



Application by Green Hill Solar Farm Limited for Green Hill Solar Farm [EN010170]

The Examining Authority's written questions and requests for information (ExQ2): Issued on 28 November 2025

Responses are due by deadline 3: 17 December 2025

The following table sets out the Examining Authority's (ExA's) second round of written questions and requests for information – ExQ2. If necessary, the examination timetable enables the ExA to issue a further round of written questions in due course. If this is done, the further round of questions will be referred to as ExQ3.

Questions are set out using an issues-based framework derived from the initial assessment of principal issues provided as **annex B** to the Rule 6 Letter dated 23 September 2025. Questions have been added to the framework of issues set out there as they have arisen from representations and to address the assessment of the application against relevant policies.

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

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

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

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



Microsoft Word version: [https://nsip-documents.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/published-documents/EN010170-001229-Examining%20Authority's%20Written%20Questions%202%20\(ExQ2\)%20MS%20Word%20version.docx](https://nsip-documents.planninginspectorate.gov.uk/published-documents/EN010170-001229-Examining%20Authority's%20Written%20Questions%202%20(ExQ2)%20MS%20Word%20version.docx)



Planning Inspectorate

Abbreviations used:

PA2008	Planning Act 2008	LIR	the Local Impact Report
Art	article	LPA	local planning authority
ALA1981	Acquisition of Land Act 1981	LVIA	Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment
BESS	Battery Energy Storage System	MKCC	Milton Keynes City Council
BoR	the Book of Reference	MKCP	Milton Keynes City Plan, 2050 (emerging)
CA	compulsory acquisition	MW	megawatt
CPO	compulsory purchase order	NETS	National Electricity Transmission System
dDCO	the draft Development Consent Order	NGED	National Grid Electricity Distribution (East Midlands) plc
EM	the Explanatory Memorandum	NNC	North Northamptonshire Council
ES	the Environmental Statement	NPS	National Policy Statement
ExA	Examining Authority	NSIP	Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project
FFL	functionally linked land	oOEMP	Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan
GLVIA3	Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, 3 rd Edition	R	Requirement
HDD	horizontal directional drilling	SI	statutory instrument
HE	Historic England	SLA	Special Landscape Area
HRA	Habitats Regulation Assessment	SoCG	Statement of common ground
IP	Interested party	SoS	Secretary of state
		TP	temporary possession
		WNC	West Northamptonshire Council



The Examination Library

References in these questions set out in square brackets (for example [APP-010]) are to documents catalogued in the Examination Library. The Examination Library can be obtained from the following link: [EN010170-000607-Green Hill Solar Farm Examination Library.pdf](#)

It will be updated as the examination progresses.

Citation of questions

Questions in this table should be cited as follows:

Question reference: issue reference: question number, for example ExQ 2.1.1 – refers to question 1 in this table.



Index

1. General and cross-topic questions.....	6
2. Design, parameters and other details of the proposed development	7
3. The Environmental Statement (general)	7
4. Need.....	7
5. Site selection and alternatives	7
6. Air quality and emissions	7
7. Biodiversity, ecology and natural environment.....	7
8. Habitats Regulations Assessment.....	9
9. Compulsory acquisition, temporary possession and other land or rights considerations	9
10. The draft Development Consent Order (DCO)	9
11. Historic environment.....	9
12. Land use, agriculture and soils	10
13. Landscape and visual, including glint and glare	10
14. Noise and vibration	11
15. Socio-economic effects	11
16. Transportation and traffic	12
17. Water environment	13

