not resolved by a sensitivity-focused narrative update.	appears to describe mitigation outcomes more specifically than the underpinning outline plans and certified documents”. The Applicant has undertaken a thorough review of all references to mitigation within Annex A (Health Effects Report) of ES Volume 4, Appendix 5.5: Health and Wellbeing Summary Statement [EN010158/APP/6.4.6] and is assured that there is no discrepancy between the level of specificity described within that document and the outline plans and certified documents it references.	
3.4.56	Page 91, Ref. 9.3	Buckinghamshire Council acknowledges that the proposed noise limits are met, but remains concerned that some receptors could still experience levels significantly above background at night in a very quiet rural setting. It concludes that, despite the worst-case assumptions used in the assessment, the character and context of the noise mean potential impacts remain a concern.	Noise generated by the Proposed Development has been mitigated and potential adverse impacts reduced to a minimum as stated in ES Volume 2, Chapter 13: Noise and Vibration [EN010158/APP/6.2.3]. This has been achieved through the introduction of mitigation measures (embedded and additional), which ensure that the lowest-observed-adverse-effect level (LOAEL) is not exceeded at surrounding residential receptors. By avoiding exceedances of the LOAEL threshold, this would constitute a situation whereby noise can be heard, but does not cause any change in behaviour, attitude or other physiological response. There may be a slight effect on the acoustic character of the area but not such that there is a change in the quality of life. The mitigation measures adopted in the operational phase assessment comprise of: - Maximising the separation distances between proposed noise emitting infrastructure and surrounding sensitive receptors. - Orientating noise emitting equipment to minimise off-site emissions. - Use of low-noise equipment. - Introduction of noise barriers around the BESS container areas, Central Inverters and Rosefield Substation.	The Council note that it has updated its position in the SoCG on this issue. For the reasons set out therein the Council remains concerned about the effect that certain receptors experience where the existing background is tranquil and the magnitude of change is considerable as a result of the Proposed Development. Attention is drawn to the Council's position in the SoCG. The Council welcomes the inclusion of mitigation measures such as equipment selection, orientation of plant, acoustic barriers, enclosures and post-construction noise monitoring. These measures provide assurance that some noise impacts can be managed through the detailed design process and that opportunities for further mitigation can be secured where necessary. However, the effectiveness of these measures cannot be fully assessed until detailed equipment specifications and final plant layouts are available.

Ref.	Page Reference	Summary Position	Applicant's Response	Buckinghamshire Council Comments
			- Introduction of enclosures and/or barriers around the main transformers within the Rosefield Substation and Satellite Collector Compound. - Operational phase noise monitoring to demonstrate compliance. As noted in Section 13.13 of ES Volume 2, Chapter 13: Noise and Vibration [EN010158/APP/6.2.3], the operational phase assessment is based on all plant/equipment running at full duty during both daytime and night-time periods. This is likely to overestimate the noise emissions from the Site, as a reduced operating duty would be expected during periods of the night, when baseline sound levels are lowest, due to darkness and temperature fluctuations resulting in lower cooling demands; the level of noise reduction would be determined once plant/equipment specifications are defined during the detailed design stage. As a result, the difference between the rated noise levels and the typical background sound levels are expected to be lower than those presented. In all instances, the rating level is inclusive of penalties to account for the characteristics of the noise emissions. The mitigation measures adopted to achieve the operational noise rating levels set out in the Outline OEMP [EN010158/APP/7.3.5] would be subject to review at detailed design stage by Buckinghamshire Council, as stipulated by Schedule 2 of the Draft DCO [EN010158/APP/3.1.7].	
3.4.57	Page 94, Ref. 10.3	Comment noting that Buckinghamshire Council maintains its position that there is a need for further assessment of Population effects to be undertaken and reported in a way that allows the reader to understand all factors that have led to the conclusions for a combined receptor type.	This comment has been addressed in response to Ref. 3.3.32 above, and in response to Q2.14.8 of the Examining Authority's Second Written Questions.	Refer to response to 3.2.7.
3.4.61	Page 99, Ref 11.2	Comment welcoming the breakdown of ALC grades in Table 12.4. However, the breakdown is	ES Volume 2, Chapter 12: Soil [EN010158/APP/6.2.3] Table 12.4 has been	The Council is satisfied that the relevant updates have been made but notes that there is a disconnect between the total area of the

Ref.	Page Reference	Summary Position	Applicant's Response	Buckinghamshire Council Comments
		unclear due to an error in formatting and the areas do not align with the correct columns.	updated at Deadline 4 to fix the formatting errors.	proposed development shown in Table 12.3 of the revised ES, as compared to Table 12.4. The areas in Table 12.4 do not match Table 12.3 (not all areas have been included) and it is not clear what activities are proposed in some areas of the site.
3.4.62	Page 100, Ref 11.4	Comment requesting for the Applicant to follow Table 2 in the Institute of Quarrying Guidance in the Outline SMP [EN010158/APP/7.7.3] to classify the soils as low resilience to handling as per Table 2. The heavy textures of the soils on site are further compounded by the fact that the soils on site have a weakly developed structure and are non-calcareous, making them more susceptible to compaction, as stated on page 16 of the Institute of Quarrying guidance.	The Applicant acknowledges that, in accordance with the Institute of Quarrying (IoQ) guidance, clay and heavy clay loam soils have an inherently low resilience to structural damage when considered on the basis of textural class alone. However, the Institute of Quarrying guidance also states that the resilience is significantly modified by the soil water regime (Soil Wetness Class) and the local climate. This is consistent with the IEMA guidelines classifying the clay and heavy clay loam soils as medium resilience due to the field capacity days being fewer than 150. Furthermore, the Outline SMP [EN010158/APP/7.7.3] [REP2-069] explicitly recognises compaction as the principal risk associated with the Proposed Development and sets out a comprehensive framework of control measures. Soil handling suitability is therefore not overestimated in the Outline SMP [EN010158/APP/7.7.3] [REP2-069]. The assessment therefore already applies the principles of the IoQ guidance, as the classification of resilience as medium is in accordance with the IoQ assertion to take climate into account.	The Applicant has not addressed the consideration of soils having a weakly developed structure and non-calcareous nature in their assessment of its resilience to structural damage. The Council welcomes the recognition of compaction as the principal risk but this has not been reflected in the assigned sensitivity of the soil (which has been assigned as medium as opposed to high sensitivity). The Council has agreed to accept the Outline SMP [REP2-070] as it contains appropriate methods for soil handling but advises that the overestimation of soil resilience could lead to a lack of care in handling the soils.
3.4.63	Page 100, Ref 11.4	Comment noting that ES Volume 2, Chapter 12: Soil [EN010158/APP/6.2.2] acknowledges that the soils on the Site can be considered medium sensitivity due to field capacity days and texture as per the EIA method in the IEMA guidance. However, it is requested that the Applicant follows the Institute of Quarrying Guidance in the Outline SMP.	The Applicant maintains that the classification of the soils on the Site as medium sensitivity is appropriate for the soil handling procedures described in the Outline SMP [EN010158/APP/7.7.3] [REP2-069]. The use of field capacity days in the IEMA guidance is particularly important as it provides an idea of the window of suitable working conditions. Furthermore, the Outline SMP [EN010158/APP/7.7.3] [REP2-069] prescribes a precautionary approach to soil handling, whereby operations only take place under	The Applicant has not addressed the consideration of soils having a weakly developed structure and non-calcareous nature in their assessment of its resilience to structural damage and maintains that the clay/heavy clay loam, weakly developed, non-calcareous soils in wetness class IV have high sensitivity to structural damage. However, the Council has agreed to accept the Outline SMP [REP2-070] as it contains appropriate methods for soil handling but advises that the overestimation of soil resilience could lead to a lack of care in handling the soils.

Ref.	Page Reference	Summary Position	Applicant's Response	Buckinghamshire Council Comments
			suitable ground and moisture conditions, with controls in place to prevent handling and trafficking while soils are wet and vulnerable to damage. The loQ guidance states that the resilience is significantly modified by the soil water regime (Soil Wetness Class) and the local climate. The assessment therefore already applies the principles of the loQ guidance, as the classification of resilience as medium is in accordance with the loQ assertion to take climate into account.	
3.4.64	Page 101, 102, and 104 Ref 11.6, 11.9 and 11.15	Comment requesting for the Applicant to highlight the importance of treating the soils with care by applying the principles on page 16 of the Institute of Quarrying Guidance Good Practice Guide for Handling Soils in Mineral Workings in the Outline SMP [EN010158/APP/7.7.3]. As per Table 2, the clay and heavy clay loam textures of the soils on site are considered to have low resilience to structural damage and this is further compounded by the fact that the soils on site have a weakly developed structure, are non-calcareous and considered Wetness Class IV, making them more susceptible to compaction. It is important that the Outline SMP [EN010158/APP/7.7.3] does not overestimate the resilience of the soils.	The Applicant maintains that the classification of the soils on the Site as medium sensitivity is appropriate for the soil handling procedures described in the Outline SMP [EN010158/APP/7.7.3] [REP2-069]. The use of field capacity days in the IEMA guidance is particularly important as it provides an idea of the window of suitable working conditions. Furthermore, the Outline SMP [EN010158/APP/7.7.3] [REP2-069] prescribes a precautionary approach to soil handling, whereby operations only take place under suitable ground and moisture conditions, with controls in place to prevent handling and trafficking while soils are wet and vulnerable to damage. The resilience of the soils is therefore not overestimated. 3.3.427 The loQ guidance states that the resilience is significantly modified by the soil water regime (Soil Wetness Class) and the local climate. The assessment therefore already applies the principles of the loQ guidance, as the classification of resilience as medium is in accordance with the loQ assertion to take climate into account.	The Applicant has not addressed the consideration of soils having a weakly developed structure and non-calcareous nature in their assessment of its resilience to structural damage and maintains that the clay/heavy clay loam, weakly developed, non-calcareous soils in wetness class IV have high sensitivity to structural damage. However, the Council has agreed to accept the Outline SMP [REP2-070] as it contains appropriate methods for soil handling but advises that the overestimation of soil resilience could lead to a lack of care in handling the soils.