ExQ2: 28 November 2025

Responses due by deadline 3: 17 December 2025

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
1. General and cross-topic questions		
Q2.1.1	The applicant	Missing area on plans An area of land including Construction Compound 1 is absent from the Schedule of Protective Ecological Buffers (Green Hill C) [APP-095] and the Landscape and Ecology Mitigation Plan C and D Option A (Revision A) [REP1-111]. Please update these plans, and any other plans and documents for which this is deemed necessary, to show the missing area.
Q2.1.2	The applicant	Terms within documents to be certified Documents to be certified including, for example, the Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan Revision A [REP1-133] and the Outline Public Rights of Way and Permissive Paths Management Plan Revision A [REP1-148] refer to “the Applicant” but not to “the Undertaker”. Should references to the applicant in such documents be amended to “the undertaker”, in order to ensure that the draft development consent order and the documents it would secure would be consistent and effective?
Q2.1.3	The applicant Interested parties	Updated National Policy Statements for energy infrastructure On 13 November 2025 government published its response to revisions to National Policy Statements for energy infrastructure. Final versions of the updated EN-1, EN-3 and EN-5 have been laid in Parliament for a 21-sitting day ‘consideration period’, before being published in December. The final paragraph of the government response document makes clear that: <i>“Once published, the updated 2025 NPSs (EN-1, EN-3 and EN-5) will have effect in relation to applications for development consent accepted for examination. For applications that have been accepted for examination before publication of the updated 2025 NPSs, the 2024 versions will underpin planning decisions.”</i> The ExA will therefore be forming its recommendation based on the 2024 versions of the energy NPSs. However, is there anything in the updates to EN-1, EN-3 and/or EN-5 that you consider might be material in relation to the Green Hill Solar Farm application?
Q2.1.4	The applicant	Importing electricity to the Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) The ExA notes from the Grid Connection Statement [APP-557] that the grid connection agreement allows in addition to the export of electricity from the scheme to the National Electricity Transmission System (NETS) of 500 MW (AC) the import of up to the same figure from the NETS to be stored in the scheme’s BESS. Is this agreement for importing up to 500 MW (AC) a nominal figure, or would there be circumstances where you envisage importing from the NETS up to the maximum allowance under the grid connection agreement? Could you explain why importing up to 500 MW (AC) to the BESS might be necessary? Roughly what proportion of the time during operation do you envisage the scheme would be importing from the NETS rather than exporting electricity to the NETS?
Q2.1.5	The applicant	BESS Emergency Response Plan A request has been made that Grendon Parish Council is consulted on the site-specific Emergency Response Plan for the Green Hill BESS. Please provide your view on that request.
Q2.1.6	The applicant	Layout of the BESS sites In the same way as overplanting is proposed for the areas of solar panels, have the areas denoted on the submitted plans to accommodate BESS at the Green Hill BESS site and at Green Hill C been sized with any thought of ‘overplanting’ in mind, for example if the effectiveness of the battery modules to store the electrical energy declines over time?
Q2.1.7	The applicant	Possible additional consent requirement for BESS In their deadline 1 submission [REP1-186], Easton Maudit Parish Council at paragraph 10 referenced a paper opining that BESS installations require an application for Hazardous Substances Consent. Your deadline 2 response [REP2-048] on pages 169 to 172 does not appear to address that point. However, the ExA is aware that the Consents and Agreements Position Statement [REP1-149] references

ExQ2: 28 November 2025**Responses due by deadline 3: 17 December 2025**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		the possible need to obtain Hazardous Substance Consent. Has that been included to account specifically for the BESS or for some other reason?
Q2.1.8	The applicant and National Grid Electricity Distribution (East Midlands) plc (NGED)	<p>NGED assets within the order limits</p> <p>The ExA welcomes the update in [REP2-048] that discussions are underway between the applicant and NGED on protective provisions. Can you confirm whether the full extent of NGED assets within the order limits now been identified and agreed between the two parties?</p> <p>Based on the answer to the above, might preparation of a Statement of Common Ground by both parties be beneficial, or is it considered that matters can be successfully resolved within the examination through protective provisions?</p>
Q2.1.9	North Northamptonshire Council (NNC)	<p>Community Benefit Fund</p> <p>The ExA notes your request in both your relevant representation [RR-1243] and local impact report [REP1-171] for the Community Benefit Fund to be secured as part of the DCO, as you consider it is required to mitigate the impacts of the development. Could you signpost the ExA to any examples in made DCOs where a Community Benefit Fund, or equivalent, has been secured?</p>
Q2.1.10	The applicant	<p>Decommissioning and restoration</p> <p>The ExA notes the response that you provided to NNC on this matter (ref.NNC-085 of [REP1-161]), but you will be aware from various other representatians from IPs that there is clearly a concern to ensure that decommissioning and restoration of the sites is fully secured. The DCO contains requirement 21 and we note your views regarding it complying with the relevant paragraphs of NPS EN-3 and the precedent from previous decisions. However, 60 years is a significant period of time for the operational phase and under article 37 the benefit of the Order could be transferred to another party (albeit that all of the provisions of the Order, including requirement 21 will also transfer). Is there more that could be done to provide absolute certainty to IPs that decommissoining will be successfully carried out, as restoiration bonds are commonplace in the minerals industry where sites are worked over similarly long timescales?</p>
2. Design, parameters and other details of the proposed development		
Q2.2.1	Trescella Elderton and Ben Elderton (t/a FC & CC Elderton)	<p>Compound location</p> <p>Following the applicant's response to your written representations (specifically point 3.7) in section ELD-004 of [REP2-048], does this address your concerns about the location and size of the compound?</p>
3. The Environmental Statement (general)		
		There are no questions on this topic at this time. Questions may be asked in future hearings or in further written questions.
4. Need		
		There are no questions on this topic at this time. Questions may be asked in future hearings or in further written questions.
5. Site selection and alternatives		
		There are no questions on this topic at this time. Questions may be asked in future hearings or in further written questions.
6. Air quality and emissions		
		There are no questions on this topic at this time. Questions may be asked in future hearings or in further written questions.
7. Biodiversity, ecology and natural environment		
Q2.7.1	The applicant	<p>Protected species licence</p> <p>Please provide an update on the great crested newt District Licence which is being pursued with NatureSpace.</p>

ExQ2: 28 November 2025
Responses due by deadline 3: 17 December 2025

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
Q2.7.2	The applicant	<p>Extent of ancient woodland buffers</p> <p>The Schedule of Protective Ecological Buffers (APP-095) does not depict ecological buffers adjacent to the following areas of ancient woodland:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ The western edge of Sywell Wood (Cable Route Corridor near Site C)○ The eastern edge of Horn Wood (Site F) and○ Barslay Spinney (Cable Route Corridor to the west of Site G). <p>Please explain why these are absent and, consequently, whether the Change Request reflects the full extent of changes which may be sought in this regard.</p>
Q2.7.3	The applicant	<p>Clarification of plans and extent of Change Request</p> <p>The Change Request includes realignment of the track next to Horn Wood to create an access which would lie outside the ancient woodland buffer zone for use during the construction, replacement and decommissioning phases. Landscape and Ecology Mitigation Plan F Sheet 3 Revision B [CR1-036 and CR1-037] still shows an access track within the buffer to the east and south-east of Horn Wood, as well as a track outside the buffer. The Works Plan [CR1-006] depicts an existing track within the buffer at a similar location.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Works Plan depicts an existing track within the buffer at the southwestern corner of Threeshire Wood at Sheet 18. The Landscape and Ecology Mitigation Plan G [APP-219] depicts an access track within the buffer at a similar location, but with a greater extent.</p> <p>Whilst the Landscape and Ecology Mitigation Plans are indicative documents, are the above elements intended to depict existing tracks within buffers on which no works would be carried out? If this is the case, has consideration been given to whether any changes may be sought in respect of the Threeshire Wood buffer, where the Landscape and Ecology Mitigation Plan shows an increase in the extent of the track?</p>
Q2.7.4	The applicant	<p>Clarification of Landscape and Ecology Mitigation Plan</p> <p>Please confirm what the vertical green striped marking covering the Cable Route Corridor to the west of Sywell Wood on the Landscape and Ecology Mitigation Plan C and D Option A (Revision A) [REP1-111] depicts, as it is not explained in the key.</p>
Q2.7.5	The applicant	<p>Hedgerow removal timings</p> <p>Paragraph 6.2.2 of the Outline Ecological Protection and Mitigation Strategy (Revision A) [REP1-140] states that habitat clearance including some hedgerow would be undertaken between March and October inclusive. However, paragraph 6.4.1 states that clearance of hedgerow is not to be undertaken between March and August inclusive due to the risk of unlawful impacts on nesting birds. Please clarify whether these statements require revision.</p>
Q2.7.6	Natural England	<p>Consultation on document and plans to be certified</p> <p>The draft development consent order [CR1-014] currently provides for the statutory nature conservation body to be consulted on the final landscape and ecological management plan, ecological protection and mitigation strategy and biodiversity net gain strategy. Would Natural England wish to be consulted on any of the other documents and plans to be certified, as set out in Schedule 13, Part 1 of the draft order?</p>
Q2.7.7	Stop Green Hill Solar	<p>Llanwern solar scheme</p> <p>Please outline any areas of similarity and difference between the Llanwern scheme discussed in the “Notes on Ecology aspects of Green Hill solar plans” document [REP1-218] and the proposed development.</p>
Q2.7.8	Stop Green Hill Solar	<p>Bat Study methodology</p>