Table 3.5: Buckinghamshire Council (Written summaries of oral submissions made at the hearings and any other post hearing submissions – ISH1 Post Hearing Note) [REP3-056]

Ref.	Page Reference	Summary Position	Applicant's Response	Buckinghamshire Council Comments
3.5.1	Page 2, Ref. 4 and 7	Comment noting whether the test that the SoS must apply when considering availability of a network connection (NPS EN-1 para 4.11.12) is met given that the PV generation will have Gate 2 Phase 2 prioritisation but that the BESS will have Gate 1 prioritisation as Gate 1 gives an uncertain connection date. It is ultimately up to the SoS to conclude whether the test is met.	The Applicant notes this comment and directs Buckinghamshire Council to Q2.2.2 in Applicant's Response to the Examining Authority's Second Written Questions [EN010158/APP/8.23] .	The Council notes the Applicant's response to Question Q2.2.2 and the information provided regarding the current connection arrangements and future participation in the connections reform process. The Council's comment was intended to highlight that the photovoltaic and BESS elements are at different stages within the network connection process and that the Secretary of State will need to be satisfied that the requirements of NPS EN-1 paragraph 4.11.12 are met in respect of the Proposed Development as a whole. The Council acknowledges that this is ultimately a matter for the Secretary of State and does not seek to reach a definitive conclusion on the application of that policy test; however, it remains apparent that there is a distinction between the connection provisions for the generating and BESS aspects of the Proposed Development.
3.5.2	Page 3, Ref. 5, 6 and 8	Comment noting the Applicant's reliance on NPS EN1 para 3.2.6 prioritising projects for 2030 while remaining a robust pipeline beyond 2030 in relation to the BESS connection and how the BESS is not the subject of the Planning Act 2008 regime. Therefore, the need, and CNP presumption, must be seen in that context as it should be distinguished as to which infrastructure is directly the subject of the NSIP regime, and which is subject as a result of being associated development.	The Applicant confirms that it is proposing BESS as Associated Development to the main solar NSIP. However, it is important to note that NPS EN-1 (2023) (which applies to the Proposed Development) sets out the need for storage because of the benefits it brings to the energy system (see Paragraphs 3.3.5 and 3.3.6) and explains the role of electricity storage in Paragraphs 3.3.25 to 3.3.31. While the Applicant understands that standalone BESS sits outside of the NSIP regime, the NPSs also consider the possibility of co-located solar and storage schemes and NPS EN-3 (2023) expresses support for solar that is co-located with other functions, including storage, to maximise the efficiency of land use. (Paragraph 2.10.10). In Planning for New Energy Infrastructure (the government's consultation response to the new NPSs) available at https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/69121170bda892e068aa6454/nps-revisions-2025-consultation-government-response.pdf the government explains that <i>"Clean Power 2030 is a milestone that reflects the scale of ambition required to meet our Net Zero 2050 target; it is not a fixed ceiling on technology deployment or project approvals"</i>. It is the Applicant's view that this explanation applies to projects of all scales which require consent across all of the planning landscape, i.e. NSIPs and their associated development, and TCPA-consented schemes. This is consistent with the attributes of projects which can contribute to the Clean Power 2030 milestone. The government has clarified that its capacity ranges for solar are applicable to schemes of over 1MW in England and Wales. The	Buckinghamshire Council notes the Applicant's response and acknowledges that electricity storage is recognised within the National Policy Statements as playing an important role in supporting the transition to a low-carbon energy system, and that co-location of solar generation and storage is supported in principle by national policy. However, the Council's point is that the BESS forms part of the Proposed Development as associated development to the principal solar NSIP, rather than infrastructure which is itself being consented through the Planning Act 2008 regime. In the Council's view, this distinction is relevant when considering how need in principle in the policy is addressed. See further detail in the Council's submissions on ISH3.