ExQ2: 28 November 2025

Responses due by deadline 3: 17 December 2025

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		Please provide any comments you wish to make in response to the applicant's comments on the methodology of the bat populations study (at SGHS-005, Pages 232-3 of the applicant's Responses to Written Representations at Deadline 1 [REP2-048])?
8. Habitats Regulations Assessment		
Q2.8.1	Natural England	Disturbance to species outside the Special Protection Area Does the applicant's response to Issue reference NE-004 (Visual and noise disturbance) of the applicant's Responses to Deadline 1 Submissions document [REP2-050] adequately address Natural England's concerns in this regard? If not, please outline how the concerns could be addressed.
Q2.8.2	Natural England	Functionally Linked Land Methodology Although the use of a "land parcel scale" in determining FLL was approved by Natural England, the applicant's response at NE-003 of its Responses to Written Representations at Deadline 1 [REP2-048] sets out that a "land parcel scale" was not used in determining FLL. Does this affect Natural England's conclusions on the approach to determining FLL?
Q2.8.3	Natural England The applicant	Special Protection Area qualifying features impact pathways The updated HRA [REP1-153] sets out qualifying features of the Upper Nene Valley Gravel Pits Special Protection Area at paragraph 5.2.4. Para 5.2.6 states that "the site qualifies under article 4.2 of the Birds Directive as it is used regularly by over 20,000 waterbirds (waterbirds as defined by the Ramsar Convention) in any season. In the non-breeding season, the area regularly supports 23,821 individual waterbirds (5 year peak mean 1999/2000-2003/04), including wigeon, gadwall, mallard, shoveler, pochard, tufted duck, great crested grebe, cormorant, bittern, golden plover, lapwing and coot". However, Table 2 (Summary of Screening Outcomes in Isolation and in Combination) (Page 32) lists only the following qualifying features and impact pathways for them: bittern, golden plover, gadwall, mute swan and waterbird. Should all the species listed at paragraph 5.2.6 be included in Table 2?
Q2.8.4	Natural England	Ramsar site conservation objectives To clarify question 9.0.10 of the Examining Authority's Written Questions 1 [PD-007], please confirm whether the conservation objectives for the Special Protection Area which are set out in Natural England's response to the question (in its Responses to ExQ1 document [REP1-181]) also apply to the Ramsar site.
9. Compulsory acquisition, temporary possession and other land or rights considerations		
		Questions on this topic will be posed during the forthcoming compulsory acquisition hearing.
10. The draft Development Consent Order (DCO)		
Q2.10.1	The applicant	References to Milton Keynes The dDCO refers to both the Borough of Milton Keynes and the District of Milton Keynes. Please check these terms for accuracy.
Q2.10.2	NNC	Noise assessment for the BESS Noting the applicant's response on p.121 of its Responses to Local Impact Reports [REP2-049] to paragraphs 8.264 to 8.266 of your local impact report stating that requirement 17 in schedule 2 to the draft DCO requires an operational noise management plan confirming how the design of the BESS has incorporated the operational noise mitigation measures set out in the oOEMP [REP1-133], to be approved by the relevant LPA prior to the commencement of the BESS, does this address your recommendation for submission of a noise assessment for the BESS?
		Further questions on this topic will be posed during the forthcoming issue specific hearing 3 on the dDCO.
11. Historic environment		

ExQ2: 28 November 2025
Responses due by deadline 3: 17 December 2025

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
Q2.11.1	Historic England (HE)	<p>Setting of designated heritage assets</p> <p>As part of ExQ1 the ExA asked the following question of HE:</p> <p><i>In relation to the comments in your relevant representation [RR-1228] regarding the settlements of Mears Ashby, Walgrave and Old, can you clarify that the proposed mitigation has satisfied your earlier concerns, or is there more to be done?</i></p> <p>As we did not receive representations from HE at D1 or D2, could you provide us with an answer to the above question by D3.</p>
Q2.11.2	Historic England	<p>Registered Park and Garden of Castle Ashby</p> <p>As part of ExQ1 the ExA asked the following question of HE:</p> <p><i>Your RR [RR-1228] in respect of the proximity of the Grade I Registered Park and Garden of Castle Ashby to the proposed development notes the topography and proposed screening would reduce the setting impact. Does this alleviate your concerns regarding the impact on setting, or is there more you expect from the applicant?</i></p> <p>As we did not receive representations from HE at D1 or D2, could you provide us with an answer to the above question by D3.</p>
Q2.11.3	WNC (and any other IP)	<p>Archaeological assessment</p> <p>Do you have any comments to make on the additional geophysical surveys [REP1-059] to [REP1-077] that were submitted by the applicant at deadline 1?</p>
Q2.11.4	NNC	<p>Non-designated (built) heritage assets within/outside the Order Limits</p> <p>Noting the applicant's response on p.89 of its Responses to Local Impact Reports [REP2-049] to paragraph 8.141 of your local impact report stating that the Order Limits runs adjacent to the property boundary of the three non-designated assets listed but does not include the buildings, does this address the previous disagreement on this point?</p> <p>If you still consider that these three non-designated heritage assets fall within the Order Limits could you please provide some evidence into the examination to back up your argument.</p>
12. Land use, agriculture and soils		
		There are no questions on this topic at this time. Questions may be asked in future hearings or in further written questions.
13. Landscape and visual, including glint and glare		
Q2.13.1	The applicant	<p>Progress on matters under discussion</p> <p>In the draft Statements of Common Ground with NNC [REP2-056], WNC [REP2-057] and MKCC [REP2-058] there are a number of Landscape and Visual Impacts which remain under discussion. Please could an update on the progress of any of these be provided.</p>
Q2.13.2	The applicant	<p>Mitigation planting</p> <p>NNC in their LIR para 8.40 refer to the landscape and visual mitigation having been conflated and too much weight applied to the benefits of this mitigation over and above its role of screening the proposed development? In your response ref NNC 8.40-8.41 [REP2-049] you note these comments however is there any further response you wish to make to NNC's concern?</p>
Q2.13.3	NNC	<p>Mitigation planting</p>