Ref.	Page Reference	Summary Position	Applicant's Response	Buckinghamshire Council Comments
			threshold in Scotland is lower (Clean Power 2030 Action Plan, Connections Reform Annex (updated), p5 & Table 1, Footnote 10). Planning for New Energy Infrastructure therefore explains that the government has committed to <i>“ensure that language used across government publications does not inadvertently constrain ambitious deployment of clean energy technologies”</i> for example through the application of the Clean Power 2030 capacity ranges to the re-prioritisation of projects as part of Connections Reform, acting as a constraint on project approvals.	
3.5.3	Page 3, Ref. 9 to 13	Comment noting that Buckinghamshire Council wish to see the underlying evidence that underpins the Applicant's letter on BESS siting to understand if proper compliance with the mitigation hierarchy was undertaken. Buckinghamshire Council believe that Fields E10 and E11 would be a better location for the BESS, noting the concerns the Applicant raised in relation to this location around noise, flood risk, and easement but requested further information. As the Council did not put E10 and E11 forward first, it is on the Applicant to properly set out that alternative.	The Applicant provided further detail on the evidence underpinning the exclusion of Fields E10 and E11 from development as BESS in the Applicants Response to Action Point 7 from ISH1 [EN010158/APP/8.19] [REP3-052] .	This has been resolved elsewhere, including in ISH3.
3.5.6	Page 7, Ref. 22-23	Comment noting that Buckinghamshire Council expect buffers for hedgerows to be measured from the edge of the feature as measuring from the centreline does not protect the feature itself, especially since the hedgerows are old, wide, non-uniform and contain large trees. Measuring from the centre-line would mean that the RPA's of large trees would not be protected.	A response has previously been provided within the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations [EN010158/APP/8.3] [PDA-006] and secured within the Design Commitments [EN010158/APP/5.9.6] . The spatial extent of the Proposed Development, as set out in the DCO Application, has similarly been based on offsets from the centreline of the hedgerows. This is considered to be the most consistent data source available across the Site. The buffers from hedgerows also accommodate the root protection zones of trees sited within the hedgerows.	Please refer to Council's comments at 3.1.3
3.5.7	Page 8, Ref. 26-30	Comment noting that areas had not been surveyed because of access and growth constraints. These areas should be identified on a plan to reduce baseline uncertainty and therefore reduce uncertainty on management of features such as around if buffers were appropriate during maintenance, mitigation and operation. To ensure confidence trees would be retained,	The Applicant acknowledges the Council's comments regarding areas where survey access or visibility were more constrained however all areas have been surveyed on the ground. It is not agreed that these localised constraints give rise to material baseline uncertainty or affect confidence in the assessment of arboricultural impacts. As set out previously, all arboricultural features were subject to ground-based inspection and were subsequently ground-truthed against the drone-derived base mapping. Whilst some trees were located within dense hedgerows, ditch corridors where direct measurement were more challenging, sufficient information was available to undertake a BS 5837:2012-	Please refer to Council's comments at 3.2.10

Ref.	Page Reference	Summary Position	Applicant's Response	Buckinghamshire Council Comments
		maintained and protected, the Council requests an Arboriculture Method Statement and further information in the Outline LEMP.	compliant assessment. These constraints did not materially affect tree categorisation, condition assessment, crown spread plotting, Root Protection Area calculations, retention recommendations or the identification of arboricultural constraints. In relation to the Arboricultural method statement pleased see response at Ref. 3.2.10.	
3.5.12	Page 12, Ref. 43-47	Comment noting the ambiguity of the word 'potential' in the Outline LEMP. Buckinghamshire Council also requests further mitigation to mitigation effects that they see as problematic as it is difficult to have confidence that all steps to resolve issues have been taken e.g. on BESS mitigation.	As outlined in the Written Summary of Applicant's Oral Submissions at Issue Specific Hearing 1 (ISH1) [EN010158/APP/8.16] [REP3-049] under agenda item 5b, the Applicant considers that the word 'potential' confers that the final design of the Scheme has not been determined and therefore the final mitigation to be applied is not known until the final design is established. The measures set out in the Outline LEMP [EN010158/APP/7.6.5] are a commitment to mitigate the Proposed Development and the final LEMP must demonstrate to the Local Authority that the mitigation is substantially in accordance with the Outline LEMP [EN010158/APP/7.6.5] . The Applicant welcomes confirmation from Buckinghamshire Council that it is satisfied with the approach to establishment and ongoing maintenance of mitigation planting in the oLEMP. In relation to BESS mitigation, the Applicant's response to Q1.15.10 within the Applicant's Response to the Examining Authority's First Written Questions [EN010158/APP/8.13] [REP2-087] and at Ref. 7.3.3 of the Applicant's Response to Written Representations [EN010158/APP/8.12] [REP2-086] the Applicant sets out the mitigation measures already in place to break up views of the Proposed Development, and particularly the BESS, in views from the south east. These earlier responses also highlight that further detailed design is most appropriately dealt with at discharge of requirements stage, as it would depend on the detailed design of the Proposed Development and in particular the BESS.	See the Council's submissions at in its post-hearing note on ISH3.
3.5.13	Page 13, Ref. 49-50	Comment noting Buckinghamshire Council's concerns about Annex D as they believe that the significance of assets had not been adequately explained or assessed in a number of instances or having regard to Historic England's GPA 3. The Council have provided an example in relation to Botolph House in its Deadline 3 submission.	The Applicant has provided more detail within Annex D of ES Volume 4, Appendix 9.1: Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment and Setting Assessment [EN010158/APP/6.4.3] submitted at Deadline 4 but does not consider that the level of harm is altered by consideration of these other elements of significance.	The Council do not agree that the level of harm to the relevant heritage assets would not be elevated in relation the Applicant's previous assessment, given that the Applicant's previous assessment does not appear to have considered several key aspects of the assets' significance that would be adversely impacted by the Solar Farm and the overall diminution of setting that would arise from the quantum of infrastructure. The Council's view of the harm has been submitted to the ExA.
3.5.15	Page 14, Ref. 53-56	Comment noting the importance of the approaches past Pond Farmhouse and connecting to other assets therefore, surrounding it with development would	The Applicant has considered the architecture of Pond Farmhouse and its links to Claydon House within Annex D of ES Volume 4, Appendix 9.1: Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment and Setting Assessment [EN010158/APP/6.4.3] submitted at Deadline 4. The Applicant acknowledges that the effect of	The Council disagree that surrounding Pond Farmhouse, or indeed any heritage asset that derives a reasonable proportion if its significance from its setting, would only lead to less than substantial harm in the middle of the

Ref.	Page Reference	Summary Position	Applicant's Response	Buckinghamshire Council Comments
		cause top end of less than substantial harm. Buckinghamshire Council noted that the mitigation planting may be harmful and recommend further setback. The Council also comment that Appendix D does not address the architecture and the link with Claydon House.	surrounding Pond Farmhouse with Solar PV will cause harm to its significance that would equate to a moderate effect and that this would be significant. The Applicant however considers that this does not approach substantial harm and therefore judges the harm to be in the middle of the scale of less than substantial.	scale. The council conservatively identifies harm to Pond Farmhouse at the upper end of less than substantial harm.
3.5.17	Page 15, Ref. 60	Comment noting concern on the wording around temporary traffic signals in the DCO.	The Applicant has proposed text changes to Buckinghamshire Council and is awaiting their response.	Text changes are accepted. It is made clear that the temporary signals can only be in place for the duration of works being carried out to implement highway mitigation to facilitate free movement of construction traffic.
3.5.20	Page 17, Ref. 69-71	Comment that Buckinghamshire Council had not done a specific assessment of TCS Biosciences/Preston Farms and did not see one from the Applicant however they consider it important that effects are properly assessed. Buckinghamshire Council have concerns that the underlying sensitivity is probably incorrect and therefore an underassessment of significance and absence of mitigation.	The Applicant has undertaken an assessment of significance on the viability of agricultural and non-agricultural businesses, in line with the proposed approach in the ES Volume 4, Appendix 5.1: EIA Scoping Report [EN010158/APP/6.4] [APP-079]. In-line with the approach to sensitivity set out in Table 14.21 of ES Volume 2, Chapter 14: Population [EN010158/APP/6.2.4], the sensitivity of non-agricultural receptors draws on guidance (Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) 'LA 112 Population and Human Health') and is influenced by changes to environment or access such that significant effects may: a) affect viability (<u>Very High</u>); b) affect operating practices, with limited capacity to absorb or respond to change (<u>High</u>); c) affect operating practices but not to a significant degree due to capacity to absorb or respond to changes (<u>Medium</u>); or d) affect operating practices such that significant effects may influence operating practices to a slight or hardly perceptible degree (<u>Low</u>). As such, assessments are based on the factors that the business relies upon for its viability or operating model. In one case (TCS Biosciences Ltd), the potential for effects on viability are considered to meet the 'very high' criteria – the business is located partly within the Order Limits, so will experience changes in land and access, and interaction with project infrastructure directly, as well as immediate environmental effects. Its operating model is such that it relies upon access to and within land affected, and a strictly controlled environment. The magnitude of change for these non-agricultural receptors draws on guidance (Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB) 'LA 112 Population and Human Health') and is determined by criteria set out in Table 14.22 of ES Volume	The Council notes the clarification provided by the Applicant regarding the individual sensitivity applied to the receptor; however, maintains reservations about the level of impact magnitude assigned by the Applicant and, therefore, the overall level of significance of effect reported. Refer to response to 3.2.7.

Ref.	Page Reference	Summary Position	Applicant's Response	Buckinghamshire Council Comments
			2, Chapter 14: Population [EN010158/APP/6.2.4], which considers whether there is: a) Loss, damage or change to attributes, quality or key characteristics or vulnerability (A <u>Moderate/Major</u> change would mean loss or severe damage e.g. direct total or partial acquisition and demolition compromising viability; a <u>Minor</u> change would be a discernible change in attributes, minor loss of or alteration to key characteristics – e.g. amendment to access or acquisition of land resulting in changes to operating conditions that do not compromise overall viability); and/or b) Introduction of severance with adequate accessibility provision (a <u>Moderate/Major</u> change would require the introduction of complete or severe severance with limited/moderate accessibility provision; a <u>Minor</u> change provides adequate accessibility provision). In all cases, in the context of these criteria, at most a minor magnitude of change is anticipated on all non-agricultural business receptors including TCS Biosciences Ltd. This is in consideration of embedded and additional mitigation, including the provision of land swaps with what the Applicant and Claydon Estate consider equal or better provision of land in terms of quality and access, and additional mitigation has been developed through engagement with affected parties and in-line with standards and guidance for the management of (e.g. air quality, noise, traffic/access). Bespoke mitigation is secured specific to TCS Biosciences Ltd, as set out in Appendix 1 to the Applicant's Response to Written Representations [EN010158/APP/8.12] [REP2-086]. Following the application of these mitigations, the Applicant believes that there would remain discernible change in attributes and a minor loss of some key characteristics of these businesses including amendment to access or acquisition of land (which where acquired, would be replaced) resulting in changes to operating conditions that do not compromise overall viability.	
3.5.21	Page 18, Ref. 72	Comment noting concerns about the timelines in Schedule 16 of the draft DCO.	The Applicant shared proposed amendments to the text of Schedule 16 (Procedure for discharge of requirements) with Buckinghamshire Council on 15 June 2026. The Applicant received comments from the Council on 16 June 2026 and incorporated these changes into the updated Draft DCO [EN010158/APP/3.1.7] submitted at Deadline 4. The Council indicated that it had no further substantive points on this issue at this stage.	This is agreed.
3.5.22	Page 18, Ref. 73	Comment noting that although agreed the traffic route with the Applicant, Buckinghamshire Council has not assessed the particular sensitivities of TCS Biosciences	The Applicant notes the Council's comments relating to sensitivities regarding Preston Farms Ltd/ TCS Biosciences Ltd, however notes that Buckinghamshire Council has not raised any concerns relating to the general use of Granborough	As the Council has emphasised previously, its focus is on matters of highway safety and appropriate use of the public highway in general. The Council has not assessed specific effects on the sensitivities of TCS Biosciences and Preston Farms. As such, it cannot comment as the