ExQ2: 28 November 2025**Responses due by deadline 3: 17 December 2025**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		In relation to paragraph 8.43 of your Local Impact Report [REP1-171], are there any specific areas where the proposed mitigation hedgerow planting of approximately 4 – 4.5m height would result in unacceptable levels of enclosure or impacts on existing visual connections/rural openness?
Q2.13.4	NNC	Cumulative impacts The applicant has responded to your concerns relating to cumulative impacts and viewing the scheme as a single, cohesive development in NNC 8.45 [REP2-049]. Does this address or alter your concerns in this regard?
Q2.13.5	MKCC, the applicant, Lavendon PC	Fields GF9 and GF13 Noting the submissions in relation to fields GF9 and GF13, is there an update regarding any progress on this issue or any updates as to the status of the emerging policies of the MKCP or the proposed SLA and the weight that should be given to these?
Q2.13.6	The applicant and MKCC	Additional viewpoints It is noted in the applicant's response MCC-012 [REP2-050] and MKCC's response Q16.0.3 [REP1-0170] that discussions are being held with MKCC to agree additional viewpoint locations with a view to submitting these at either D4 or D5. Are there any updates on the progress of these discussions?
Q2.13.7	The applicant, Local Planning Authorities and Stop Green Hill Solar	Local character variations Paragraph S.13 of Stop Green Hill Solar's Landscape and Related Matters Statement [REP-194] and [REP1-195] and the Local Impact Reports [REP1-169, REP1-171 and REP1-175] mention the need to consider the local variations in landscape character given the site is over such a wide area. Do the applicant, the Councils and Stop Green Hill Solar consider that a suitable level of consideration has been given to local landscape character baseline variations on which the assessments have been based upon?
Q2.13.8	Stop Green Hill Solar	LVIA methodology The Councils appear to be content with the methodology used for the LVIA and landscape assessments and are satisfied that they follow GLVIA3. However, in SGHS's submission REP1-194 and REP1-195, it is considered that the applicant's LVIA method and process have errors and flawed assumptions have been made (paragraph S.11 onwards). Does the applicant's response to these concerns in SGHS-28 [REP2-048] satisfactorily address these issues?
Q2.13.9	The applicant	Viewpoint and photomontage locations – Lamport Hall CPRE Northamptonshire, in their response to ExQ1 Q16.0.3 [REP2-069] have raised concerns with VP1 not being representative of the views experienced by visitors to Lamport Hall. Is the applicant intending to amend or provide an additional viewpoint to address this?
Q2.13.10	WNC	Effect on local roads In paragraph 4.167 - 4.169 of the LIR, reference is made to local roads having been omitted from the glint and glare assessments. The applicant has submitted a further Glint and Glare Technical Note [REP2-054], does this document address these omissions or do you consider further local roads should be included in the assessments?
14. Noise and vibration		
		There are no questions on this topic at this time. Questions may be asked in future hearings or in further written questions.
15. Socio-economic effects		
Q2.15.1	Wellingborough Town Council	Waendel Walk

ExQ2: 28 November 2025

Responses due by deadline 3: 17 December 2025

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		Please confirm whether you are satisfied with the updated proposed mitigation measures in respect of the International Waendel Walk Weekend, following engagement with the applicant on the issue.
16. Transportation and traffic		
Q2.16.1	The applicant	National Highways Please provide an update on discussions with National Highways.
Q2.16.2	The applicant	Construction parking provision Host authorities raise concerns that the level of shuttlebus use may be overestimated due to a lack of local hotel availability, increasing the need for parking within the proposed development. It is suggested that heavy goods vehicles may arrive ahead of schedule, potentially increasing congestion. Parking provision has not yet been defined. How would “overspill” parking on the highway be avoided in light of the shuttlebus concerns, and how would sufficient provision for HGV parking/holding areas be made within the proposed development?
Q2.16.3	The applicant	Travel arrangements Would staff and visitors travel to/from the sites once they had parked at one of the three compounds, or would parking be available within each of the sites, including the cable route corridor? If the former is envisaged, would people travel between the compound and the site they would be attending by shuttlebus?
Q2.16.4	The applicant	Access to Construction Compound 4 Construction Compound 4 would be accessed via an internal haul route from Station Road, Grendon. Horizontal directional drilling (HDD) would be used in the vicinity of the Station Road terminus of the haul route in respect of Crossings HV_SP8760_013 and HV_SP8760_014, as shown in the Crossing Schedule [APP-562]. The applicant’s response to Question Q20.0.3 of the Examining Authority’s First Written Questions [REP1-163] states that where HDD is used, internal haul routes cannot be used to inter-connect between sites. Can the applicant explain how a haul route would be made available from Station Road.
Q2.16.5	The applicant	Access D-1 (Highfield Road) The applicant’s response to Q20.0.12 [REP1-163] sets out that Access D-1 has been identified for use during the construction phase and during replacement periods. The access would lie close to the Sywell Road junction with Highfield Road. A representation [REP1-207] has been made regarding the safety of this access. What assessments of the highway safety implications of its use have been made?
Q2.16.6	The applicant	Notice of public right of way closures West Northamptonshire Council’s Local Impact Report requests that notice is given to the public of any temporary closures of public rights of way. Please confirm whether any updates to the Outline Public Rights of Way and Permissive Paths Management Plan (Revision A) [REP1-147] in this respect are considered appropriate.
Q2.16.7	The applicant	Consideration of management measures to prevent diversions or closures of public rights of way The Outline Public Rights of Way and Permissive Paths Management Plan Revision A [REP1-147] sets out (at 3.2) management measures for the tabulated public rights of way which would need to be crossed during construction or which would require management associated with the Cable Route Corridor. However, any management measures which would be considered before closures in respect of several other public rights of way which may be subject to temporary closure, such as Footpath TF/004 between Grendon and Castle Ashby, are not set out. Given the value placed on countryside access by local communities, can the applicant explain whether consideration of such management measures in preference to diversions or closures would be given in respect of all affected public rights of way?
Q2.16.8	The applicant	Public access to the countryside and perceptions of safety