Ref.	Page Reference	Summary Position	Applicant's Response	Buckinghamshire Council Comments
		and Preston Farms and therefore, the traffic route should not be taken to have resolved.	Road. Further information relating to the alternative route is provided in the Construction Access Review [EN010158/APP/8.26] being provided at Deadline 4.	highways authority on the suitability in respect of those businesses.
3.5.23	Page 18, Ref. 74	Comment noting that Buckinghamshire Council has a general concern about the level of detail provided by the Applicant in the ES (relating to effects on TCS Biosciences) and a lack of transparency.	The Applicant recognises the concern raised by Buckinghamshire Council. The Applicant and TCS Biosciences Ltd had signed a Non-Disclosure Agreement which limited the amount of detailed information that could be submitted within ES Volume 2, Chapter 14: Population [EN010158/APP/6.2.4]. Notwithstanding this, the highest value of sensitivity ('Very High') has been afforded to TCS Biosciences Ltd and Preston Farms Ltd within the assessment, in order to account for the specific, highly sensitive and unique operations that occur at this site for the business. Further information about the specific operations of the business have been iteratively made available to the examination throughout the process, which weren't fully available to the Applicant at the point of submission. Where practicable, the Applicant has sought to adapt and design mitigation to address this iterative information about the operations of TCS Biosciences Ltd, which has been incorporated into subsequently amended and submitted responses and updated Management Plans, in order to give a fuller picture of the approach to understanding and addressing potential impacts.	Refer to response to 3.2.7.
3.5.24	Page 18, Ref. 76-77	Comment noting Buckinghamshire Council's residual concern regarding the difference between the absolute and relative noise increases caused by the Scheme. Despite the 35dB threshold being acceptable, the increase of 10dB plus, despite being within the acceptable range as per the relevant BS, was problematic given the rural and tranquil character of the area. The Council request further assurance in the Detailed OEMP.	Noise generated by the Proposed Development has been mitigated and potential adverse impacts reduced to a minimum as detailed in ES Volume 2, Chapter 13: Noise and Vibration [EN010158/APP/6.2.3]. This has been achieved through the introduction of mitigation measures (embedded and additional), which ensure that the lowest-observed-adverse-effect level (LOAEL) is not exceeded at surrounding residential receptors. By avoiding exceedances of the LOAEL threshold, this would constitute a situation whereby noise can be heard, but does not cause any change in behaviour, attitude or other physiological response. There may be a slight effect on the acoustic character of the area but not such that there is a change in the quality of life. The mitigation measures adopted in the operational phase assessment comprise of: - Maximising the separation distances between proposed noise emitting infrastructure and surrounding sensitive receptors. - Orientating noise emitting equipment to minimise off-site emissions. - Use of low-noise equipment. - Introduction of noise barriers around the BESS container areas, Central Inverters and Rosefield Substation. - Introduction of enclosures and/or barriers around the main transformers within the Rosefield Substation and Satellite Collector Compound.	See comment above on 3.4.56.