ExQ2: 28 November 2025**Responses due by deadline 3: 17 December 2025**

ExQ2	Question to:	Question:
		A number of existing public rights of way would cross the proposed development. Some of these would follow a generally 30-metre-wide corridor between post and wire fencing on both sides, to a maximum height of 2.5 metres. Concern has been raised about how safe the public would feel using such paths through the development. Some paths (for instance the green lane permissive path through Site A, Path MK/Lavendon/005 through Site G (part of the Milton Keynes Boundary Walk) and Path MK/Lavendon/002 through Site G, part of the Three Shires Way) would include a continuously fenced corridor through, or adjacent to, solar panels for some distance. How would this affect the perceived potential for assistance, evasion or escape if a path user felt under threat there? Is there a risk that some members of the public may feel intimidated using such paths where they did not previously, with a resulting reduction in use of the paths concerned and hence an adverse effect on public access to the countryside?
Q2.16.9	Easton Maudit Parish Meeting	Easton Way Please confirm whether the Parish Meeting has any remaining concerns regarding the inclusion of part of Easton Way in the scheme following the applicant's response (at EMPM-007 of its Responses to Relevant Representations document [REP1-161]) to these.
Q2.16.10	Stop Green Hill Solar	Public access to the countryside and perceptions of safety Stop Green Hill Solar's Landscape and Related Matters Statement [REP1-195] raises concerns regarding public safety when using fenced paths through the proposed development. The green lane off Newland Road north of Walgrave which would pass between solar panels is given as an example. Paragraph 8.39 of the document submits that the application would create an inescapable corridor along an existing path that was previously open to the wider countryside. It is submitted that the current route provides anyone using it who may feel under threat with numerous options for escape and means of drawing attention in the event of an emergency. Please explain what these are, and how they would change if the proposed development received consent.
17. Water environment		
Q2.17.1	All parties	Environment Agency updated flood mapping dataset Do you wish to comment on any implications for the scheme of the Environment Agency's NaFRA2 updated flood mapping dataset, released 25 March 2025?
Q2.17.2	The applicant	Site G off-site hydrology The applicant's Responses to Relevant Representations [REP1-161] states at Page 346 that extensive work has been undertaken at Site G to confirm that there would be no off-site detriment to flood risk. The sections of the site-wide and site-specific Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Strategy Reports [REP1-053 and APP-107] which concern off-site flood risk are relatively brief. Please clarify whether the results of the work undertaken in respect of off-site flood risk at Site G are set out elsewhere.
Q2.17.3	Environment Agency	Flood Risk Please explain whether the Environment Agency (EA) considers the applicant's proposed approach to the EA's concerns regarding hydraulic modelling (EA-016 of the Applicant's Response to Relevant Representations [REP1-161]) to be sufficient.
Q2.17.4	Richard Gregory	Signposting enquiry Please direct the Examining Authority to the location of the statement referred to at Page 3 of your written representation at Deadline 1 [REP1-283], namely that Area G's natural permeability is low, and that imported graded topsoil would be required to improve conditions.
Q2.17.5	Richard Gregory	Geology of Site G A submission at Page 18 of your written representation at Deadline 1 [REP1-283] challenges statements in the EIA Scoping Report [APP-066] concerning the geology of Site G. How, if at all, do you consider that the two submitted photographs affect the assessment of flood risk to and from Site G of the proposed development?

ExQ2: 28 November 2025
Responses due by deadline 3: 17 December 2025