Ref.	Page Reference	Summary Position	Applicant's Response	Buckinghamshire Council Comments
			- Operational phase noise monitoring to demonstrate compliance. As noted in Section 13.13 of ES Volume 2, Chapter 13: Noise and Vibration [EN010158/APP/6.2.3], the operational phase assessment is based on all plant/equipment running at full duty during both daytime and night-time periods. This is likely to overestimate the noise emissions from the Site, as a reduced operating duty would be expected during periods of the night, when baseline sound levels are lowest, due to darkness and temperature fluctuations resulting in lower cooling demands; the level of noise reduction would be determined once plant/equipment specifications are defined during the detailed design stage. As a result, the difference between the rated noise levels and the typical background sound levels are expected to be lower than those presented. In all instances, the rating level is inclusive of penalties to account for the characteristics of the noise emissions. The mitigation measures adopted to achieve the operational noise rating levels set out in the Outline OEMP [EN010158/APP/7.3.5] would be subject to review at detailed design stage by Buckinghamshire Council, as stipulated by Schedule 2 of the Draft DCO [EN010158/APP/3.1.7].	
3.5.25	Page 19, Ref. 78-81	Comment noting that a user of the PRoW should not be classified as 'transient' when the user might be in the noise effect area for an extended period. Buckinghamshire Council noted that the WHO Guidance states <i>"existing quiet outdoor areas should be preserved and the ratio of intruding noise to natural background sound should be kept low"</i>. Buckinghamshire Council accepts that there is no quantitative assessment but a qualitative or hybrid assessment are acceptable.	Within paragraph 81 of Buckinghamshire Council post ISH1 note [REP3-056], reference is made to the WHO Guidelines for Community Noise, specifically the following requirement for outdoor areas in parkland and conservations areas: <i>"existing quiet outdoor areas should be preserved and the ratio of intruding noise to natural background sound should be kept low"</i>. Buckinghamshire Council advise that this requirement should be applied to the operational phase noise assessment for PRoW users. This is contested by the Applicant, on the basis that the PRoW do not constitute either parkland or conservation areas in their own right, nor are they located within any defined parkland or conservation areas. There are no quantitative assessment thresholds for the determination of adverse effects on PRoWs. Notwithstanding this, the resultant operational phase noise levels experienced by PRoW users will be subject to mitigation, through the adoption of low-noise emitting equipment and perimeter barriers, as secured by Outline OEMP [EN010158/APP/7.3.5]. The baseline ambient sound levels along PRoWs and permissive paths within the Order Limits will be influenced by a variety of sources, which may include, but not be limited to, birds, insects, livestock, wind-blown foliage, road traffic and occasional aircrafts. On the basis of the residual noise levels generated by the Proposed Development post-mitigation and the acoustic masking effects of existing sound sources, perceptible noise from the Proposed Development during operation would be localised, rather than widespread along the PRoW/permissive path network.	See the Council's comment on the Applicant's response to ExAQ2 Q2.13.4.

Table 3.6: Buckinghamshire Council (Written summaries of oral submissions made at the hearings and any other post hearing submissions – ISH2 Post Hearing Note) [REP3-057]

Ref.	Page Reference	Summary Position	Applicant's Response	Buckinghamshire Council Comments
3.6.1	Pages 2 and 3, Paras. 5 and 6	Comment noting that Buckinghamshire Council considers Article 9 may be sufficient to provide notice in relation to Article 8, subject to confirmation that all relevant uses of Article 8 are captured within its provisions. Comment noting that Buckinghamshire Council wishes to explore this further with the Applicant, with an update to follow by Deadline 4 following discussion, notwithstanding the original action point timetable.	The Applicant notes the comment that Article 9 may be sufficient to provide notice. Article 9(1) confirms that the permit scheme set out in Article 9 applies to street works carried out under the powers conferred by Article 8 (street works) of the Draft DCO [EN010158/APP/3.1.7]. Accordingly, Buckinghamshire Council would be made notified of the relevant works upon permit application. The Applicant also refers to Article 8(3) of the Draft DCO [EN010158/APP/3.1.7] which states that “<i>Where the undertaker is not the street authority, the provisions of sections 54 (notice of certain works) to 106 (index of defined expressions) of the 1991 Act apply to any street works carried out under paragraph (1)</i>”. As noted in the Explanatory Memorandum EN010158/APP/3.2.4 [CR1-010] this addition of sections from the New Roads and Streets Act 1991 provides protection for the street authority in respect of street works carried out pursuant to Article 8(1). For example, Section 54 of the New Roads and Streets Act 1991 means that the Applicant must give advance notice of particular street works to the street authority and the Applicant must comply with requirements that have been prescribed by the street authority. The Applicant therefore considers its approach to providing notice in respect of powers under Article 8 is sufficient and appropriate.	Buckinghamshire Council notes the Applicant's response and acknowledges that Article 9 applies to street works undertaken pursuant to Article 8. The Council further notes the application of sections 54 to 106 of the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991 through Article 8(3), which provide additional notification and procedural protections for the street authority. On that basis, Buckinghamshire Council is satisfied that appropriate notice provisions are secured and this matter is agreed.
3.6.2	Page 3, Para. 7	Comment noting that Buckinghamshire Council considers a notice provision should be included within Article 10 wherever possible, consistent with its position on ensuring adequate notification mechanisms. Comment noting that Buckinghamshire Council understands the Applicant is considering how such notice requirements may align with the permit scheme and wishes to explore this further through discussion.	The Applicant refers to its response given in Action Point 4 of its Written Summary of Applicant's Oral Submissions at Issue Specific Hearing 2 (ISH2) [EN010158/APP/8.17] [REP3-050] which explained that the Applicant does not consider it necessary for separate notice provisions to be incorporated into Article 10 because Buckinghamshire Council would be made notified of the relevant works upon permit application.	This is noted and the point is resolved.
3.6.3	Page 3, Para. 10	Comment noting that Buckinghamshire Council's suggested wording for Section 278 agreements	Please refer to Applicant's response to Ref 3.1.18 in this document.	The Council is content with the wording added to the oCTMP.

Ref.	Page Reference	Summary Position	Applicant's Response	Buckinghamshire Council Comments
		(Article 16), drawn from the Sizewell DCO, was discussed with the Applicant. Comment noting that discussions between the Council and the Applicant are ongoing and will continue following the hearings to resolve this matter.		
3.6.6	Page 4, Para. 17	Comment noting, in respect of Article 41, discussions on the disapplication of certain tree protection orders. Further comment noting that the Applicant will be looking into this matter further and that the oLEMP and detailed LEMP will deal with such matters.	The Applicant refers to section 4.6.14 of the Explanatory Memorandum [EN010158/APP/3.2.4] [CR1-010]. That section explains the extent and purpose of the power in Article 41 and notes that it is a model provision which has been modified to reflect that no tree preservation orders (TPO) relevant to the Proposed Development currently exist. The drafting follows the approach accepted in the Cleve Hill Solar Park Order 2020, the Cottam Solar Project Order 2024 and the Springwell Solar Farm Order 2026 whereby the power applies to TPOs made after the submission of the Application because there are trees within the Order Limits with the potential to attract a TPO in the future. The Outline LEMP [EN010158/APP/7.6.5] (secured by Requirement 7 in the Draft DCO [EN010158/APP/3.1.7]) also contains measures related to the removal of trees subject to a TPO and replacement planting. It notes that, while no removals of trees subject to a TPO are proposed, where an individual tree subject to a TPO must be removed (e.g. due to its dead or dangerous condition) and the relevant planning authority requires replacement, a new tree of equivalent species and ultimate size will be planted in the same place or as near as reasonably practicable to the position of the removed tree, subject to operational requirements.	The Council understand that the extent of such removals is controlled by reference to the outline plans and the controls described here.
3.6.7	Pages 4 and 5, Paras. 19 and 20	Comment noting that Buckinghamshire Council considers the oCEMP provisions relating to working hours and noise appear sufficient in principle to control activity outside normal hours, subject to confirmation from relevant officers. Comment noting that Buckinghamshire Council will confirm its position following consultation with its expert, indicating that this matter remains subject to final verification. Further comment from Buckinghamshire Council noting their expert has been on leave and so	The Applicant welcomes Buckinghamshire Council's view on this matter and awaits the confirmation of its position at Deadline 4.	This has been confirmed.

Ref.	Page Reference	Summary Position	Applicant's Response	Buckinghamshire Council Comments
		Buckinghamshire Council have not been able to confirm the matter but will do so by Deadline 4.		
3.6.8	Page 5, Paras. 22 and 23	Comment noting that Buckinghamshire Council wishes to discuss the provisions of Schedule 16 further with the Applicant, particularly in relation to ensuring that time limits are proportionate. Comment noting that this matter remains ongoing, with further engagement between Buckinghamshire Council and the Applicant anticipated and an update expected by Deadline 4.	The Applicant shared proposed amendments to the text of Schedule 16 (Procedure for discharge of requirements) with Buckinghamshire Council on 15 June 2026. The Applicant received comments from the Council on 16 June 2026 and incorporated these changes into the updated Draft DCO [EN010158/APP/3.1.7] submitted at Deadline 4. The Council indicated that it had no further substantive points on this issue at this stage.	The Council is satisfied with the terms of the new Schedule 16.
3.6.9	Page 5, Para. 24	Comment noting that Buckinghamshire Council has raised a query regarding whether Article 6 should disapply Section 106 of the Water Industry Act 1991, given the inclusion of a bespoke water discharge provision in Article 18. Comment noting that the Applicant has indicated it will await the outcome of the ongoing Gatwick Airport DCO judicial review before providing clarification, which Buckinghamshire Council welcomes.	The Applicant is awaiting the judgement of the Gatwick Airport judicial review and will confirm its position at a later date.	A permission to appeal hearing was heard in the Gatwick DCO challenge on 27 and 28 July 2026. Ground of Appeal 4 in the CAGNE case concerned wastewater and the interaction of specific DCO provisions with (inter alia) s.106 WIA 1991. The Council will provide an update at the next deadline.
3.6.10	Page 5, Para. 25	Comment noting that, in relation to Requirement 20 of Schedule 2, Buckinghamshire Council has raised concerns regarding the risk of the relevant undertaker being dissolved prior to decommissioning, and the implications this would have for securing and delivering those works. Comment noting that the Applicant has indicated this issue will be addressed following the hearing, and further detail is therefore expected on how decommissioning obligations will be secured in such circumstances.	The Applicant notes the position states Requirement 20 but the Applicant understand this query to be about Requirement 18. A response to this has been provided in Action Point 15 of ISH2 in the document Applicant's Outstanding Responses to Actions from ISH1 and ISH2 [EN010158/APP/8.24] .	The enforcement provisions in the Planning Act 2008 are noted and, while the Council has remaining concerns about the sufficiency of recovering expense, it is recognised that this provides some mechanism to control this concern.

